

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

Solomon Sara, S.J.
Georgetown University

Chapter 14. This is a chapter on *ʔal-mafʔuwl*
'the acted-upon'(1)

(Bulaq vol. 1. P.19, Derenbourg vol.1. p.14, Haruwn vol.1. p.41)

(I:14. L. 17) This is a chapter on *ʔal-mafʔuwl* 'the acted-upon' whose action transitivizes it to *mafʔuwl* 'an acted-upon', and that is as in your saying *kusiya ʔabd-u ʔal-lāhi ʔal-θawb-a* 'Abdullah was clothed (with) a garment', and *ʔuʔtʔiya ʔabd-u ʔal-lāhi ʔal-māl-a* 'Abdullah was given the money'². *rafaʔta* 'You raised' Abdullah, just as you raised it in *dʔuriba* 'he was struck', when you said *dʔuriba ʔabu ʔal-lāhi* 'Abdullah was struck', and you engaged it with *kusiya* 'was covered', and *ʔuʔtʔiya* 'was given', in the manner you engaged it with *dʔuriba* 'was struck'. The *θawb-u* 'garment' and *māl-u* 'money' *ʔintasʔaba* 'were put in the erect [-a]' state because they are *mafʔuwlān* 'two acted-upons', (L.20) transitivized by the action of *mafʔuwl* 'an acted-upon' that has the status of *ʔal-fāʔil* 'the actor'³. If you so wish, you may pre-pose or post-pose and say *kusiya ʔal-θawba zaydun* 'Zaid was covered with the garment' *ʔuʔtʔiya ʔal-māla ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'Abdullah was given the money', as you said *dʔaraba zaydan ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'Abdullah struck Zaid.'⁴ The situation in this case is the same as in the case of *ʔal-fāʔil* 'the actor'. Know that the *mafʔuwl* 'acted-upon' whose action does not transitivize *mafʔuwl* 'an acted-upon', it transitivizes everything that *ʔal-fiʔl* 'the action' of *ʔal-fāʔil* 'the actor' transitivizes⁵, whose action does not transitivize *mafʔuwl* 'an acted-on', and that as in your saying *dʔuriba zaydun ʔal-dʔarba ʔal-šadiyda* 'Zaid was struck a strong blow'.

هذا كتاب سيبويه
المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(١٤) هذا باب المفعول الذي تتعداه فعله إلى
مفعول

(ص. ١٤. س. ١٧) وذلك قولك كُسيَ عبدُ الله
الثوبَ وأُعطيَ عبدُ الله المالَ رفعتَ عبدَ الله
هاهنا كما رفعته في ضُرب حين قلتَ
ضُربَ عبدُ الله وشغلتَ به كُسيَ وأُعطيَ كما
شغلتَ به ضُربَ وانتصب الثوبُ والمالُ
لانهما مفعولان (س. ٢٠) تتعدى إليهما فعلُ
مفعولٍ هو بمنزلة الفاعل وإن شئتَ قدّمتَ
وأحررتَ فقلتَ كُسيَ الثوبَ زيدٌ وأُعطيَ
المالَ عبدُ الله كما قلتَ ضُربَ زيداً عبدُ الله
فالامر في هذا كالامر في الفاعل واعلم أنّ
المفعولَ الذي لا يتعداه فعله إلى مفعول
يتعدى إلى كلّ شيءٍ تتعدى إليه فعلُ الفاعل
الذي لا يتعداه فعله إلى مفعولٍ وذلك قولك
ضُربَ زيدٌ الضُربَ الشديداً

¹Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

²The actions mentioned in this chapter and their transitivity were touched upon in chapter 11.

³The *mafʔuwl* has the status of the *fāʔil*.

⁴The *fāʔil* comes before the *mafʔuwl* but the order may be reversed as in this case.

⁵When the *fāʔil* is not expressed the *mafʔuwl* assumes the status of the *fāʔil*

dʿuriba ʿabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔal-yawmayni ʔal-laḏayni taʿlamu ‘Abdullah was hit the two days that you know about’. You don’t consider it *dʿarf* ‘an envelop (of time)’, but as you say *yā (I:15. L. 1) madʿruwba ʔal-laylati ʔal-dʿarba ʔal-šadiyda* ‘You that was hit tonight a strong hit’. *ʔuḡʿida ʿabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔal-muḡʿada ʔal-kariyma* ‘Abdullah was seated (on) the seat of honor’. All that the action of the actor transitivityzes, whose action does not transitivityze *mafʿuwl* ‘an acted-upon’, the action of the *mafʿuwl* ‘acted-upon’ transitivityzes it, whose action does not transitivityze beyond it. Know that the *mafʿuwl* ‘acted-upon’, to which the action of an actor does not transitivityze, in the process of transitivityzation and limitation, is of its status, if the action of an actor transitivityzes it, because transitivityzing the action of the actor transitivityzing it, and its action (L. 5) not transitivityzing it mean the same thing. Don’t you see that you say *dʿarabtu zaydan* ‘I hit Zaid’, you do not transitivityze beyond this *mafʿuwl* ‘acted-on’. You say *dʿuriba zaydun* ‘Zaid was hit’. Its action does not transitivityze beyond it, because the meaning is one. You say *kasawtu zaydan ḥawban* ‘I covered Zaid (with) a garment’. It does transitivityze another *mafʿuwl* ‘acted-upon’. You say *kusiya zaydun ḥawban* ‘Zaid was covered (with) a garment.’ It does not transitivityze beyond the *ḥawban* ‘garment’, because the first is in place of the *mansʿuwb* ‘erect’ one, since the meaning is one, even if its expression is the expression of *ʔal-fāʿil* ‘the actor’.⁶

وضُربَ عبدُ الله اليومين اللذين تَعَلَّمُ
لا تَجْعَلُهُ ظَرْفًا وَلَكِنْ كَمَا تَقُولُ يَا
(ص. ١٥) مَضْرُوبَ اللَّيْلَةِ الضَّرْبَ الشَّدِيدَ
وَأَقْعِدَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ الْمُقْعَدَ الْكَرِيمَ فَجَمِيعُ مَا
تَعَدَّى إِلَيْهِ فِعْلُ الْفَاعِلِ الَّذِي لَا يَتَعَدَّاهُ
فِعْلُهُ إِلَى مَفْعُولٍ يَتَعَدَّى إِلَيْهِ فِعْلُ
المَفْعُولِ الَّذِي لَا يَتَعَدَّاهُ فِعْلُهُ وَاعْلَمْ
أَنَّ المَفْعُولَ الَّذِي لَمْ يَتَعَدَّ إِلَيْهِ فِعْلُ
فَاعِلٍ فِي التَّعَدِّيِّ وَالِاقْتِصَارِ بِمَنْزِلَتِهِ إِذَا
تَعَدَّى إِلَيْهِ فِعْلُ الْفَاعِلِ لِأَنَّ مَعْنَاهُ مَتَعَدِّيًّا
إِلَيْهِ فِعْلُ الْفَاعِلِ وَغَيْرَ مَتَعَدٍّ (س. ٥) إِلَيْهِ
فِعْلُهُ سِوَاءَ أَلَا تَرَى أَنَّكَ تَقُولُ ضَرَبْتُ
زَيْدًا فَلَا تَجَاوِزُ هَذَا المَفْعُولَ وَتَقُولُ
ضُربَ زَيْدٌ فَلَا يَتَعَدَّاهُ فِعْلُهُ لِأَنَّ المَعْنَى
وَاحِدٌ وَتَقُولُ كَسَوْتُ زَيْدًا ثَوْبًا فَيَجَاوِزُ
إِلَى مَفْعُولٍ آخَرَ وَتَقُولُ كَسَى زَيْدٌ ثَوْبًا
فَلَا يَجَاوِزُ الثَّوْبَ لِأَنَّ الْأَوَّلَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ
الْمَنْصُوبِ لِأَنَّ المَعْنَى وَاحِدٌ وَإِنْ كَانَ
لَفْظُهُ لَفْظَ الْفَاعِلِ.

⁶The structure of a sentence is as follows: action + actor (raised) + acted upon-1 (erected) + acted upon-2 (erected). When the actor is not expressed then the structure of the sentence changes to: action + acted upon-1 (raised) + acted upon-2 (erected).

Chapter 15. This is a Chapter on *ʔal-mafʔuwl* ‘the acted-upon’ (2)

(Bulaq vol. 1. P.20, Derenbourg vol.1. p.15, Haruwn vol.1. p.43)

(I: 15. L. 10) This is a chapter on *ʔal-mafʔuwl* ‘the acted-upon’ whose action *yataʔadāhu* ‘transitivizes’ *mafʔuwlayni* ‘two acted-upons’, but you may not limit yourself to one of the two without the other⁷. That is as in your saying *nubbiʔtu zaydan ʔabā fulānin* ‘I was informed Zayd (is) the father of so-and-so’. Since *ʔal-fāʔil* ‘the actor’ transitivizes three, *ʔal-mafʔuwl* ‘the acted-upon’ transitivizes two. You say *ʔurā ʔabda ʔal-lāhi ʔabā fulānin* ‘I am shown ʔabdallah the father of so-and-so’. Because if you were to introduce into this *fiʔl* ‘action’ *ʔal-fāʔil* ‘the actor’, and you constructed it for it, its *fiʔl* ‘action’ would transitivize three *mafʔuwliyna* ‘acted-upons.’⁸

Know that *ʔal-ʔafʔāl* ‘the actions’, if they were to end right here, they will not be permitted to proceed further. They have transitivized all that *fiʔl* ‘action’ transitivizes which does not transitivize *ʔal-mafʔuwl* ‘an acted-upon’, and that is in your saying *ʔuʔʔiya ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔal-θawba ʔiʔʔāʔan gamiylan* ‘Abdallah was given the garment, an elegant giving’. *nubbiʔtu zaydan ʔabā fulānin tanbiyʔan hasanan* ‘I was informed that Zayd (is) the father of so-and-so, a good information’, and *suriqa ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔal-θawba ʔal-laylata* ‘the robe of Abdallah was stolen tonight’ (L. 15). You do not consider it as *δʔarfan* ‘an envelope (of time)’, but as in your saying *yā masruwqa ʔal-laylati ʔal-θawba*. ‘O, you the stolen thing of tonight, the garment’. It was made the *fiʔl* ‘action’ of *ʔal-mafʔuwl* ‘the acted-upon’ and *ʔal-fāʔil* ‘the actor’, where their *fiʔl* ‘action’ ended, of the same status as *ʔal-fiʔl* ‘the action’ whose neither its *fāʔil* ‘actor’ nor its *ʔal-mafʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ transitivizes; neither of them is weaker than the action which does not transitivize.

(١٥) هذا باب المفعول الذي يتعداه فعله إلى مفعولين وليس لك أن تقتصر على واحد منهما دون الآخر

(ص. ١٥. س. ١٠) وذلك قولك نُبِّئْتُ زَيْدًا أَبَا فَلَانٍ لَمَّا كَانَ الْفَاعِلُ يَتَعَدَّى إِلَى ثَلَاثَةٍ تَعَدَّى الْمَفْعُولُ إِلَى اثْنَيْنِ وَقَوْلُ أَرَى عَبْدَ اللَّهِ أَبَا فَلَانٍ لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ أَدْخَلْتَ فِي هَذَا الْفِعْلِ الْفَاعِلَ وَبَنَيْتَهُ لَهُ لَتَعَدَّاهُ فَعْلُهُ إِلَى ثَلَاثَةِ مَفْعُولِينَ.

واعلم أنّ الأفعال إذا انتهت هاهنا فلم تُجاوزْ تَعَدَّتْ إِلَى جَمِيعِ مَا تَعَدَّى إِلَيْهِ الْفِعْلُ الَّذِي لَا يَتَعَدَّى الْمَفْعُولَ وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ أُعْطِيَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ الثَّوْبَ إِعْطَاءً جَمِيلًا وَنُبِّئْتُ زَيْدًا أَبَا فَلَانٍ تَنْبِيئًا حَسَنًا وَسُرِقَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ الثَّوْبَ (س. ١٥) اللَّيْلَةَ لَا تَجْعَلُهُ ظَرْفًا وَلَكِنْ عَلَى قَوْلِكَ يَا مَسْرُوقَ اللَّيْلَةِ الثَّوْبَ صَيَّرَ فِعْلَ الْمَفْعُولِ وَالْفَاعِلِ حَيْثُ انْتَهَى فَعْلُهُمَا بِمَنْزِلَةِ الْفِعْلِ الَّذِي لَا يَتَعَدَّى فَاعِلَهُ وَلَا مَفْعُولَهُ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ أَوْضَعُ مِنَ الْفِعْلِ الَّذِي لَا يَتَعَدَّى.

⁷The actions discussed in this chapter and their transitivity were touched upon in chapter 12.

⁸The structure of a sentence is as follows: action + actor (raised) +acted upon-1(erected) + acted upon-2 (erected) + acted-upon-3 (raised). When the actor is not expressed, then the structure of the sentence changes to: action + acted upon-1 (raised) + acted upon-2 (erected) + acted upon-3 (erected).

