

This is the Famous Book of Sībawayh on *naḥw*¹ ‘Grammar’ and its Name is *ḥal-kitāb* ‘The Book’

Solomon Sara, S.J.
Georgetown University

Chapter 26. This is a chapter in which a choice is made to engage the *fiʔl* ‘action’ in what is in the *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’ on which the *fiʔl* ‘action’ is built²

(Būlāq vol. 1. P. 46, Derenbourg vol.1. p.35, Haruwn vol.1. p. 88)

(I. Ch. 26. P. 35. L. 3) That is in your saying: *ra ʔaytu zaydan wa samran*³ *kallamtuhu* ‘I saw Zaid and Amr I talked to him’; *ra ʔaytu samran wa sabda ʔal-lāhi*⁴ *marartu bihi* ‘I saw Amr and Abdullah I passed by him’; *la ʔiytu ʔaysan wa bakran*⁵ *ʔaxaḍtu* (I. Ch. 26. P. 35. L. 5) *ʔabāhu* ‘I met Qays and Bakr I took his father’; *la ʔiytu xālidan wa zaydan*⁶ *ʔištara ytu lahu ʔawban* ‘I met Xalid and Zaid I bought him a garment’. The *nasʔb* ‘erecting’ was chosen here because the first *ʔism* ‘name’ is built on the *fiʔl* ‘action’. So the building of the other on the *fiʔl* ‘action’ is better according to them, since it was built on the *fiʔl* ‘action’ and there was before it no *ʔism* ‘name’ built on the *fiʔl* ‘action’, so that the other follows the course that the one that follows it follows, since it does not contradict the meaning if you were to build it on the *fiʔl* ‘action’. This has a priority in being related to it whose proximity is to it. Since they are used to saying *dʔarabuwniy wa dʔarabtu ʔawmaka* ‘they hit me and I hit your people’ because it follows it. It is to make speech of one *wagh* ‘surface form’ (I. Ch. 26. P. 35. L. 10), if it is not forbidden for the other that it be built on what the first one was built on. It is the easiest source. An example of that is the saying of the Powerful and the Glorious *yudxilu man yašāʔu fiy raḥmatihī wa ʔal-ḍʔālimiyā ʔaḥadda lahum ḥaḍāban ʔaliyman* (Sūrah LXXI:31) ‘He will admit to His mercy whom He wills, but the wrong doers, for them, He has prepared a grievous penalty’ and His saying, the Powerful

هذا كتاب سيوييه المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(٢٦) هذا باب ما يُختار فيه إعمالُ الفعل مما يكون في المبتدأ مبنياً عليه الفعلُ

وذلك قولك رأيتُ زيداً وعمراً كلمته ورأيتُ
عمراً وعبدَ اللهَ مررتُ به ولقيتُ قيساً وبكراً
أخذتُ (س. ٥) أباه ولقيتُ خالداً وزيداً
اشتريتُ له ثوباً. وإنما أختيرَ النصبُ هاهنا
لأنَّ الاسمَ الأوَّلَ مبنياً على الفعلِ فكان بناء
الأخرِ على الفعلِ أحسنَ عندهم إذ كان يُبنى
على الفعلِ وليس قبله اسمٌ مبنياً على الفعلِ
ليجريَ الآخرُ على ما جرى عليه الذي يليه
قبله إذ كان لا يَنقُضُ المعنى لو بنيته على
الفعلِ. وهذا أولى أن يُحمَلَ عليه ما قُربَ
جوارهُ منه إذ كانوا يقولون ضَرَبوني
وضربتُ قومَكَ لأنه يليه فكان أن يكونَ
الكلامُ على وجهِ واحدٍ (س. ١٠) إذا كان لا
يَمْتنعُ الآخرُ من أن يكونَ مبنياً على ما بُني
عليه الأوَّلُ أقربَ في المأخذِ ومثلُ ذلك قوله
عزَّ وجلَّ: يُدْخِلُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ فِي رَحْمَتِهِ
وَالظَّالِمِينَ أَعَدَّ لَهُمْ عَذَاباً أَلِيماً. وقوله عزَّ

¹Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

²Thanks go to professor Mohammad Alhawary for looking over these chapters and making stylistic and substantive recommendations.