Chapter 16. This is a Chapter on *fiʿl* Action (1)

(Bulaq vol. 1. P. 20, Derenbourg vol.1. p.15, Haruwn vol.1. p.44)

(I:P. 15. L. 18) This is a chapter on what the *fiʿl* 'action' affects, and *yantasʿib* 'is rendered erect'. It is *ḥāl* 'a state' in which the action occurred and it is not *mafʿuwl* 'an acted-upon', as in the case of *ḥawb* 'garment' in your saying *kasawtu ʔal-ḥawba* 'I covered (with) the garment', and in your saying *kasawtu zaydan ʔal-ḥawba* 'I covered zayd (with) the garment'. Because *ʔal-ḥawba* 'the garment' is not *ḥāl* 'a state' in which the action occurred. It is, rather, *mafʿuwl* 'an acted-upon' like the first. Don't you see that it is *maʿrifah* 'definite' and its meaning as a second is the same as its meaning as the first, if you said *kasawtu ʔal-ḥawba* 'I covered (with) a garment.' and it has the same meaning, if it had the status of *ʔal-fāʿil* 'the actor',⁹ if you were to say *kusia ʔal-ḥawbu* 'it/he was covered (with) the garment', and that in your saying *dʿarabtu ʔabda ʔal-lāhi qāʔiman* 'I hit Abdallah while he stood' and *ḍahaba zaydun rākiban* 'Zayd went as a rider'. For if it were in place of *ʔal-mafʿuwl* 'the acted-upon' which the action of the actor transitivizes (P. 16. L.1), like 'Abdullāh' and 'Zayd', it would not be permitted with *ḍahabtu* 'I went', but it would be permitted if you say *ḍarabtu zaydan ʔabāka* 'I hit zayd, your father' and *ḍarabtu zaydan ʔal-qāʔima* 'I hit zayd, the-one-standing-up'. You don't mean by the 'father' nor in the 'the-one-standing-up', *ʔal-sʿifāh* 'the descriptive' nor the *badal* 'substitutive'. The first *ʔism* 'name', *ʔal-mafʿuwl* 'the acted-upon' of *dʿarabtu* 'I hit', has interfered between it and *ʔal-fiʿl* 'the action' that it be of the same status, just as *ʔal-fāʿil* 'the actor' interfered between it and the action in *ḍahaba* 'he went' that it be *fāʿil* 'an actor'. In the same manner, the names in the *magruwr* 'pull' status interfere between what is after them and *gār* 'puller'¹⁰, (L.5) as in your saying *liy miḥluhu ragulan* 'I am like him a man' and *liy miḥluhu ʔasalan* 'I have its fullness of honey'. Also *wayḥahu fārisan* 'Alas, he (is) not a knight'. Just as the *nuwn* [n] in *ʔišriyn* 'twenty' interfered with having any *gar* 'pull' after it, if you said 'he has *ʔišruwna dirhaman* 'twenty dirhams'. The action here worked on what would be *ḥāl* 'a state' just like the work of *liy miḥluhu* 'I am/have like him', in what follows it. Don't you see that it

⁹The *mafʿuwl* is like *ʔal-fāʿil*.

¹⁰The particle that affects the *gar* 'pull' and is marked with a *kasrah* [-i].

(١٦) هذا باب ما يَعْمَلُ فِيهِ الْفِعْلُ فَيَنْتَصِبُ
وَهُوَ حَالٌ وَقَعَ فِيهِ الْفِعْلُ وَلَيْسَ بِمَفْعُولٍ

(ص. ١٥. س. ١٨) كالثوب في قولك كسوتُ
الثوبَ وفي قولك كسوتُ زيداً الثوبَ لأنَّ
الثوبَ ليس بحالٍ وقع (س. ٢٠) فيها الفعلُ
ولكنه مفعولٌ كالاولِ ألا ترى أنه يكون
معرفةً ويكون معناه ثانياً كمعناه أولاً إذا قلتَ
كسوتُ الثوبَ وكمعناه إذا كان بمنزلة
الفاعلِ إذا قلتَ كسيتُ الثوبَ وذلك قولك
ضربتُ عبدَ الله قائماً وذهبَ زيدٌ ركباً فلو
كان بمنزلة المفعول الذي يَتَعَدَّى (ص. ١٦)
إليه فعلُ الفاعلِ نحو عبدِ الله وزيد ما جاز
في ذهبتُ ولجاز أن تقول ضربتُ زيداً أباك
وضربتُ زيداً القائمَ لا تريد بالاب ولا
بالقائمِ الصفةَ ولا البَدَلَ فالاسمُ الاولُ المفعولُ
في ضربتُ قد حال بينه وبين الفعل ان يكون
فيه بمنزلة كما حال الفاعل بينه وبين الفعل
في ذهبَ أن يكون فاعلاً وكما حالَتِ
الاسماءُ المجرورةُ بين ما بعدها وبين الجارِ
(س. ٥) في قولك لي مثله رجلاً ولي ملؤه
عسلاً وكذلك ويحهُ فارساً وكما منعتِ التَّوْنُ
في عشرين أن يكون ما بعدها جراً إذا قلتَ
له عشرون درهما فَعَمِلَ الْفِعْلُ هَاهُنَا فِيمَا
يكون حالاً كعملِ لي مثله فيما بعده ألا ترى

أته

can not be except *nakirah* 'indefinite', just as this one can not be except *nakirah* 'an indefinite', even if *ḥāl* 'state' were to have the status of the *ḥawb* 'garment and 'Zayd' with *kasawtu* 'I covered'. This would not be permitted in *ḍahabtu rākiban* 'I went riding', because it does not transitive *mafiuwl* 'an acted-upon' like 'Zayd' and 'Amr'. This one was allowed, because it is a *ḥāl* 'state' and its meaning is not like the meaning of *ḥawb* 'garment' and 'Zayd'. It functioned like the function of something other than *fiʿl* 'action'. It is not weaker than it, since it transitive what I mentioned of *ʔazminah* '(envelopes of) time/tenses', *masʿādir* 'roots', and similar ones.

لا يكون إلا نكرة كما أن هذا لا يكون إلا نكرة ولو كان هذا الحال بمنزلة الثوب وزيد في كسوت لما جاز ذهبته ركباً لأنه لا يتعدى إلى مفعول كزيد وعمره وإنما جاز هذا لأنه حال وليس معناه كمعنى الثوب (س. ١٠) وزيد فعمل كعمل غير الفعل ولم يكن أضعف منه إذ كان يتعدى إلى ما ذكرت من الأزمنة والمصادر ونحوه.

Chapter 17. This is a chapter on *fiʿl* ‘Action’ (2)

(Bulaq vol. 1. P. 21, Derenbourg vol.1. p.16, Haruwn vol.1. p.45)

(I: p. 16. L. 12) This is a chapter on *ʔal-fiʿl* ‘the action’ in which *ʔismu ʔal-fāʿil* ‘name of the actor’ transitivizes *ʔism ʔal-mafʿuwl* ‘name of the acted-upon’ and in which the name of the actor and the acted-upon refer to the same thing, hence it was mentioned by itself, and not mentioned with the first. It is not permitted in this case to be restricted to *ʔal-fāʿil* ‘the actor’ just as it is not permitted in *dʿanantu* ‘I considered’ to be restricted to the first *ʔal-mafʿuwl* ‘acted-upon’, because your situation of need for (L. 15) the other here, is like your situation in the need for it there, and we shall explain it to you, God willing. This is in your saying *kāna*, ‘he was’ *yakuwnu* ‘he is’, *sʿāra* ‘he became’, *mā dāma*, ‘as long as he continues’, *laysa* ‘he is not’, and of what is like them in action that do not do without the *xabar* ‘predicate’. You say: *kāna ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔaxāka* ‘abdullah was your brother’. You wanted to predicate about the brotherhood. You inserted *kāna* ‘he was’ to make that in what has passed. So you mentioned the first as you mentioned the first acted-upon for *dʿanantu* ‘I considered’. If you wished, you could have said *kāna ʔaxāka ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘Abdullah was your brother’¹¹. You pre-positioned and post-positioned as you did in *dʿaraba* ‘he hit’, because it is an action like it, and the state of pre-positioning (L. 20) and post-positioning in it is like its state with *dʿaraba* ‘he hit’, except that *ʔismu ʿal-fāʿil* ‘name of the actor’ and the *ʔism ʔal-mafʿuwl* ‘the name of acted-upon’ here refer to the same. You say *kunnāhum* ‘We were them’, as you say *dʿarabnāhum* ‘We hit them’; and he said *ʔiḏā lam nakunhum* ‘if we are not them’, then *man yakunhum* ‘who will be them’, as you say *ʔiḏā lam nadʿribhum* ‘if we do not hit them,’ then *man yadʿribhum* ‘who will hit them’. *ʔabuw ʔal-ʔaswad ʔal-duʔaliyy* said:(tʿawiyl)¹²

faʔin lā yakunhā ʔaw takunhu faʔinnahu

ʔaxuwḥa ʔaḏḏathu ʔummuhu bilibāniha

‘If he is not her, and she is not him then he is
her brother, his mother nursed him with her milk’

(١٧) هذا باب الفعل الذي يتعدى اسم
الفاعل إلى اسم المفعول واسم الفاعل
والمفعول فيه لشيء واحد

فمن ثم ذكر على حدته ولم يذكر مع
الاول ولا يجوز فيه الاقتصار على
الفاعل كما لم يجز في ظننت الاقتصار
على المفعول الاول لان حالك في الاحتياج
الى (س. ١٥) الآخر هاهنا كحالك في
الاحتياج اليه ثمه وسنبين لك ذلك ان
شاء الله وذلك قولك كان ويكون
وصار وما دام وليس وما كان نحوهن
من الفعل مما لا يستغنى عن الخبر
تقول كان عبد الله أخاك فإثما
أردت أن تخبر عن الأخوة وأدخلت
كان لتجعل ذلك فيما مضى وذكرت
الاول كما ذكرت المفعول الاول في
ظننت وإن شئت قلت كان أخاك
عبد الله فقدمت وأخرت كما فعلت
ذلك في ضرب لآته فعل مثله وحال
التقديم (س. ٢٠) والتأخير فيه كحاله
في ضرب إلا أن اسم الفاعل
والمفعول فيه لشيء واحد وتقول
كأهم كما تقول ضربناهم وقال إذا
لم نكنهم فمن ذا يكونهم كما تقول إذا لم
نضربهم فمن ذا يضربهم وقال الشاعر أبو
الأسود الدؤلي (طويل)

فإن لا يَكُنْها أو تَكُنْه فإِنَّه

أخوها غَدَتْه أُمُّه بليانها

¹¹Abdullah is post-positioned and your brother is pre-positioned here.

¹²Meter for tʿawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun* (2 times)

He is a *kāʔin* 'one who is' and *makuwn* 'one who has been', just as he is *dʿārib* 'one who hits/hitter' and *madʿruwb* 'one who is hit'. *kāna* 'he was' may have another *mawdʿiʔ* 'location' that is restricted to (P. 17) the *fāʔil* 'actor'. You say *Gad kāna ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'Abdullah is' in the sense of *Gad xuliGa ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'abdullah is created', and *Gad kāna ʔal-ʔamru* 'it so happened' in the sense of *wagaʔa ʔal-ʔamru* 'the matter came to pass', *Gad dāma fulānun* 'so and so endured' in the sense of *Gad ʔabata fulānun* 'so-and-so withstood'. It is just like your saying *raʔaytu zaydan* 'I saw Zayd' you mean the seeing with the eye, and as you say *wagadtuhu* 'I found him', you mean *wigdānu ʔal-dʿāllati* 'finding of the lost one', and *asʔaba*, *ʔamsā* 'came upon morning, enter into evening' are used once in the sense of *kāna* 'be', and at another time, in the sense of your saying *ʔistayGaḏʔuw*, *nāmuw* 'they woke up, they slept'. As for *laysa* 'not be', it does not have the same potential, because it is placed in one single place, and from there it does not have (L.5) *tusʔarrafu tasʔarrufa* 'inflects with the same inflections'¹³ of the other action. As to what came in the sense of *wagaʔa* 'happen' is the saying of poet, who is: *Maggās ʔal-ʔāʔiḏiyyu (tʔawiyl)*¹⁴

fadan li-baniy ḏuhli bni Šaybāna nāGati

ʔiḏā kāna yawmun ḏuw kawākiba ʔašhabu

'my she-camel, a sacrifice for the people of the tribe of ḏuhl bin Šaybān

If a day happened in which the stars are gray.'

That is *ʔiḏā kāna* 'if it were' i.e. *ʔiḏā wagaʔa* 'if it happened' and the other, *ʔamr bnu Šaʔs*, said (tʔawiyl)¹⁵

baniy ʔasadin hal taʔlamuwna balāʔana

ʔiḏā kāna yawman ḏā kawākiba ʔašnaʔa

'Bani Asad do you know our predicament

If a more hideous day with stars occurred'

He did not express to the hearer what he means, i.e. 'the day'. I heard some of the Arabs say *ʔašanʔā* 'more hideous' and raise what is before it, (L.10) as if he said *ʔiḏā wagaʔa yawmun ḏuw kawākiba ʔašnaʔā* 'if a more hideous day with stars occurred'.

¹³*Laysa* lacks the morphological derivation one finds in the others

¹⁴Meter for tʔawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun* (2 times).

¹⁵Meter for tʔawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun* (2 times).

فهو كائن ومكون كما كان ضارباً
ومضروباً وقد يكون لكان موضع آخر
يقتصر على (ص. ١٧) الفاعل فيه تقول قد
كان عبد الله أي قد خلق عبد الله وقد كان
الامر أي وقع الامر وقد دام فلان أي ثبت
كما تقول رأيت زيدا تريد رؤية العين وكما
تقول وجدته تريد وجدان الضالة وكما يكون
أصبح وأمسى مرة بمنزلة كان ومرة بمنزلة
قولك استيقظوا وناموا وأما ليس فإنه لا
يكون فيها ذلك لأنها وضعت موضعاً واحداً
زمن ثم لم (س. ٥) تصرف تصرف الفعل
الآخر فمما جاء على وقع قول الشاعر وهو
مقاس العائذي (طويل)

فدى لبني دهل بن شيبان ناقتي
إذا كان يومٌ ذو كواكبٍ أشهبُ

أي إذا وقع وقال الآخر عمرو بن شأس
(طويل)

بنى أسدٍ هل تعلمون بلائنا
إذا كان يوماً ذا كواكبٍ أشنعاً

أضمر لعلم المخاطب بما يعنى وهو اليوم
وسمعت بعض العرب يقول أشنعاً ويرفع ما
قبله (س. ١٠) كأنه قال إذا وقع يومٌ ذو
كواكبٍ أشنعاً

Know that if there is in this chapter *nakirah* 'indefinite' and *maʿrifah* 'definite', the one that *kāna* 'he was' will be engaged with is the 'definite', since it is the definition of speech and because they are both one thing. It is not with the status of your saying *dʿaraba rajulun zaydan* 'A man hit Zayd', because these are two different things. With *kāna* 'he was' they would have their status in the initial position. If you said *ʿabdu ʿal-lāhi muntʿaliḡun* 'Abdullah (is) departing', you begin with the most known, then you mention the *xabar* 'predicate'. In your saying *kāna zaydun ḥaliyman* and *kāna ḥaliyman zaydun* 'Zayd was wise' It does not matter whether you pre-positioning or post-positioning. It is, however, as I described to you in your saying *dʿaraba zaydan* (L.15) *ʿabdu ʿal-lāhi* 'Abdullah hit Zayd'. If you said *kāna zaydun* 'Zayd was', you began with what is known to him which is similar to what is known to you, but he is waiting for the *xabar* 'predicate'. If you said *ḥaliyman* 'gentle', then you informed him of what you know. If you were to say *kāna ḥaliyman* 'He was gentle', he is waiting that you introduce him to the proprietor of the *sʿifah* 'descriptive' which is begun with the action, even if it is delayed in the utterance. If you were to say *kāna ḥaliymun, ʿaw ragulun* 'He was gentle or (he was) a man', you began with a *nakirah* 'an indefinite', and it is not correct to inform the addressee about the indefinite. This is not how the addressee comes to know what you know, and that is definite knowledge. They hated to come close to the door of confusion. (L. 20) You might say *kāna zaydun ʿal-tʿawiylu muntʿaliḡan* 'Zayd the tall was departing', if you were afraid to confuse the two Zayds. You say *ʿasafiyhan kāna zaydun ʿam ḥaliyman* 'Was Zayd unwise or wise?', *ʿa ragulan kāna zaydun am sʿabiyyan* 'Was Zayd a man or a youth?', you apply them to Zayd, because it is necessary for you to ask him about *xabar* 'predicate' about someone who is known to him, just as you talked to him about information of someone known to you. The *maʿruwf* 'known' is what is begun with, and what is confusing is not begun with, which is the *nakirah* 'indefinite'. Don't you see that if you were to say *kāna ragulun* (P. 18) *muntʿaliḡan* 'A man was leaving' or *kāna ʿinsānun ḥaliyman* 'There was a wise person', you are causing confusion, because it is undeniable that there be in the world such a person. Hence they hated to begin with what has confusion, and make the *maʿrifah* 'definite' *xabaran* 'a predicate' to what has this confusion. It may be allowed in poetry and in weakness of *kalām* 'speech', which led them to that. It is an action with the status of *dʿaraba* 'to hit' and it might become known if you mention Zayd and make him the predicate, that he is the proprietor of the *sʿifah* 'descriptive', in a weakness in speech.

واعلم أنه إذا كان في هذا الباب نكرةً ومعرفةً فالذي تشغل به كان المعرفة لأنه حدُّ الكلام لانهما شيءٌ واحدٌ وليس بمنزلة قولك ضربَ رجلٌ زيداً لانهما شيئان مختلفان وهما في كان بمنزلة في الابتداء إذا قلت عبدُ الله منطلقٌ تبتدئُ بالأعرافِ ثم تذكر الخبرَ وذلك قولك كان زيدٌ حليماً وكان حليماً زيدٌ لا عليك أقدمتَ أم أخرتَ إلا أنه على ما وصفتُ لك في قولك ضربَ زيداً (س. ١٥) عبدُ الله فإذا قلت كان زيدٌ فقد ابتدأتُ بما هو معروفٌ عنده مثله عندك فإنما ينتظرُ الخبرَ فإذا قلت حليماً فقد أعلمته مثل ما علمتَ وإذا قلت كان حليماً فإنما ينتظرُ أن تعرفه صاحبَ الصفة فهو مبدوءٌ به في الفعل وإن كان مؤخرًا في اللفظ فإن قلت كان حليماً أو رجلٌ فقد بدأتُ بنكرةٍ ولا يستقيم أن تُخيرَ المخاطبَ عن المنكور وليس هذا الذي يَنْزِلُ به المخاطبُ منزلتك وهو المعرفة فكرهوا أن يَقْرَبُوا بابَ لبس (س. ٢٠) وقد تقول كان زيدٌ الطويلُ منطلقاً إذا خفتَ التباسَ الزيدَيْنِ وتقول أسفياً كان زيدٌ أم حليماً وأرجلاً كان زيدٌ أم صبيياً تجعلها لزيد لأنه إنما ينبغي لك أن تسأله عن خبر من هو معروفٌ عنده كما حدثته عن خبر من هو معروفٌ عندك فالمعروفُ هو المبدوءُ به ولا يبدأ بما يكون فيه اللبسُ وهو النكرة ألا ترى أنك لو قلت كان رجلٌ (ص. ١٨) منطلقاً وكان إنسانٌ حليماً كنتُ تُبْسُ لأنه لا يُستتكرُ أن يكون في الدنيا إنسانٌ هكذا فكرهوا أن يبدعوا بما فيه اللبس ويجعلوا المعرفة خبراً لما يكون فيه هذا اللبسُ وقد يجوز في الشعر وفي ضعفٍ من الكلام حملهم على ذلك أنه فعلٌ بمنزلة ضربَ وأنه قد يُعلم إذا ذكرتَ زيداً وجعلته خبراً أنه صاحبُ الصفة على ضعفٍ من الكلام

An example of that is the saying of the poet (L. 5) who is ʔabuw gays bin ʔal-ʔaslat ʔal-ʔansāriy: (wāfir)¹⁶

ʔalā man mubliyun hassāna ʔanni

ʔasihrun kāna tʔibbaka ʔam gunuwnu

'Will anyone inform hassān for me
was your medicine magic or madness.'

hassān bin θābit said (wāfir)¹⁷

kaʔanna sabiyʔatan min bayti raʔsin

yakuwnu mizāgahā ʔasalun wa māʔu

'like the wine from Bayt Raʔs
its mixture is of honey and water.'

Xidāš bin Zuhayr (wāfir)¹⁸ (P. 10)

faʔinnaka lā tubāli baʔda ḥawlin

ʔaḏʔabyun kāna ʔummaka ʔam himāru

'After a year you would not care
if a doe were your mother or a donkey'

ʔal-Farazdaq said (tʔawiyl)¹⁹

ʔasakrānun kāna ʔibna ʔal-Marāyati ʔiḏ hagā

tamiyman bigawfi ʔal-Šāmi ʔam mutasākiru

'Was the breed of a donkey drunk when he satirized
Tamiym from within Syria, or was he feigning drunkenness'

This is the recitation of some of them. Most of them put *sakrān* 'drunk' in the 'erect', and raise the other on the assumption of a break and a beginning. If they were both definite, you have the choice. Whichever you make the *fāʔil* 'actor', you raise, and you 'erect' the other just as you did with *dʔaraba* 'to hit' (L. 15) as in examples in your saying *kāna ʔaxuwka zaydan* 'Your brother was Zayd', *kāna zaydun sʔāhibaka* 'Zayd was your friend', *kāna ḥādā zaydan* 'This was Zayd', *kāna ʔal- mutakillimu ʔaxāka* 'The speaker was your brother', and you say *man kāna ʔaxāka* 'Who was your brother', *man kāna ʔaxuwka* 'Your brother was whom?' Just as you say *man dʔaraba ʔabāka* 'Who hit your father?' if you made *man* 'who' the actor, *man dʔaraba ʔabuwka* 'Whom did your father hit?' if you make the father the actor.

¹⁶Meter for wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun faʔuwulun* (2 times).

¹⁷Meter for wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun faʔuwulun* (2 times).

¹⁸Meter for wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun faʔuwulun* (2 times).

¹⁹Meter for tʔawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun* (2 times).

وذلك (س. ٥) قول الشاعر وهو أبو قيس بن
الأسلت الانصاري (وافر)

ألا مَنْ مُبْلِعُ حَسَّانَ عَنِّي
أَسْحَرُ كَان طِبِّكَ أَمْ جُنُونُ

وقال حسان بن ثابت (وافر)

كَأَنَّ سَبِيئَةً مِنْ بَيْتِ رَأْسِ
يَكُونُ مِزَاجُهَا عَسَلٌ وَمَاءٌ

وقال خدّاش بن زهير (وافر) (س. ١٠)

فإنّك لا تُبالي بعد حَوْلِ
أظنيّ كان أمّك أم حمار

وقال الفرزدق (طويل)

أسكرانُ كانَ ابنَ المِراغةِ ذَ هَجَا
تَمِيمًا بِجَوْفِ الشَّامِ أَمْ مُتَسَاكِرُ

فهذا إنشادُ بعضهم أكثرُهم يَنْصِبُ السكرانَ
ويَرْفَعُ الآخرَ على قطعٍ وابتداءٍ وإذا كانا
معرفةً فأنت بالخيار أيهما ما جعلته فاعلاً
رفعتُه ونصبتَ الآخرَ كما فعلتَ ذلك في
ضربِ (س. ١٥) وذلك قولك كان أخوك
زيداً وكان زيدٌ صاحبك وكان هذا زيداً
وكان المتكلمُ أخاك وتقول من كان أخاك
ومن كان أخوك كما تقول مَنْ ضربَ أخاك
إذا جعلتَ مَنْ الفاعلَ ومن ضربَ أبوك إذا
جعلتَ الأبَ الفاعلَ

In the same manner *ʔayyuhum kāna ʔaxāka* 'Who of them was your brother'; *ʔayyahum kāna ʔaxuwka* 'Whom among them was your brother. You say *mā kāna ʔaxāka ʔilla zaydun* 'You brother was no other except Zayd' as your saying *mā dʿaraba ʔaxāka ʔilla zaydun* 'No one hit your brother except Zayd', and similar to that is His saying the Almighty and the Glorious *mā kāna ḥuggatahum ʔilla ʔan gāluw* 'Their argument was nothing except they said...' [sura 44:25] and *mā kāna gawāba gawmihi ʔilla ʔan gāluw* 'his people gave no answer except to say...' [Sura 7:28]; and the poet said (tʿawiyl)²⁰ (L. 20)

wagad ʔalima ʔal-ʔagwāmu mā kāna dāʔahā

biθahlāna ʔilla ʔal-xizyu mimman yaGuwduhā

'The nations did learn what the malady at θahlān was

it is no other than the disgrace of the one who leads them.'

If you so wish, you may raise the first as you say, *mā dʿaraba ʔaxuwka ʔilla zaydan* 'Your brother hit no one except Zayd' and some reciters read what we mentioned as raised with [-u]. An example of their *man kāna ʔaxāka* 'Who was your brother' is the saying of the Arabs *mā gāʔat ḥāgataka*, as if one said *mā sʿārat* (P. 19) *ḥāgataka* 'What became of your need' but you introduced the *tāʔ* [-t] to *gāʔa* 'he came' when the *mā* 'what' itself was the *ḥāgah* 'need/necessity'; and as some Arabs have said *man kānat ʔummaka* 'Who was your mother', where they placed *man* 'who' in the feminine. and *gāʔa* 'to come' is made to become with the status of *kāna* 'he was' in this *ḥarf* 'word/sentence' only, because it is in its place in the *maθal* 'example', just as they made *ʔasā* 'might' in place of *kāna* 'he was' in their saying *ʔasā ʔal-ʔuwayru ʔabuʔsan* 'may the little cave be miserable' and it is not said *ʔasayta*²¹ *ʔaxāna* 'might you be our brother'* just as they made *ladun* 'at' with *ʔudwatan* 'early morning', with nunation in their saying *ladun ʔudwatan* 'at early morning'. It is part of their speech (L. 5) that they put an item in a place that is different from its state in the rest of speech, and you shall see examples of that, God willing. Among the Arabs who say *mā gāʔat ḥāgatuka* 'What is your need' are many, as they say *man kānat ʔummaka* 'Who was your mother'. They do not say *mā gāʔa ḥāgataka* 'What brought-in-m your need-f*', as they did say *man kāna ʔummaka* 'Who was-m you mother'*, because it is of the status

²⁰Meter for tʿawiyl is: *fa ʔuwlun mafāʔiyulun fa ʔuwlun mafāʔiyulun* (2 times).

²¹Non-occurring form of *laysa* which has a defective conjugation.