³*Samran* has the same accusative case as *zaydan* before it.

⁴*Sabda ʔal-lāhi* has the same accusative case as *Samran* before it.

⁵*Bakran* has the same accusative case as *ʔaysan* before it.

⁶*Zaydan* has the same accusative case as *xālidan* before it.

and Glorious: ‘*wa fādan wa Ṭamuwdan wa ḥasḥāba ḥal-rassi wa ḡuruwnan bayna ḏālika kaṭṭiyan wa kullan dʿarabnā lahu ḥal-ḥamṭāla* (Sūrah XXV:37-38) ‘As also Ad and Thamoud and the companions of the Rass and many a generation between them. To each one, we set forth parables and examples;’ and like it is *fariyḡan hadā wa-fariyḡan ḥaḡḡa ḥalayhumu ḥal-dʿalāla* (Sūrah VII:30) ‘some of them he has guided and some have deserved the loss of their way’. This is frequent in the Qurʾān. And an example like that is *kuntu ḥaxāka wa zaydan*⁷ *kuntu ḥaxan lahu* ‘I was your brother and Zaid I was a brother to him’, because *kuntu ḥaxāka* ‘I was your brother’ has the status of *dʿarabtu ḥaxāka* ‘I hit your brother’. You say *lastu ḥaxāka* (I. Ch. 26. P. 35. L. 15) *wa zaydan*⁸ *ḥaḥantuka ḥalayhi* ‘I am not your brother and Zaid I helped you against him’, because it is *fiḥ* ‘an action’ and variation in its meaning is the variation in that of *kāna* ‘it was’. The poet, who is ḥal-Rabiyṣu dʿabuṣi ḥal-fazāriyyu, said: (munsariḥ)⁹

ḥasḥabātu lā ḥaḥmilu ḥal-silāḥa wa lā
ḥaruddu raḥsa ḥal-baḥiyri in nafarā
*wa ḥal-ḏiḥba*¹⁰ *ḥaxšāhu ḥin marartu bihi*
waḥdiy wa ḥaxša ḥal-riyāḥa wa ḥal-matʿara

‘I have become non-weapon carrying person nor
Do I turn the head of the two camels when they stampede
I fear the wolf when I encounter it
Alone, and I fear the winds and the rain.’

It could be begun with and it is related to something similar to it and there is not before it *mansʿuwb* ‘something erected’, and that is good Arabic. And that is in your saying (I. Ch. 26. P. 35. L. 20): *laḡiytu zaydan wa ḥamrun kallamtuhu* ‘I met Zaid and Amr I talked with him’. It is as though you said *laḡiytu zaydan wa ḥamrun ḥafḏʿalu minhu* ‘I met Zaid and Amr is better than he is’. This cannot have except *raḥḥ* ‘raising’, because you did not mention a *fiḥ* ‘action’. If it is permissible that it be in the *mubtadaʿ* ‘initial’ in this status, it is permissible that it be (I. Ch. 26. P. 36. L. 1) within speech and closer to it than the *raḥḥ* ‘raising’: *ḥabda ḥal-lāhi laḡiytu wa ḥamrun laḡiytu ḥaxāhu* ‘Abdulah I met and Amr I met

⁷*zaydan* has the same accusative case as *ḥaxāka* before it.

⁸*zaydan* has the same accusative case as *ḥaxāka* before it.

⁹Meter of munsariḥ is: *mustafsilun fāḥilātun muftaḥilun* (twice).

¹⁰*ḥal-ḏiḥba* is in the accusative case.

وَجَلَّ: وَعَادَا وَتَمُودَا وَأَصْحَابَ الرَّسِّ
وَقُرُونًا بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ كَثِيرًا وَكُلًّا ضَرَبْنَا لَهُ
الْأَمْثَالَ وَمِثْلَهُ فَرِيقًا هَدَى وَفَرِيقًا حَقَّ عَلَيْهِمُ
الضَّلَالَةُ. وَهَذَا فِي الْقُرْآنِ كَثِيرٌ وَمِثْلُ ذَلِكَ
كَنتُ أَخَاكَ وَزَيْدًا كَنتُ أَخَا لَهُ لِأَنَّ كَنتُ
أَخَاكَ وَزَيْدًا كَنتُ أَخَا لَهُ لِأَنَّ كَنتُ أَخَاكَ
بِمَنْزِلَةِ ضَرَبْتُ أَخَاكَ وَتَقُولُ لَسْتُ أَخَاكَ
(س. ١٥) وَزَيْدًا أَعْنُكَ عَلَيْهِ لِأَنَّهَا فَعْلٌ
وَتَصَرَّفُ فِي مَعْنَاهَا تَصَرَّفُ كَانَ وَقَالَ
الشَّاعِرُ وَهُوَ الرَّبِيعُ بْنُ ضَيْعِ الْفَزَارِيِّ:
(مَنْسَرِح)

أَصْبَحْتُ لَا أَحْمِلُ السَّلَاحَ وَلَا
أَرُدُّ رَأْسَ الْبَعِيرِ إِنْ نَفَرَا
وَالذَّنْبَ أَحْشَاهُ إِنْ مَرَرْتُ بِهِ
وَحَدِي وَأَحْشَى الرِّيَّاحَ وَالْمَطْرَا

وَقَدْ يُبَدَأُ فَيُحْمَلُ عَلَى مِثْلِ مَا يُحْمَلُ عَلَيْهِ
وَلَيْسَ قَبْلَهُ مَنْصُوبٌ وَهُوَ عَرَبِيٌّ وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ
(س. ٢٠) لَقَيْتُ زَيْدًا وَعَمَرُو كَلْمَتُهُ كَأَنَّكَ
قَلْتُ لَقَيْتُ زَيْدًا وَعَمَرُو أَفْضَلُ مِنْهُ فَهَذَا لَا
يَكُونُ فِيهِ إِلَّا الرَّفْعُ لِأَنَّكَ لَمْ تَذْكُرْ فِعْلًا فَإِذَا
جَازَ أَنْ يَكُونَ فِي الْمَبْتَدَأِ بِهَذِهِ الْمَنْزِلَةِ جَازَ
أَنْ يَكُونَ (ص. ٣٦) بَيْنَ الْكَلَامِ وَأَقْرَبَ مِنْهُ
إِلَى الرَّفْعِ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ لَقَيْتُ وَعَمَرُو لَقَيْتُ

his brother' and *xālidan raʔaytu wa zaydun kallamtu ʔabāhu* 'Xalid I saw and Zaid I talked with his father'. Here it is closer to *raʔʔ* 'raising' as it was in the *ʔibtidāʔ* 'initial' farther from the *nasʔb* 'erect'. As to His saying the Powerful and the Glorious; *ya ʔšā tʔāʔifatan minkum wa tʔāʔifatan ʔad ʔahammathum ʔanfusuhum* 'he sent down calm on the band of you while another band stirred to anxiety pre-occupied with themselves' (Sūrah III:154). They directed it towards *ʔannahu ya ʔšā tʔāʔifatan minkum* 'that he visit a band of you and *wa tʔāʔifatan* 'a band ...' is in this state. It is as though He said *ʔiʔ tʔāʔifatan fi ʔ hāʔihi ʔal-hāl* 'is a band in this state'. Rather He made it to be *wa ʔtan* 'a time' and He did not (I. Ch. 26. P. 35. L. 5) want to make it to be a *wāw ʔatʔ* '[w] of conjunction', rather it is a *wāw ʔal-ʔibtidāʔ* '[w] of initiation'. Of what is chosen for *nasʔb* 'erecting', due to the *nasʔb* 'erecting' of the first, is his saying *mā la ʔiytu zaydan wa lākin ʔamran marartu bihi* 'I did not meet Zaid but Amr I passed by him'; and *mā raʔaytu zaydan bal xālidan la ʔiytu ʔabāhu* 'I did not see Zaid, but Xalid I met his father'. You make it follow according to your saying *dʔarabtu zaydan wa ʔamran lam ʔal ʔahu* 'I hit Zaid and Amr I did not meet'. The last one is as though he introduces it with the *fi ʔ* 'action' with the status of this one, where he does not introduce it because *bal* 'but' and *lākin* 'however' do nothing, and they associate the last with the first because they are like *wāw*, *ʔumma* and *ʔal-fāʔ* '[w], then and *fa* particle'. So make them follow their path in whatever of them the *wagh* 'surface form' is the *nasʔb* 'erecting' and in which the *raʔʔ* 'raising' is permitted'.