وكذلك أيهم كان أخاك وأيهم كان أخوك
وتقول ما كان أخاك إلا زيد كقولك ما
ضرب أخاك إلا زيد ومثل ذلك قوله عز
وجل ما كان حجّتهم إلا أن قالوا وما كان
جواب قوميه إلا أن قالوا وقال الشاعر
(طويل) (س. ٢٠)

وقد علم الأقبام ما كان داءها
بتهلان إلا الخزي ممن يقودها

وإن شئت رفعت الأوّل كما تقول ما ضرب
أخوك إلا زيداً وقد قرأ بعض القراء ما
ذكرنا بالرفع ومثل قولهم من كان أخاك قول
العرب ما جاءت حاجتك كأنه قال ما
صارت (ص. ١٩) حاجتك ولكّك أدخلت
على جاء التاء لما كانت ما هي الحاجة وكما
قال بعض العرب من كانت أمك حيث وقع
من على مؤنث وإثما صيرت جاء بمنزلة
كان في هذا الحرف وحده لأنه بمنزلة المثل
كما جعلوا عسى بمنزلة كان في قولهم عسى
العُوَيْرُ أبوساً ولا يقال عسيّت أخانا وكما
جعلوا لذن مع غدوة كأنها منونة في قولهم
لذن غدوة ومن كلامهم (س. ٥) أن يجعلوا
الشيء في موضع على غير حاله في سائر
الكلام وسترى مثل ذلك إن شاء الله ومن
يقول من العرب ما جاءت حاجتك كثير كما
يقول من كانت أمك ولم يقولوا ما جاء
حاجتك كما قالوا من كان أمك لأنه بمنزلة

of an example. They attached the *tāʔ* '[t]' to it obligatorily, in the same manner in which they agreed on *la-ʕamru-ʔal-lāhi* 'by God's eternity', in oaths. Yuwnis claims that he heard Ruʔba say *mā gāʔat ḥāgatuka*²² 'What brought-in-f your need-f'. He raised. Similarly is their saying *mā gāʔat ḥāgataka* 'What brought-in your need.' It comes in the feminine with some reciters in the verse *θumma lam takun fitnatahum ʔilla ʔan* (L. 10) *ḡāluw* 'there will be no subterfuge for them but to say' [Sura 6:23], and in the verse *wa taltagitʔhu baʕdʔu ʔal-sayyārati* 'he will be picked up by some caravan of travelers' [Sura 12:10], and may be they said in some speech *dahabat baʕdʔu ʔasʔabiʔihi* 'some of his fingers got lost'. He femininized the *baʕdʔ* 'some' because he added it to a feminine, since it is related to it, and if it were not related to it, he would not have femininized it, because if he were to say *dahabat ʕabdu ʔummika*, 'the servant-m of your mother went-f*', is not good. What came similar to it in poetry is the saying of ʔal-ʔaʕšā: (tʔawiy1)²³

wa-tašragu bi-ʔal-ḡawli ʔal-laḏi ḡad ʔaḏaʕtahu

kamā šariqat sʔadru ʔal-ḡanāti mina ʔal-dami

'you will choke with the saying that you broadcast

just as the tip of the spear choked with the blood.'

because the *sʔadr ʔal-ḡanāt* 'tip of the spear' is in the feminine. Like it is the saying of gariyr (wāfir)²⁴ (L. 15)

ʔiḏā badʔu ʔal-siniyna taʕarragatna

kafā ʔal-ʔaytāma faḡda ʔabiy ʔal-yatiymi

'If some of the years have stripped us naked

he sufficed the orphans the loss of their fathers'

because *baʕdʔ* 'some' in this place refers to *sinuwn* 'years'. It is similar to the saying of gariyr (kāmīl)²⁵

lammā ʔatā xabaru ʔal-zubayri tawādʔaʕat

suwru ʔal-madinati wal-gibālu ʔal-xuššaʕi

'When the news of ʔal-Zubayr came,

The walls of the city and the mighty mountains, became humble.'

المثل فالزموه التاء كما اتفقوا على لعمرك الله في اليمين وزعم يونس أنه سمع رؤبة يقول ما جاءت حاجتك فرفع ومثل قولهم ما جاءت حاجتك إذ صارت تقع على مؤنث قراءة بعض القراء ثم لم تكن فثنتهم إلا أن (س. ١٠) قالوا وتلقطه بعض السيارة وربما قالوا في بعض الكلام ذهبت بعض أصابعه وإنما أنت البعض لأنه أضافه إلى مؤنث هو منه ولو لم يكن منه لم يؤنثه لأنه لو قال ذهبت عبد أمك لم يحسن ومما جاء مثله في الشعر قول الشاعر الأعشى (طويل)

وتسرق بالقول الذي قد أدعته
كما سرقته صدر القناة من الدم

لأن صدر القناة من مؤنث ومثله قول جرير (وافر)

إذا بعض السنين نعرفنا
كفى الأيتام فقد أبي اليتيم

لأن بعض هاهنا سينون ومثله قول جرير أيضا (كامل)

لما أتى خبر الزبير تواضعت
سور المدينة والجبال الخشع

²²It occurs both as raised and erected.

²³Meter for tʔawiy1 is: *faʕuw1un mafāʕiy1un faʕuw1un mafāʕiy1un* (2 times).

²⁴Meter for wāfir is: *mufāʕalatun mufāʕalatun faʕuw1un* (2 times).

²⁵Meter for kāmīl is: *mutafāʕilun* (6 times).

Similar to it is the saying of: *ḏu-ʔal-Rumma (tʿawiyl)*²⁶

mašayna kamā ʔihtazzat rimāhun tasaffahat

ʔaʔāliyahā marru ʔal-riyāhi ʔal-nawāsimi (L. 20)

'The ladies walked quivering like pliant spears
their tips shaken by the blow of the gentle breeze.

*ʔal-ʔaggāg said (rajaz)*²⁷

tʿuwlu ʔal-layāli ʔasraʔat fi naḡdʿiy

'the length of nights hastened my dissolution'

(p. 20) We heard from someone in whom we trust from among the Arabs say *ʔigtamaʔat ʔahlu ʔal-yamāmati* 'the people of Yamāmah gathered', because he says in his speech *ʔigtamaʔati ʔal-yamāmatu* 'ʔal-Yamāmah gathered', by which he means that the people of ʔal-Yamāmah. He femininized the *fiʔl* 'action' in the utterance, since he made it refer to ʔal-Yamāmah in the utterance. He left the utterance be as in the *saʔah* 'flow/expansiveness' of speech. An example like it is *yā tʿalhata ʔaḡbil* 'tʿalhata, come!' because, mostly, tʿalhata is called with *tarxiym* 'apocopation'. He left the *ʔalhāʔ* '[h]' the way it was, and *yā tayma tayma ʔadiyyin ʔaḡbil*. The poet gariyr said (*basiyʿ*)²⁸

yā tayma tayma ʔadiyyin lā ʔabā lakumu

lā yulḡiyannakumu fiy sawʔatin ʔumaru

'O Tayma Tayma of ʔadiyy, you have no generous father

Let not ʔumar get you in trouble'

You shall see this explained in its proper places, God willing. The *tāʔ* '[t]', left out in this manner, is the definition and in general. You shall also see, God willing, that in maintaining of *tāʔ* '[t]' in it in this manner is better due to its frequency in their speech and it shall be explained in its chapter. If you were to say *man dʿaraba ʔabdu ʔummika*²⁹ 'who did the servant-m of your mother hit?' or *hāḏā ʔabdu zaynaba*³⁰ 'this is the slave-m of Zaynab',

²⁶Meter for tʿawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun* (2 times).

²⁷Meter for ragaz is: *mustaʔʔilun* (6 times).

²⁸Meter for basiyʿ is: *mustaʔʔilun fāʔilun* (4 times).

²⁹The būlāq edition has: *man dʿarabat ʔabdu ʔummika*.

³⁰The būlāq edition has: *hāḏihi ʔabdu zaynaba*.

ومثله قول ذي الرمة (طويل)

مَشْنَيْنَ كَمَا اهْتَزَّتْ رِمَاحٌ تَسْفَهَتْ

أَعَالِيهَا مَرُّ الرِّيحِ التَّوَاسِمِ

وقال العجاج (وجز)

طُولُ اللَّيَالِي أُسْرَعَتْ فِي نَفْضِي

(ص. ٢٠) وسمعنا من يوثق به من العرب يقول اجتمع أهل اليمامة لأنه يقول في كلامه اجتمعت اليمامة يعني أهل اليمامة فأثت الفعل في اللفظ إذ جعله في اللفظ لليمامة فترك اللفظ على ما يكون عليه في سعة الكلام ومثله في هذا يا طلحة أقبل لأن أكثر ما يدعوظلحة بالترخيم فترك الحاء على حالها ويا تيم تيم عدي أقبل وقال الشاعر جرير (بسيط) (س. ٥)

يا تيم تيم عدي لا أبا لكم

لا يلقينكم في سوءة عمر

وسترى هذا مبيّنا في مواضعه إن شاء الله وترك التاء في جميع هذا الحد والوجه وسترى ما إثبات التاء فيه جيد إن شاء الله من هذا النحو لكثرتة في كلامهم وسيبين في بابها فإن قلت من ضرب عبد أمك أو هذا عبد زينب

nothing is acceptable except this³¹ because they are neither of it, nor does it refer to it, and it is not possible to utter it if you mean the male slave.

لم يجز إلا هذا لأنه ليس منها ولا بها ولا
يجوز أن تُلْفِظَ بها وأنت تريد العبدَ.

³¹The bŭlāq edition's *man d'arabat ṣabdu ḥummika* and *hāḍihi ṣabdu zaynaba* are not acceptable because there is incompatibility of gender, if one is referring to *ṣabd* 'servant'. This edition is more coherent on this point.

Chapter 18. This is a Chapter in which *tuxbiru* 'you predicate' about the *nakirah* 'indefinite' with *nakirah* 'an indefinite'

(Būlāq vol. 1. P. 26, Derenbourg vol.1. p.20, Haruwn vol.1. p. 54)

(I: p. 20, L. 10) This is a chapter in which *tuxbiru* 'you predicate' about the *nakirah* 'indefinite' with a *nakirah* 'indefinite', and that is your saying, *mā kān ṭahadun miθlaka* 'there was no one like you', and *laysa ṭahadun xayran minka* 'there is no one better than you' and *mā kāna ṭahadun mugtariṭan ṣalayihi*³² 'there is no one challenging him'. Here, however, the predication about the indefinite is good where you wanted to negate that there be, in his state, something similar or above him, because the *muxāṭaba* 'addressee' may need that you inform him of something like this. If you were to say *kāna ragulun ḏāhiban* 'A man was leaving/there was a man leaving', there is nothing in this that you inform him of that he did not know. If you were to say *kāna ragulun min ṭāli fulānin fārisan* 'There was a man from such-and-such a clan who was a knight', this is good, because he may need to know that that person is from the such-and-such (L. 15) a clan, and he many not have known that. If you were to say *kāna ragulun fīy ḡawmin fārisan* 'A man in a nation was a knight/there was a man from a nation who was a knight', it is not good, because it is undeniable that there is a knight in the world, and that he is from a nation. On this procedure, the good and the bad are based. It is not permitted that *ṭahad* 'one', be put in an obligatory position; if you were to say *kāna ṭahadun min ṭāli fulān* 'One was from such-and-such a clan/there was one from such-and-such a clan', it is not permitted, because there is in their speech a general negation. The man says *ṭatāniy ragulun* 'A man visited me'. He intends one in number, not two. Then you say *mā ṭatāka ragulun* 'A man did not visit you'; that is to say, more than that visited you. Then he says *ṭatāniy ragulun lā ṭimraṭatun* 'A man visited me not a woman'. Then you say *mā ṭatāka ragulun ṭay ṭimraṭatun* (L. 20) *ṭatatka* 'A man did not visit you, that is, a woman visited you'. He says *ṭatāniy ṭal-yawma ragulun ṭay fīy ḡuwwatihi wa nafāḏihi* 'Today a man visited me, that is, by his own power and under his own control'. Then you say *mā ṭatāka ragulun ṭay ṭatāka ṭal-dʿuṣafāṭu* 'A man did not visit you, that is, weaklings visited you'. If he were to say *mā ṭatāka ṭahadun* 'No one visited you', it became a general negation, for all this, because this is its flow in

(١٨) هذا باب تُخْبِرُ فِيهِ عَنِ
النَّكَرَةِ بِنَكْرَةٍ

(ص. ٢٠. س. ١٠) وذلك قولك ما كان أحدٌ مثلك وليسَ أحدٌ خيراً منك وما كان أحدٌ مجترئاً عليه وإيما حَسَنَ الإخبارِ هاهنا عن النكرة حيث أردت أن تنفي أن يكون في مثل حاله شيءٌ أو فوقه لأنَّ المخاطبَ قد يحتاج إلى أن تُعلمه مثلَ هذا وإذا قلتَ كان رجلٌ ذاهباً فليس في هذا شيءٌ تُعلمه كان جهله ولو قلتَ كان رجلٌ من آل فلانِ فارساً حَسَنَ لانه قد يحتاجُ إلى أن تُعلمه أن ذلك في آل (س. ١٥) فلانٍ وقد يجهله ولو قلتَ كان رجلٌ في قومٍ فارساً لم يحسنْ لانه لا يُستنكر أن يكون في الدنيا فارسٌ وأن يكون من قومٍ فعلى هذا النحو يحسنُ ويقبحُ ولا يجوز في أحدٍ أن تضعه موضعَ واجبٍ لو قلتَ كان أحدٌ من آل فلانٍ لم يجزْ لانه إيما وقع في كلامهم نفيًا عامًا يقول الرجلُ أتاني رجلٌ يريد واحداً في العدد لا اثنين فنقول ما أتاك رجلٌ أي أتاك أكثرُ من ذلك ثم يقول أتاني رجلٌ لا امرأةً فنقول ما أتاك رجلٌ أي امرأةً (س. ٢٠) أتتك ويقول أتاني اليوم رجلٌ أي في قوته ونفاذه فنقول ما أتاك رجلٌ أي أتاك الضعفاءُ فإذا قال ما أتاك أحدٌ صار نفيًا عامًا لهذا كله فإنما مجراه في

³²Būlāq edition has: *mā kāna ṭahadun mugtariṭan ṣalayihi*. (I: p.26)

speech. If you were to say *mā kāna miθluka ṣaḥdan* 'There is no one like you', or *mā kāna zaydun ṣaḥadan* 'Zayd was not one', you are contradicting, because it is known that neither Zayd nor (P. 21) someone like him can be excepted from the people. If you were to say *mā kāna miθluka ṣal-yawma ṣaḥadun* 'There was no one like you today', it is possible that there is no person in his situation today. Unless you were to say *mā kāna zaydun ṣaḥadan* 'Zayd was not one', that is of *ṣal-ṣaḥadiyn* 'the ones' and *mā kāna miθluka ṣaḥadan* 'There was no one like you' by way of diminutizing it. It becomes as if you were saying *mā d'araba zaydun ṣaḥadan* 'Zayd did not strike anyone' and *mā qatala miθluka ṣaḥadan* 'Someone like you did not kill anyone'. Post-positioning and pre-positioning in this has the same status as in the *maṣrifah* 'definite' and what I have already mentioned to you about the *fiʿl* 'action'. The *nakirah* 'indefinite' here (L. 5) in this chapter, is good, because you did not put the most definite in place of the most indefinite. They are *mutakāfiṭān* both equivalent, just as the *maṣrifatāni* 'two definites' are equivalent, because the *muxāṭab* 'addressee' may need the knowledge that I mentioned to you. He may know whom you mean by that, just like your knowledge. You say *mā kāna fiyhā ṣaḥadun xayrun minka* 'There was no one in it better than you' and *mā kāna ṣaḥadun miθluka fiyhā* 'There was no one like you in it', and *laysa ṣaḥadun fiyhā xayrun minka* 'There is no in it better than you', if you were to make *fiyhā* 'in it' *mustaḡarran* 'stable', and you were not to make it on the pattern of your statement *fiyhā zaydun qāṣimun* 'In it, Zayd resides'. You applied the *s'ifah* 'descriptive' to the *ṣism* 'name'. If you patterned it according to your saying *fiyhā zaydun ḡāṣimun* 'In it Zayd resides', you have the 'erect' state. You say *mā kāna fiyhā ṣaḥadun xayran* (L. 10) *minka* 'In it, there was no one better than you' and *mā kāna ṣaḥadun xayran minka fiyhā* 'There was no one better than you in it', except if you wanted the *ṣilyāṣ* 'cancellation'. So, whenever you *ṣaxxarta* 'post-positioned' the one you cancel, it is better. If you want it to be *mustaḡirr* 'stable', you keep it, and whenever you *ḡaddamta* 'pre-positioned', it is better, because if it were operative in anything you pre-position, just as you pre-position *ṣad'unnu* 'I think' and *ṣaḥsibu* 'I account'. If you were to cancel, you would post-position it, just as you would post-position both of them, because they are not engaged in anything. *taḡdiym* 'pre-positioning' here and *taṣxiyr* 'post-positioning' of what is *d'arf* 'an envelope (of place)' or is a name that is the focus of attention and importance are like what I have mentioned to you in the chapter on

الكلام هذا ولو قلت ما كان مثلك أحداً أو ما كان زيداً أحداً كنت ناقضاً لأنه قد علم أنه لا يكون زيداً ولا (ص. ٢١) مثله إلا من الناس وإذا قلت ما كان مثلك اليوم أحدٌ فإنه يكون إلا يكون في اليوم إنساناً على حاله إلا أن تقول ما كان زيداً أحداً أي من الأحدين وما كان مثلك أحداً على وجه تصغيره فتصير كأنك قلت ما ضرب زيداً أحداً وما قتل مثلك أحداً والتقديم والتأخير في هذا بمنزلة في المعرفة وما ذكرت لك من الفعل وحسنت التكررة هاهنا (س. ٥) في هذا الباب لأنك لم تجعل الأعراف في موضع الأتكر وهما متكافئان كما تكافأت المعرفتان ولأن المخاطب قد يحتاج إلى علم ما ذكرت لك وقد عرف من تعني بذلك كمعرفتك وتقول ما كان فيها أحدٌ خيرٌ منك وما كان أحدٌ مثلك فيها وليس أحدٌ فيها خيرٌ منك إذا جعلت فيها مستقراً ولم تجعله على قولك فيها زيداً قائم أجريت الصفة على الاسم فإن جعلته على قولك فيها زيداً قائم نصبت تقول ما كان فيها أحدٌ خيراً (س. ١٠) منك وما كان أحدٌ خيراً منك فيها إلا أنك أردت الإلغاء فكلماً أخرت الذي تلغى كان أحسن وإذا أردت أن يكون مستقراً تكتفي به فكلماً قدمته كان أحسن لأنه إذا كان عاملاً في شيء قدمته كما تقدم أظن وأحسب وإذا ألغيت أخرته كما تؤخرهما لأنهما ليسا يعملان شيئاً والتقديم هاهنا والتأخير فيما يكون ظرفاً أو يكون اسماً في العناية والاهتمام مثله فيما ذكرت لك في باب

the *fāʿil* 'actor' and *mafʿuwl* 'acted-upon'. All that I have mentioned to you about *taʿdiym* 'pre-positioning', (L. 15) *taʿxiyr* 'post-positioning', *ʔilyāʔ* 'cancellation', and *ʔistiḡrār* 'stabilization' is all very good Arabic. In this context the saying of the Almighty and Glorious God *wa lam yakun lahu kufuwan ʔaḥadun* 'like Him, there is no one equal' (Sura 112:4). Some rude Arabs say *wa lam yakun kufuwan lahu ʔaḥadun* 'There is no one equal to Him'. It is as though they post-positioned it since it was not stable. The poet said (ragaz)³³

lataḡrubinna ḡaraban ḡulḏiyyan

mā dāma fiyhunna faṣʿiylun ḡayyān

faḡad dagā ʔal-laylu fa-ḡayyā ḡayyā

'Trot swiftly at night

as long as the other camels are alive

the night has darkened, hurry, hurry'

الفاعل والمفعول وجميع ما ذكرت لك من التقديم (س. ١٥) والتأخير والإلغاء والاستقرار عربى جيد كثير فمن ذلك قوله عز وجل ولم يكن له كفواً أحدٌ وأهل الجفاء من العرب يقولون ولم يكن كفواً له أحدٌ كأنهم أخرجوها حيث كانت غير مستقرٍ وقال الشاعر (رجز)

لتقرين قَرَباً جُلْدِيًّا

ما دام فيهنَّ فَصِيلٌ حِيًّا

فقد دَجَا الليلُ فهَيَّا هَيًّا

³³Meter for ragaz is: *mustafīlum* (6 times).

Chapter 19. This is a Chapter on what is made to follow the Path of *laysa* 'is not'

(Būlāq vol. 1. P. 28, Derenbourg vol.1. p.21, Haruwn vol.1. p. 57)

(I: P.21, L. 20) This is a chapter on what is made to follow in the path of *laysa* 'is not' in some contexts in the language of ʔal-higāz, then it returns to its origins, and that particle is *mā* 'not'. You say *mā ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔaxāku*³⁴ 'Abdullah is not your brother' and *mā zaydun muntʔaligan* 'Zayd is not departing'. As to the people from Tamiym, they make it follow the path of *ʔammā* 'however' and *hal* 'interrogative particle' and that is the *ḡiyās* 'norm', because it³⁵ is not *fiʔl* 'an action' and *mā* 'not' is not like *laysa* 'is not', and there is no *ʔidʔmār* 'adumbrated' pronoun in it. As for the people of higāz, (P. 22) they liken it to *laysa* 'is not', since its meaning is like its meaning. Just as they likened to it *lāta* 'not' in certain locations/contexts and that with *hiyn* 'time during' especially. *lāta* 'not' does not occur except with *hiyn* 'time during'. It *tudʔmiru* 'adumbrates' in it *marfuwʔan* 'a raised one' and erects the *xabar*³⁶ 'predicate', because it is the *mafʔuwl bihi* 'direct acted-upon'. It is not *tamakkan* 'inflected' nor does it have its inflection, nor do they use it except with *mudʔmaran* 'something adumbrated' in it, because it is not like *laysa* 'is not' in *muxātʔabah* 'addressing' and *ʔixbār* 'predication' about something/one absent. You say *lasta* 'you-m are not', *lasti* 'you-f are not', *laysuw* 'they-m are not', and *ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi laysa ḡāhiban* 'Abdullah is not going'.³⁷ It is constructed on the *mubtadaʔ* 'initial' and it has *yudʔmaru* 'adumbrations' in it, (L. 5) but this³⁸ (*lāta* 'not') does not have that in it. Nor do you say *ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi lāta muntʔaligan** 'Abdullah is-not-s departing', nor *qawmuka lātuw muntʔaliqiyina** 'your people are-not-pl departing'. It is equivalent to *lāta* 'not' in that it does not occur except when a *laysa* 'is not' is *mudʔmaran* 'adumbrated' in it, nor does it occur with the *ʔistiḡnā* 'exceptive', if you were to say *ʔatawniy laysa zaydan** 'they visited me not Zayd/they visited me without Zayd', and *lā yakuwnu bišran* 'he is not Bishr'. They claimed that some of them read *wa lāta hiynu manāsʔin* 'there was no longer time for being saved' [Sura 38:3], but they are few, as some of them said in

(١٩) هذا باب ما أُجْرِي مُجْرَى لَيْسَ فِي
بعض المواضع بلغة الحجاز ثم يصيرُ الى
أصله وذلك الحرفُ ما

تقول ما عبدُ الله أخاك وما زيدٌ منطلقاً وأما
بنو تميم فيُجْرُونَهَا مُجْرَى أَمَّا وَهَلْ وَهُوَ
القياسُ لآتِهِ لَيْسَ بِفَعْلٍ كَلَيْسَ وَلَا يَكُونُ فِيهِ
إِضْمَارٌ وَأَمَّا أَهْلُ الْحِجَازِ (ص. ٢٢)
فِيَشَبُّونَهَا بَلَيْسَ إِذْ كَانَ مَعْنَاهَا كَمَا شَبَّهُوا
بِهَا لَاتَ فِي بَعْضِ الْمَوَاضِعِ وَذَلِكَ مَعَ الْحَيْنِ
خَاصَّةً لَا تَكُونُ لَاتَ إِلَّا مَعَ الْحَيْنِ تُضْمَرُ
فِيهَا مَرْفُوعاً وَتَنْصِبُ الْخَبَرَ لآتِهِ مَفْعُولٌ بِهِ
وَلَمْ تَمَكَّنْ تَمَكَّنْهَا وَلَمْ يَسْتَعْمَلُوهَا إِلَّا مَضْمَرًا
فِيهَا لِأَنَّهَا لَيْسَتْ كَلَيْسَ فِي الْمَخَاطَبَةِ
وَالْإِخْبَارِ عَنِ غَائِبٍ تَقُولُ لَسْتَ وَلَسْتَ
وَلَيْسُوا وَعَبْدُ اللَّهِ لَيْسَ ذَاهِبًا فَيُنْتَى عَلَى
الْمَبْتَدَأِ وَيُضْمَرُ فِيهِ (س. ٥) وَهَذَا لَا يَكُونُ
فِيهِ ذَلِكَ وَلَا تَقُولُ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ لَاتَ مِنْطَلِقًا وَلَا
قَوْمُكَ لِاتُوا مِنْطَلِقِينَ وَنَظِيرُ لَاتَ فِي أَنَّهُ لَا
يَكُونُ إِلَّا مَضْمَرًا فِيهِ لَيْسَ وَلَا يَكُونُ فِي
الْإِسْتِثْنَاءِ إِذَا قُلْتَ أَتُونِي لَيْسَ زَيْدًا وَلَا يَكُونُ
بِشْرًا وَزَعَمُوا أَنَّ بَعْضَهُمْ يَقُولُ لَاتَ حِينَ
مَنَاصِرٍ وَهِيَ قَلِيلَةٌ كَمَا قَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ فِي

³⁴The case ending on *ʔaxāka* is *mansʔuwb* 'erect' as it would be if it were preceded by *laysa* in place of *mā*.

³⁵i.e. the particle *mā* 'not'.

³⁶Būlāq edition has *hiyn* 'time during' here. (P. 28)

³⁷A more literal translation for *ḡāhiban* would be "the person going".