أخاه وخالداً رأيتُ وزيدٌ كلّمْتُ أباه فهو هنا إلى الرفع أقربُ كما كان في الابتداء من النصب أبعدَ. وأما قوله عزّ وجلّ يَغشَى طائفةً مِنْكُمْ وَطائفةٌ قد أَهَمَّتْهُمْ أَنفُسُهُمْ فَإِنما وَجَّهوه على أَنه يَغشى طائفةً مِنْكم وَطائفةً في هذه الحال كأنه قال إذ طائفةٌ في هذه الحال فَإِنما جَعَلَهُ وقتاً ولم (س. ٥) يُرَدُّ أَن يجعلها واو عطفٍ وإِنما هي واوُ الابتداء وممّا يُختار فيه النصبُ لنصبِ الأوّلِ قوله ما لقيتُ زيداً ولكن عمراً مررتُ به وما رأيتُ زيداً بل خالداً لقيتُ أباه تُجْريه على قولك ضربتُ زيداً وعمراً لم ألقه يكون الآخرُ في أَنه يُدْخِلُه في الفعل بمنزلة هذا حيث لم يُدْخِلُه لأنّ بل ولكن لا تَعْمَلان شيئاً وتُشْرِكُان الآخرَ مع الأوّلِ لأنهما كالواو وتُمّ والفاء فأجرهما مُجْراهُنّ فيما كان فيهنّ النصبُ الوجهةً وفيما جاز فيه الرفعُ.

Chapter 27. This is a chapter in which *ḥism* ‘a name’ is related to another *ḥism* ‘name’ on which the *fiʔl* ‘action’ is built one time and another time it is built on *ḥism* ‘a name’ that is built on *fiʔl* ‘an action’

(Būlāq vol. 1. P. 47, Derenbourg vol.1. p.36, Haruwn vol.1. p. 91)