³⁸i.e. *lāta* 'not'.

the saying of Saʿīd bin Mālik ʿal-Gaysiy (kāmil)³⁹

man farra ʿan nirānihā faʿana ʿibnu ʿaysin la barāhu
 'Who will flee its fires I, son of Qays, won't leave'

(L. 10) He made it⁴⁰ with the status of *laysa* 'is not', so it is with the status of *lāta* 'not' in this respect. It can not be extended beyond this place whether your raise or erect. It is not given the inflectional flexibility in speech of *laysa* 'is not'. It rather goes with *hiyn* 'time during', as *ladun* 'at time of' that one can 'erect' with, as with *yudwatan* 'morning dawn'. Just as the *tāʿ* [t] does not *tagurr* 'pull' in oaths nor in others, except with the word *ʿallāh* 'God', if you were to say *ta-ʿal-lāhi la-ʿafʿallanna* 'By God, I will do it'. Similarly, the saying of the Almighty and the Glorious *mā hādā bašaran* 'This is not man' [Sura 12:31] in the language of people of *hiḡāz*, but people of *Tamiym* raise it (*bašarun* 'man') except the one who knows how it is read in the *musʿḡaf* 'book' [Qurʿān]. If you were to say *mā muntʿaligun ʿabdu ʿal-lāhi* 'Abdullah (is) not departing' or *mā musiʿun man ʿaʿtaba* 'He (is) not an evildoer who repents', you raise. It is not (L. 15) permitted that what is pre-positioned is like it post-positioned in this case, just as it not permitted to say *ʿinna ʿaxuwka ʿabda ʿal-lāhi*⁴¹ 'Indeed, Abdullah (is) your brother'* in the same sense as you say *ʿinna ʿabda ʿal-lāhi ʿaxuwka*⁴² 'Indeed, ʿabdullah (is) your brother', because it is not *fiʿl* 'an action', but it is put in its place. Just as *ʿinna* 'indeed' does not conjugate as *fiʿl* 'an action', it is not permitted with it, all that is permitted with *fiʿl* 'an action', nor does it have its power, similarly *mā* 'not', you say *mā zaydun ʿilla muntʿaligun* 'Zayd (is) not except leaving'. The two dialects are alike in it. Like it is the saying of the Almighty *mā ʿantum ʿilla bašarun miθlunā*⁴³ 'You (are) not but human like us [Sura 14:11] *mā* 'not' was not empowered where you contradicted the meaning of *laysa* 'is not', just as it is not empowered when you *gaddamta* 'post-positioned' the *xabar* 'predicate'. The meaning of *laysa* 'is not' is *naḡiy* 'negation', while the meaning of *kāna* 'he was' (L. 20) is *wāḡib* 'affirmation'.

³⁹Meter of *kāmil* is: *mutaḡāʿilun* (6 times).

⁴⁰i.e. *lā* 'no'.

⁴¹The positions of *ʿaxuwka* and *ʿabda ʿal-lāhi* are reversed.

⁴²What follows *ʿinna* is always *mansʿuwb* 'erected', so these two sentences are not identical.

⁴³This differs from the official text that reads: *ʿin naḡnu ʿilla bašarun miθlukum* 'Indeed, we are but human like yourselves'.

قول سعد بن مالك القيسي (كامل)

مَنْ فَرَّ عَنْ نِيرَانِهَا فَأَنَا ابْنُ قَيْسٍ لَا بَرَا حُ
 (س. ١٠)

جعلها بمنزلة ليس فهي لات في هذا الوجه ولا يجاوز بها بهذا الموضع رفعت أو نصبت ولا تمكّن في الكلام كتمكّن ليس وإنما هي مع الحين كما أن لذن إنما يُصَبُّ بها مع عُذوة وكما أن التاء لا تجرُّ في القسم ولا في غيره إلا في الله إذا قلت تالله لأفعلن ومثل ذلك قوله عز وجل ما هذا بشرأ في لغة أهل الحجاز وبنو تميم يرفعونها إلا من عرف كيف هي في المصحف فإذا قلت ما منطلق عبد الله أو ما مسيء من أعتب رفعت ولا (س. ١٥) يجوز أن يكون مقدماً مثله مؤخرأ كما أنه لا يجوز أن تقول إن أخوك عبد الله على حد قولك أن عبد الله أخوك لاتها ليست بفعل وإنما جعلت بمنزلته فكما لا تتصرف إن كالفعل كذلك لم يجز فيها كل ما يكون في الفعل ولم تقو قوته فكذلك ما تقول ما زيد إلا منطلق تستوي فيه اللغتان ومثله قوله عز وجل ما أنتم إلا بشرٌ مثلنا لم تقو ما حيث نقضت معنى ليس كما لم تقو حين قدمت الخبر فمعنى ليس النفي كما أن معنى (س. ٢٠) كان الواجب

The meaning of each one of them, that is *kāna* ‘he was’ and *laysa* ‘it is not’, if you were to strip them naked, these are their meanings. If you were to say *mā kāna* ‘He (was) not’, you introduced to it what negates. If you were to say *laysa zaydun ʔilla ḏāhiban* ‘Zayd is not except going’, you introduced what affirms, just as you introduced what negates. The *mā* ‘not’ is not capable of the reversal of meaning just as it is not capable of post-positioning the *xabar* ‘predicate’. They claim that some people say, and it is, ʔal-Farazdag (*basiyṯ*)⁴⁴

faʔasʔbaḥuw Gad ʔaʔāda ʔal-lāhu niʔmatahum

*ʔiḏ hum Guraiṣun wa ʔiḏ mā miṯlahum baṣaru*⁴⁵

‘And they awoke and God has returned their plenitude

suddenly they (are) Quraish, there (are) no humans like them’

(P. 23) This is⁴⁶ barely known, just as *lāta ḥiynu manāsʔin* ‘There (was) no longer time (to be) saved’ [Sura 38:3] is barely known. Probably there is a thing like this. And this is like the saying of some of them *hāḏihi milḥafatun gadiydatun* ‘This (is) a new wrapper’ is infrequent.⁴⁷ You say *mā ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi xāriḡan* ‘Abdullah (is) not exiting.’, nor *lā maʔnun ḏāhibun* ‘Maʔan (is) not going’, you raise it, so as not to share the other name with *mā* ‘not’ but you begin it, as you say *mā kāna ʔabdu ʔal-lāi muntʔaliḡan* ‘Abdullah was not departing’ *wa lā zaydun ḏāhibun* ‘nor (was) Zayd going’, because you did not *tagʔaluhu* ‘construct it’ with *kāna* ‘he was’ and you made him “not going” now. Similarly *laysa* ‘is not’, (L. 5) if you so wish you could make it a *lā* ‘not’ with which there can be sharing, then you erect, as you do with *kāna* ‘he was’, you say *mā kāna zaydun ḏāhiban* ‘Zayd was not going.’ *wa lā ʔamrun muntʔaliḡan* ‘and nor was ʔamr leaving’, and that in your saying *laysa zaydun ḏāhiban* ‘Zayd was not going’ *wa lā ʔaxuwka muntʔaliḡan* ‘nor was your brother leaving’. Similarly *mā zaydun ḏāhiban* ‘Zayd (is) not going’ *wa lā maʔanun xāriḡan* ‘nor is Maʔan exiting’. Their claim is not that with *mā* ‘not’ there is nothing except to raise something, because they argue that you can not say *wa lā laysa* ‘and not is not, nor *wa lā mā* ‘and no no’. You say *laysa zaydun wa lā ʔaxuwku ḏāhibayni* ‘Zayd is not, nor is his brother going-d’ and *mā ʔamr wa lā xālidun muntʔaliḡayni* ‘Neither ʔamr nor Xālid are departing.’

⁴⁴Meter of (*basiyṯ*) is: *mustafʔilum fāʔilum* (4 times).

⁴⁵Farazdag is from Tamiym in the East where they raise both, but here he is forwarding the *xabar* ‘predicate’ *mā miṯlahum baṣaru*, and in the erect case, just as would be done in the West, Quraish.

⁴⁶of the previous sentence!

⁴⁷What is expected is *milḥafatun gadiydun*.

فكلُّ واحدةٍ منهما يعني كان وليس إذا
جرَدَتْها فهذا معناها فإن قلتَ ما كان أدخلت
عليها ما يَنْفِي وإن قلتَ ليس زيدٌ إلا ذاهباً
أدخلتَ ما يوجبُ كما أدخلتَ ما يَنْفِي فلم تَقوَ
ما في قلبِ المعنى كما لم تَقوَ في تقديم الخبر
وزعموا أن بعضهم قال وهو الفرزدق
(بسيط)

فأصْبَحُوا قد أَعَادَ اللهُ نِعْمَتَهُمْ
إذ هم فُرِيْشٌ وإذ ما مِثْلُهُمْ بَشَرٌ

(ص. ٢٣) وهذا لا يكاد يُعْرَفُ كما أن لاتَ
حينُ مَنَاصِرٍ لا يكاد يُعْرَفُ ورُبَّ شيءٍ هكذا
وهذا كقول بعضهم هذه ملحفةٌ جديدةٌ في
الْقَلْبَةِ وتقول ما عبدُ الله خارجاً ولا معنٌ
ذاهبٌ ترفعه على ألا تُشْرِكَ الاسمَ الآخرَ في
ما ولكن تَبَدُّبُهُ كما تقول ما كان عبدُ الله
منطلقاً ولا زيدٌ ذاهبٌ إذا لم تجعله على كانَ
وجعلته غير ذاهب الآن وكذلك ليس (س. ٥)
وإن شئت جعلتها لا التي يكون فيها
الاشتراك فتتصب كما تقول في كان ما كان
زيدٌ ذاهباً ولا عمرو منطلقاً وذلك قولك ليس
زيدٌ ذاهباً ولا أخوك منطلقاً وكذلك ما زيدٌ
ذاهباً ولا معنٌ خارجاً وليس قولهم لا يكون
في ما إلا الرفعُ بشيءٍ لأنهم يَحْتَجُّونَ بأنك
لا تستطيعُ أن تقول ولا ليس ولا ما فأنت
تقول ليس زيدٌ ولا أخوه ذاهبَيْنِ وما عمرو
ولا خالدٌ منطلقَيْنِ

You make it participate with the first in *laysa* 'is not' and in *mā* 'not'. In this, two facets are not permissible, like they are permissible with *kāna* 'he was.' (L. 10) except that if you were to *hamaltahu* 'relate it to the first, or if you were to initiate, the meaning, *tanfiy* 'you would be negating' something that does not exist at the time of your discussion. Beginning with *kāna* 'he was' is clearer, because the meaning is concerned with what has passed and what is occurring now. It is not forbidden that you intend by it the first, just as you intended it with *kāna* 'he was'. An example of that is your saying *ʔinna zaydan d'ariyfun wa ʔamrun wa ʔumaran* 'indeed Zayd (is) nice and ʔamr and ʔumar'. The meaning in the discussion is one. What you intend in operating with *kāna*, *laysa*, *mā* 'he was, he is not, not', is different. You say *mā zaydun kariyman wa lā ʔāgilan ʔabuwhu* 'Zayd is not generous nor is his father wise'. You make it as though it were a quality of the first in place of *kariym* 'generous', because it is confused with it. If you said *ʔabuwhu* 'his father' you relate it to it (L. 15) as you related *kariym* 'generous' to it, because if you said *mā zaydun ʔāgilan ʔabuwhu* 'he father of Zayd (is) not wise' you *nasʔabta* 'you erected', and it was meaningful speech. You say *mā zaydun ḏāhiban wa lā ʔāgilun ʔamrun* 'Zayd is not going nor is ʔamr wise', because if you were to say *mā zaydun ʔāgilan ʔamrun** 'Zayd (is) not wise ʔamr', it is not meaningful, because it has no causality to it. You raise it as an *ʔibtidāʔ* 'initial', and there is a *qatʔ* 'severance' from the initial, as if you said *wa mā ʔāgilun ʔamrun* 'and ʔamr (is) not wise'. If you were bring it about by its cause, there would be in it *ʔidʔmār* 'an adumbration/implication' like *hāʔ* '[-hu] his', in *ʔab* 'father' and its like. It is not permitted that you 'erect' it due to *mā* 'not', because if you were to mention *mā* 'not', then *gaddamta* 'you pre-positioned' the predicate, it would be nothing except raising. If you so wished you would say *mā zaydun ḏāhiban* 'Zayd (is) not going' *wa lā kariymun* (L. 20) *ʔaxuwahu* 'nor (is) his brother generous'. If you began with it and you do not make it dependent on *mā* 'not', as you did before when you began with a noun. With *laysa* 'is not' and *kāna* 'he was', it is permitted to be in 'erect' state, even if you were to pre-positioned the predicate. Because if you were to mention them, the predicate would be similar whether pre-positioned or post positioned. An example of that is your saying *mā kāna zaydun ḏāhiban*, and *lā ḡāʔiman ʔamrun* 'Zayd was not going nor (was) ʔamr standing'. You say *mā zaydun ḏāhiban* and *lā muhsinun zaydun* 'Zayd (is) not going nor (is) Zayd charitable'. Raising is better, even if you meant the first. If you were to say *mā zaydun muntʔaligan zaydun* 'Zayd (is) not leaving, Zayd*', this is not within the definition of speech, and it is

فَتُشْرِكُهُ مَعَ الْأَوَّلِ فِي لَيْسَ وَفِي مَا فَمَا يَجُوزُ فِيهَا الْوَجْهَانِ كَمَا يَجُوزُ فِي كَانَ (س). (١٠) إِلَّا أَنَّكَ إِنْ حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى الْأَوَّلِ أَوْ ابْتَدَأْتَ فَالْمَعْنَى أَنَّكَ تَنْفِي شَيْئًا غَيْرَ كَائِنٍ فِي حَالِ حَدِيثِكَ وَكَانَ الْإِبْتِدَاءُ فِي كَانَ أَوْضَحَ لِأَنَّ الْمَعْنَى يَكُونُ عَلَى مَا مَضَى وَعَلَى مَا هُوَ الْآنَ وَلَيْسَ يَمْتَنِعُ أَنْ تَرِيدَ بِهِ الْأَوَّلَ كَمَا أَرَدْتَ فِي كَانَ وَمِثْلُ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ إِنْ زَيْدًا ظَرِيفٌ وَعَمْرُوٌ وَعَمْرَأٌ فَالْمَعْنَى فِي الْحَدِيثِ وَاحِدٌ وَمَا تَرِيدُ مِنَ الْإِعْمَالِ مُخْتَلِفٌ فِي كَانَ وَلَيْسَ وَمَا وَتَقُولُ مَا زَيْدٌ كَرِيمًا وَلَا عَاقِلًا أَبُوهُ تَجْعَلُهُ كَأَنَّهُ لِلأَوَّلِ بِمَنْزِلَةِ كَرِيمٍ لِأَنَّهُ مَلْتَبِسٌ بِهِ إِذَا قُلْتَ أَبُوهُ تُجْرِيهِ عَلَيْهِ (س. ١٥) كَمَا أَجْرَيْتَ عَلَيْهِ الْكَرِيمَ لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ قُلْتَ مَا زَيْدٌ عَاقِلًا أَبُوهُ نَصَبْتَ وَكَانَ كَلَامًا وَتَقُولُ مَا زَيْدٌ ذَاهِبًا وَلَا عَاقِلٌ عَمْرُوٌ لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ قُلْتَ مَا زَيْدٌ عَاقِلًا عَمْرُوٌ لَمْ يَكُنْ كَلَامًا لِأَنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ سَبَبِهِ فَتَرْفَعُهُ عَلَى الْإِبْتِدَاءِ وَالْقَطْعِ مِنَ الْأَوَّلِ كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ وَمَا عَاقِلٌ عَمْرُوٌ وَلَوْ جَعَلْتَهُ مِنْ سَبَبِهِ لَكَانَ فِيهِ لَهُ إِضْمَارٌ كَالْهَاءِ فِي الْإِبْرِ وَنَحْوِهَا وَلَمْ يَجْزُ أَنْ تَنْصِبَهُ عَلَى مَا لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ ذَكَرْتَ مَا ثُمَّ قَدَمْتَ الْخَبَرَ لَمْ يَكُنْ إِلَّا رَفْعًا وَإِنْ شِئْتَ قُلْتَ مَا زَيْدٌ ذَاهِبًا وَلَا كَرِيمٌ (س. ٢٠) أَخُوهُ إِنْ ابْتَدَأْتَهُ وَلَمْ تَجْعَلْهُ عَلَى مَا كَمَا فَعَلْتَ ذَلِكَ حِينَ بَدَأْتَ بِالْأَسْمِ وَلَكِنْ لَيْسَ وَكَانَ يَجُوزُ فِيهِمَا النِّصْبُ وَإِنْ قَدَمْتَ الْخَبَرَ لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ ذَكَرْتَهُمَا كَانَ الْخَبَرُ فِيهِمَا مَقْدَمًا مِثْلَهُ مَوْخَرًا وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ مَا كَانَ زَيْدٌ ذَاهِبًا وَلَا قَائِمًا عَمْرُوٌ وَتَقُولُ مَا زَيْدٌ ذَاهِبًا وَلَا مُحْسِنٌ زَيْدٌ الرَّفْعُ أَجْوَدُ وَإِنْ كُنْتَ تَرِيدُ الْأَوَّلَ لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ قُلْتَ مَا زَيْدٌ مُنْطَلَقًا زَيْدٌ لَمْ يَكُنْ حَدًّا الْكَلَامِ وَكَانَ هَاهُنَا

weak here. It is not like your saying *mā zaydun muntʿaligan huwa* 'Zayd (is) not leaving, he', because (P. 24) you dispensed with expressing it. Rather you must *tudʿmirhu* 'adumbrate/imply it'. Don't you see that if you were to say *mā zaydun muntʿaligan ʔabu zaydin* 'Zayd (is) not departing, the father of Zayd', it is not as your saying *mā zaydun muntʿaligan ʔabuwhu* 'Zayd's father (is) not leaving', because you dispensed with the expression.⁴⁸ Since this was the way it is, it took the course of the foreign/alien/infrequent, and resumed its course where it was weak in that respect. It is permissible that you 'erect' it. The poet: Sawāda bin ʔadiyy said: (xafiyy)⁴⁹

(L. 5) *lā ʔara ʔal-mawta yasbiG ʔalmawta šayʔun*

nayyasʿa ʔal-mawtu dā ʔal-ʔina wa ʔal-faGiya

'I do not see death missing anything

⁵⁰death disturbs the prosperous and the poor'

he repeated the expression(death); and ʔal-gaʔdiyy said: (tʿawiyl)⁵¹

ʔiḏā ʔal-wahšu dʿamma ʔal-wahša fiy ḏʿululātihā

sawāGitʿu min ḥarrin waḠad kāna ʔaḏʿharā

'If the beasts embrace its shade, they are

victims of heat at the noonday sun'

The raising is the surface form. ʔal-Farazdag said: (tʿawiyl)⁵²

laʔamruka mā maʔnun bitāriki ḥaḠḠihi

wa lā munsitʿin maʔnun wa lā mutayassiru

'By your life, Maʔan is not abandoning his rights

Nor is Maʔan forgetful nor late in his demands'

(L. 10) If you say *mā zaydun muntʿaligan ʔabuw ʔamrin wa ʔabuw ʔamrin ʔabuwhu* 'Zayd is not departing, ʔabuw ʔamr, and ʔabuw ʔamr (is) his father*', this is not permissible, because you did not identify him with him⁵³, nor did you mention a name for him either adumbrated/IMPLIED nor expressed. This is not permitted, because you did not provide the cause connection for it in it. You say

ضعيفا ولم يكن كقولك ما زيدٌ منطلقاً هو
لائك قد (ص. ٢٤) استغنيتَ عن إظهاره
وإنما ينبغي لك ان تُضمِرَه ألا ترى أنك قو
قلت ما زيدٌ منطلقاً أبو زيدٍ لم يكن كقولك ما
زيدٌ منطلقاً أبوه لائك قد استغنيتَ عن
الإظهار فلما كان هذا كذلك أُجري مُجري
الأجنبيِّ واستؤنِفَ على حياله حيثُ كان هذا
ضعيفاً فيه وقد يجوز أن تنصِبَه قال الشاعر
وهو سوادة بن عدي (خفيف) (س. ٥)

لا أرى الموتَ يسبقُ الموتَ شيءٌ
نعصن الموتُ ذا الغنى والفقيراً

فأعاد الإظهارَ وقال الجعدي (طويل)

إذا الوحشُ ضمَّ الوحشُ في ظللاتها
سواقطُ من حرٍّ وقد كان أظهِراً

والرفعُ الوجهُ وقال الفرزدق (طويل)

لعمركَ ما معنٌ بتاركِ حقِّه
ولا منسىءٌ معنٌ ولا متيسرٌ

(س. ١٠) وإن قلت ما زيدٌ منطلقاً أبو عمرو
وأبو عمرو أبوه لم يجز لائك لم تُعرفه به
ولم تُذكرْ له إضماراً فيه فهذا لا يجوز لائك
لم تُجعله له فيه سبباً وتقول

⁴⁸ i.e. of Zayd.

⁴⁹Meter of xafiyy is: *fāʔilātun mustaffalun fāʔilātun* (2 times)

⁵⁰ i.e. death.

⁵¹Meter of tʿawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun* (4 times).

⁵²Meter of tʿawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun* (4 times).

⁵³e.g. *ʔabuwhu*.

mā ṭabuw zaynaba ḏāhiban wa lā muḡiymatun ṭummuhā ‘The father of Zaynab is not going nor is her mother staying’, you raise, because if you were to say *mā ṭabuw zaynaba muḡiymatan ṭummuhā* ‘The father of Zaynab is her mother is staying*’, is not permissible, because she is not due to the same causal connection, because *mā* ‘not’ affected it, but not Zaynab. An example of that is the saying of the poet who is: ṭal-ṭaṭwar ṭal-Ṣanniyy: (mutagārib)⁵⁴

hawwin ṭalayka faṭinna ṭal-umuwra

bikaffi ṭal-ṭilāhi maḡādiyruhā

(L. 15) *falaysa biṭātiyka manhiyyuhā*

wa lā ḡās^ṭirun ṭanka maṭmuwruhā

‘Take it easy, in the palm of God

are the measures of things

What is forbidden will not come your way

nor will you be denied what is decreed you’

because he made *ṭal-maṭmuwr* ‘the decreed’ be caused by *ṭal-umuwr* ‘things’ and he did not consider it to be caused by the masculine, which is *ṭal-manhiyyu* ‘the forbidden’. Some people put it in the *garr* ‘pull’ state, so they related *ṭal-maṭmuwra* ‘the decreed’ to *ṭal-manhiyy* ‘the forbidden’ and *ṭal-manhiyy* ‘the forbidden’ is *ṭal-maṭmuwr* ‘the decreed things’, because it is from the *ṭumuwr* ‘things’ and is part of it. So he ‘pulled’ and feminized it, as *gariyr* said: (wāfir)⁵⁵

ṭiḏā baṭd^ṭu ṭal-siniyna taṭarraḡatna

kafā ṭal-ṭaytāma faḡda ṭabiy ṭal-yatiymi

‘If some years have impoverished us

he sufficed the orphans the loss of their fathers’

(L. 20) Similar to that is the saying of the poet, ṭal-Nābiḡah ṭal-ḡaṭdiyy: (ṭ^ṭawiy)⁵⁶

fa-laysa be-maṭruwfin lanā ṭan naruddahā

s^ṭiḥāḥan wa lā mustankarun ṭan tuṭaḡḡarā

‘It is no favor to us that we return it

whole, nor is it ignoble to strip it to the bone.’

ما أبو زينبَ ذاهباً ولا مقيمةً أمها لائك لو
قلت ما أبو زينبَ مقيمةً أمها لم يجز لائها
ليست من سببه وإنما عملت ما فيه لا في
زينبَ ومثل ذلك قول الشاعر وهو الأعورُ
الشَّيِّ (مقارب)

هُونَ عليكَ فإنَّ الأمورَ

بكَفَّ الإلهَ مقاديرُها

(س. ١٥) فليس بآتيك متهيبها

ولا قاصيرُ عنك مأمورُها

لأنه جعل المأمورَ من سبب الأمور ولم
يجعله من سبب المذكَر وهو المنهيّ وقد
جره قومٌ فجعلوا المأمورَ للمنهى والمنهى
هو الأمور لأنه من الأمور وهو بعضُها
فأجراه وأنته كما قال جرير (وافر)

إذا بعضُ السنينَ تعرقتنا

كفى الأيتامَ فقدَ أبى اليتيم

(س. ٢٠) ومثل ذلك قول الشاعر النابغة
الجدوى (طويل)

فليسَ يمعرُوفٍ لنا أن تردّها

صباحاً ولا مُسننكرٌ أن نُعقرا

⁵⁴Meter of ṭ^ṭawiy is: *faṭuwḡun faṭuwḡun faṭuwḡun faṭuwḡ* (2 times).

⁵⁵Meter of wāfir is: *mufāṭalatun mufāṭalatun faṭuwḡun* (2 times).

⁵⁶Meter of ṭ^ṭawiy is: *faṭuwḡun faṭuwḡun faṭuwḡun faṭuwḡ* (2 times).

(P. 25) It is as if he were saying *laysa bemaḡruwfin lana radduhā wa lā mustankarun ḡagruhā* 'It is not a favor to us that we return it nor ignoble its stripping to the bone'. The *ḡagr* 'stripping to the bone' is not for the *radd* 'return' and is permissible that it be in the *garr* 'pull' state and relate it to the *radd* 'return' and it is femininized because it refers to horses, just as *ḡu ḡal-rumma* said: (t^ḡawiyl)⁵⁷

maṣayna kamā ḡihtazzat rimāḡhun tasaffahat

ḡaḡāliyahā marru ḡal-riyāḡi ḡal-nawāsimi

'the ladies walked like pliant spears

their tips shaken by the flow of the gentle breeze'⁵⁸

It is as if he said *tasaffahathā ḡal-riyāḡu* 'the breeze shook them' and as if he said *laysa biḡāḡiyatika manhiyyuhā wa laysa bemaḡruwḡatin radduhā* 'What is denied will not come your way, nor is it a favor to return it', when (L. 5) it refers to *xayl* 'horses' and 'horses' is feminine, so he femininized it. An example of this is the saying of the Glorious and Sublime God: *balā man ḡaslama waghahu li-ḡal-lāhi wa huwa muḡsinun fa-lahu ḡagruhu ḡinda rabbihi, wa lā xawfun ḡalayhim wa lā hum yaḡzanuwn* 'Nay, whoever submits his being to God, and is a doer of good, he will get his reward with his lord; such shall neither be frightened, nor shall they grieve' [Sura 2:112]. He applied the first to the pronunciation of the singular, and the other he applied to the meaning. This is similar to it, in that it talked about it in the masculine, then it is femininized as it is pluralized here. It is the same in his saying *laysa biḡāḡiyatika manhiyyuhā* 'What is forbidden will not come your way' as if he were saying *biḡāḡiyatika ḡal-umuwrū* 'Things are coming your way'. In *fa-laysa bi-maḡruwḡatin radduhā* 'It is not a favor to be returned', as if he were saying *laysa bimaḡruwḡatin xaylunā s^ḡiḡāḡhun* 'It is not a favor that our horses are whole'. If you so wish you can 'erect', then you say *wa lā mustankaran ḡan (L. 10) tuḡagḡarā wa lā ḡās^ḡiran ḡanka maḡmuwrūhā* 'It is not ignoble that they be stripped naked, nor will you be denied its good deeds' on the pattern of your saying *laysa zaydun ḡāḡhiban* and *lā ḡamrun munt^ḡaligan* or *wa lā munt^ḡaligan ḡamrun* 'Zayd is not going, nor is ḡamr leaving, or the one leaving is ḡamr'. You say *mā kullu sawdāḡa tamratan wa lā bayd^ḡāḡa ṣaḡmatun* 'Not every black thing is a date,

(ص. ٢٥) كائنه قال ليس بمعروف لنا ردها ولا مستنكر عقرها فالعقر ليس للرد وقد يجوز أن يجرد على الرد ويؤنث لأنه من الخيل كما قال ذو الرمة (طويل)

مَشِينٍ كَمَا اهْتَرَّتْ رِمَاحٌ نَسَقَهَتْ
أَعَالِيهَا مَرُّ الرِّيَاحِ النَّوَاسِمِ

كائنه قال تسقها الرياح وكائنه قال ليس بآتيك مهيها وليس بمعروفة ردها حين (س. ٥) كان من الخيل والخيل مؤنثة فأنت ومثل هذا قوله عز وجل بلى من أسلم وجهه لله وهو محسن فله أجره عند ربه ولا خوف عليهم ولا هم يحزنون أجرى الأول على لفظ الواحد والآخر على المعنى فهذا مثله في أنه تكلم به مذكراً ثم أنت كما جمع هاهنا وهو في قوله ليس بآتيك مهيها كائنه قال ليس بآتيك الأمور وفي ليس بمعرفة ردها كائنه قال ليس بمعروفة خيلنا صحاحاً وإن شئت نصبت فقلت ولا مستكراً أن (س. ١٠) تُعقرا ولا قاصراً عنك مأمورها على قولك ليس زيداً ذاهباً ولا عمرو منطلقاً أو ولا منطلقاً عمرو وتقول ما كلُّ سواداً ثمرةً

⁵⁷Meter of t^ḡawiyl is: *faḡuwḡun faḡuwḡun faḡuwḡun faḡuwḡ* (2 times).

⁵⁸for the same verse cf. ch. 17 p. 19, L. 19.

nor every white thing is a piece of fat'. If you so wish, you could erect *šaḥmatan* 'piece of fat'. *bayd'āʔa* 'white thing' is in the status of *garr* 'pull' as if you were pronouncing it with *kull* 'all', you say *wa lā kullu bayd'āʔa* 'nor each piece of a white thing'. The Poet ʔabuw Duʔād said: (mutagārib)⁵⁹

ʔakulla ʔimriʔin taḥsabiynaʔimraʔan

wa nārin tawagGadu bi-ʔal-layli nāran

'Is every man you consider a man

and a fire lit at night a fire!

You dispensed with dualizing it due to your mentioning it at the beginning of the utterance and the minimality of its ambiguity for the *muxātʔab* 'addressee'. It is permissible, (L. 15) as it was permissible for you to say *mā miθlu ʔabdi ʔal-lāhi yaGuwlu ḏāka wa lā ʔaxiyhi* 'It (is) not like ʔabdu ʔal-lāh to say that nor his brother.' If you wish you could say *wa lā miθlu ʔaxiyhi* 'nor (is) it like his brother'. Just as it was permissible to pluralize/bring together the *xabar* 'predicate', in the same manner, it is permissible to *tafriyGihi* 'un-pluralize/separate it'. An example of un-pluralizing/separation is your saying *mā miθlu ʔabdi ʔal-lāhi yaGuwlu ḏāka wa lā ʔaxiyhi yakrahu ḏāka* 'It (is) not like ʔabdu ʔal-lāh to say that, nor his brother to hate that.' Similarly, *mā miθlu ʔaxiyka wa lā ʔabiyka yaGuwlaʔni ḏāka* 'It (is) not like your brother nor father to say-d that.'

ولا بيضاء شحمة وإن شئت نصبت شحمة
وبيضاء في موضع جر كأتك لفظت بكل
فقلت ولا كل بيضاء قال الشاعر أبو ذؤاد
(متقارب)

أكل امرئ تحسبين امرءاً
ونار توقد بالليل نارا

فاستغنيت عن تثبته بذكرك إياه في أول
الكلام ولقلة التباسه على المخاطب وجاز
كما (س. ١٥) جاز في قولك ما مثل عبد الله
يقول ذلك ولا أخيه وإن شئت قلت ولا مثل
أخيه فكما جاز في جمع الخبر كذلك جاز في
تفريقه وتقريبه أن تقول ما مثل عبد الله
يقول ذاك ولا أخيه يكره ذاك وكذلك ما مثل
أخيك ولا أبوك يقولان ذاك.

⁵⁹Meter of mutagārib is: *faʔuwlan faʔuwlan faʔuwlan faʔuwlan* (2 times).

Chapter 20. This is a Chapter on what you make happen to the *mawd'if* 'position' not to the *ʔism* 'name' before it

(Būlāq vol. 1. P. 33, Derenbourg vol.1. p.25, Haruwn vol.1. p. 66)

(P. 25. L. 18) An example of that is your saying *laysa zaydun bi-gabānin wa lā baxiylan* 'Zayd is not a coward nor a miser' and *mā zaydun bi-ʔaxiyka wa lā s'āhibaka* 'Zayd is not your brother nor your friend'. The surface in it is *ʔal-garr* 'the pull', because you want to share (L. 20) between the two predicates, and its meaning does not contradict what happens to it.⁶⁰ That is, if its end has priority over its beginning in order to make (p. 26) their dual states with *bāʔ* [bi] 'with' be the same as their dual states without *bāʔ* [bi] 'with', due to its closeness to it. The closeness of proximity lead them to 'pull' *haḏā guḥru d'abbīn xaribīn*⁶¹ 'This (is) a hole of a wild lizard' and similar ones, not to mention those whose meaning is clear. What has occurred in poetry in what happens to the *mawd'if* 'position' is the saying of ʔuḡayba ʔal-ʔasadiy: (wāfir)⁶²

muʔāwiya ʔinnanā bašarun fa-ʔasgiḥ

fa-lasnā bi-ʔalgibāli wa lā ʔal-ḥadiydā

(L. 5) *ʔadiyruwha baniy ḥarbin ʔalaykum*

wa lā tarmuw bi-hā ʔal-ʔarad'a ʔal-baʔiyda

'Muʔāwiya we are human, be kind

we are not mountains nor steel

keep the war among the people of war

and do not aim it at a farther target'

Because *bāʔ* '[bi] with' entered an item. If it did not enter it, it would not disturb the meaning, nor would one need it, and then it would have been 'erect'. Don't you see them saying *ḥasbuka hāḏā*, and *bi-ḥasbika hāḏā* 'This is enough for you'. Their meaning does not change. This follows its course before you entered the *bāʔ* '[bi] with', because *bi-ḥasbika* is in the initial position, and an example of it is the saying of Labiyb: (t'awiyl)⁶³

faʔin lam tagid min duwni ʔadnāna wālidan

wa duwna maʔaddin fa-ltazaʔka ʔal-ʔawāḏilu

'If you do not have a father from ʔadnan

or from Maʔadd, then the blames (of time) should make you stop'

⁶⁰I.e. the position.

⁶¹The relation of *xaribīn* to *d'abbīn*.

⁶²Meter of Wāfir is: *muʔāʔalatun muʔāʔalatun faʔuwulun* (2 times).

⁶³Meter of t'awiyl is: *faʔuwulun maʔāʔiylun* (4 times).

(٢٠) هذا باب ما تجريه على الموضع لا على الاسم الذي قبله

(ص. ٢٥. س. ١٨) وذلك قولك ليس زيدٌ بجبان ولا بخيلاً وما زيدٌ بأخيك ولا صاحبك فالوجه فيه الجرُّ لآئك تريد أن تُشركَ (س. ٢٠) بين الخبرين وليس يتقضى إجراؤه عليه المعنى فأن يكون آخره على أوله أولى ليكون (ص. ٢٦) حالهما في الباء كحالهما في غير الباء مع قربه منه وقد حملهم قرب الجوار على أن جرُّوا هذا جُزراً ضرباً خرب ونحوه فكيف ما يصحُّ معناه ومما جاء من الشعر في الإجراء على الموضع قول عقبة الأسيدي

مُعَاوِيَةَ إِنَّا بَشَرٌ فَأَسْجِحْ

فلسنا بالجبال ولا الحديداً

(س. ٥) أديروها بني حربٍ عليكم

ولا ترمؤا بها الغرضَ البعيداً

لأنَّ الباء دخلتْ على شيء لو لم تدخلْ عليه لم تُخلْ بالمعنى ولم يُحتجَّ إليها وكان نصباً ألا تراهم يقولون حسبك هذا وبحسبك هذا فلا يتغيَّر المعنى وجرى مجراه قبل أن تدخلَ الباء لأنَّ يحسبك في موضع ابتداء ومثلاً ذلك قول لبيد (طويل)

فإن لم تجد من دون عدنانَ والدًا

ودون معدٍّ قلنزعك العوادلُ

(L. 10) *ʔal-garr* 'pull' is the surface. If your were to say *mā zaydun ʔalā qawminā wa lā ʔindana* 'Zayd is not against our tribe nor with us'. It is 'erect' and nothing else, because it is not permitted to have it related to *ʔalā* 'on/against'. Don't you see that if your were to say *wa lā ʔalā ʔindina* 'nor against us', it is not possible, because *ʔindana* 'with us' is not used except as *ḏʔarfan* 'an envelope (of place)'. Rather, you wanted to predicate that he is not with you. He said *ʔaxaḏatna bi-ʔal-gawdi wa fawGahu* 'She welcomed us with generosity and beyond', because *bi-fawGihi* does not occur in their speech. It is similar to *duwna maʔaddin* above, in the saying of the poet Kaʔab bin guʔayl: (tʔawiyl)⁶⁴

ʔalā ḥayya nadmāniy ʔumayra bna ʔāmirin
ʔiḏā mā talāGayna mina ʔal-yawmi ʔaw ʔadā
 'Ah for the tribe of my friend, ʔumayra bin ʔāmir
 Would that we could meet today or tomorrow'

ʔal-ʔaggāg said: (ragaz)⁶⁵

kašhan tʔawā min baladin muxtārā
min yaʔsati ʔal-yāʔisi ʔaw ḥiḏārā
 'He decided to turn his back on a land
 due to the despair of the desperate or due to caution'

You say that *mā zaydun ka-ʔamrin wa lā šabiyhan bi-hi* 'Zayd (is) not like ʔamr nor similar to him' and *mā ʔamrun ka-xālidin wa lā muflihan* 'ʔamr (is) not like Xālid nor successful'. The *nasʔb* 'erect' in this case is fine, because you want to know that he is not similar to someone, nor successful. This is the meaning of the sentence. If you were to say *wa lā bi-manzilati man yušbihuhu* 'and not with the status of who is similar to him', you would pull it towards your saying *mā ʔanta ka-zaydin wa lā xālidin* 'You (are) not as Zayd nor Xālid'.⁶⁶

⁶⁴Meter of tʔawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun* (4 times).

⁶⁵Meter of ragaz is: *mustaʔfiylun* (6 times).

⁶⁶Būlāq edition has a variation here (vol. I, p. 35) as follows: *naḥwa Gawlika mā ʔanta ka-zaydin wa-lā šabiyhin bihi fa-ʔinnamā ʔaradta wa lā ka-šabiyhin bihi* 'you pulled towards your saying you are not like Zayd nor similar to him; indeed you wanted to say as someone similar to him'.

(س. ١٠) والجرُّ الوجهُ ولو قلت ما زيدٌ
 على قومنا ولا عندنا كان النصبُ ليس غيرُ
 لانه لا يجوز حمُّه على على ألا ترى أنك
 لو قلت ولا على عندنا لم يكن لأنَّ عندنا لا
 يُستعملُ إلا ظرفاً وإنما أردت أن تُخبرَ أنه
 ليس عندكم وقال أخذتنا بالجوْدِ وفوقه لانه
 ليس من كلامهم وبفوقه ومثل ودون معدَّ
 قول الشاعر وهو كعبُ بن جَعيلٍ (طويل)

ألا حيَّ ندْماني عُمَيْرَ بِنَ عامرٍ
 إذا ما تلاقينا من اليوم أو غدا

(س. ١٥) وقال العجاج (رجز)

كشحا طوى من بلدٍ مختاراً
 من يأسَةِ اليأسِ أو حذاراً

وتقول ما زيدٌ كعمرو ولا شبيهاً به وما
 عمرو كخالدٍ ولا مقلحاً النصبُ في هذا جيدٌ
 لأنك إنما تريد ما هو مثل فلانٍ ولا مقلحاً
 هذا معنى الكلام فإن أردت أن تقول ولا
 بمنزلة من يُشبهه جررته نحو قولك ما أنت
 كزيدٍ ولا خالدٍ

If you were to say *mā ṭanta bi-zaidin* (L. 20) *wa lā ḡariyban minhu* 'You (are) not Zayd nor near him', here there is no meaning with the *bāṭ* '[ba]' with' that was not present before you brought it in. And you, if you were to mention the *kāf* [ka] 'as/like' you exemplify. *ḡariyban* 'near' here can be a *dʿarf* 'envelope of place', if you so wished, but if you do not make *qariyban* 'near' an envelope of place', it is permissible to 'pull' it with *bāṭ* [ba] with' or 'erect' it due to the *ṭal-mawdʿiṭ* 'the position'.

وإذا قلت ما أنت بزید (س. ٢٠) ولا قريباً
منه فإنه ليس هاهنا معنى بالباء لم يكن قبل
أن تجيء بها وأنت إذا ذكرت الكاف تُمثّلُ
ويكون قريباً هاهنا إن شئتَ ظرفاً وإن لم
تجعل قريباً ظرفاً جاز فيه الجرُّ على الباء
والنصبُ على الموضع.