(I. Ch. 27. P. 36. L. 10) Whichever of those you did is permissible. If you were to relate it to *ḥism* ‘name’ on which the *fiʔl* ‘action’ is built it assumes its status. If you were to build on it the *fiʔl* ‘action’ as *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’. It is permitted in the one what is permitted in the other. If you were to say *zaydun laḡiytuhu* ‘Zaid, I met him’. If you were to relate it to what is built on the *fiʔl* ‘action’, the *nasʔb* ‘erect’ is chosen, just as it was chosen on what was before it. It is permitted in it what was permitted in what is before it. And that is in your saying *ṣamrun laḡiytuhu wa zaydun kallamtuhu* ‘Amr, I met him and Zaid, I talked with him’. If you were to relate the *kalām* ‘speech’ to the first. (I. Ch. 27. P. 36. L. 15) If you were to relate it to the last, you would say *ṣamrun laḡiytuhu wa zaydan kallamtuhu* ‘Amr, I met him and Zaid I talked to’. Similar to that is your saying *zaydun laḡiytu ḡabāhu wa ṣamran marartun bihi* ‘Zaid, I met his father and Amr I passed by him’, if you were to relate it to the *ḡab* ‘father’. If you related it to the first, *rafaʔta* ‘you raised’. Proof for that both the *rafaʔ* ‘raise’ and the *nasʔb* ‘erect’ are permitted is that you say *zaydun laḡiytu ḡabāhu wa ṣamran* ‘Zaid, I met his father and Amr’, if you intended that you *laḡiyta ṣamran wa ḡal-ḡaba* ‘you met Amr and the father’. If you were to claim that *laḡiyta ḡabā ṣamrin wa lam talḡahu* ‘you met the father of Amr but did not meet him [ṣamr]’ you raise. An example similar to that is: *zaydun laḡiytuhu wa ṣamrun* ‘Zaid I met and Amr’. If you so wish *rafaʔta* ‘you raised’ and if you so wish you said: *zaydun laḡiytuhu wa ṣamran* ‘Zaid, I met him and Amr’. You also say *zaydun ḡalḡāhu wa ṣamrun*¹¹ / *wa ṣamran*¹² ‘Zaid I meet and Amr /and Amr’. This strengthens (I. Ch. 27. P. 36. L. 20) that you have a choice of the two surface forms. You say *zaydun dʔarabaniy wa ṣamrun marartu bihi* ‘Zaid hit me and Amr I passed by him’. If you related it to Zaid, then it is *rafaʔ* ‘raise’ because it is *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’ and the *fiʔl* ‘action’ is built on it. If you related it to the *mansʔuwb* ‘erected’,

(٢٧) هذا باب يُحْمَلُ فِيهِ الْأِسْمُ عَلَى اسْمِ
بُنِي عَلَيْهِ الْفِعْلُ مَرَّةً وَيُحْمَلُ مَرَّةً أُخْرَى
عَلَى اسْمٍ مَبْنِيٍّ عَلَى الْفِعْلِ

أَيَّ ذَلِكَ فَعَلْتَ جاز فإن حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى الْأِسْمِ
الَّذِي بُنِيَ عَلَيْهِ الْفِعْلُ كَانَ بِمَنْزِلَتِهِ إِذَا بَنَيْتَ
عَلَيْهِ الْفِعْلَ مَبْتَدَأً يَجُوزُ فِيهِ مَا يَجُوزُ فِيهِ إِذَا
قَلْتَ زَيْدٌ لَقِيْتُهُ وَإِنْ حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى الَّذِي بُنِيَ
عَلَى الْفِعْلِ اخْتِيَرَ فِيهِ النَّصْبُ كَمَا اخْتِيَرُ فِيمَا
قَبْلَهُ وَجَاز فِيهِ مَا جَاز فِي الَّذِي قَبْلَهُ وَذَلِكَ
قَوْلُكَ عَمْرُو لَقِيْتُهُ وَزَيْدٌ كَلَّمْتُهُ إِنْ حَمَلْتَهُ
الْكَلَامَ عَلَى الْأَوَّلِ (س. ١٥). وَإِنْ حَمَلْتَهُ
عَلَى الْآخِرِ قَلْتُ عَمْرُو لَقِيْتُهُ وَزَيْدٌ كَلَّمْتُهُ
وَمِثْلُ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ زَيْدٌ لَقِيْتُ أَبَاهُ وَعَمْرَأُ
مَرَرْتُ بِهِ إِنْ حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى الْأَبِ وَإِنْ حَمَلْتَهُ
عَلَى الْأَوَّلِ رَفَعْتَهُ. وَالِدَلِيلُ عَلَى أَنَّ الرَّفْعَ
وَالنَّصْبَ جَائِزٌ كِلَاهُمَا أَنَّكَ تَقُولُ زَيْدٌ لَقِيْتُ
أَبَاهُ وَعَمْرَأُ إِنْ أَرَدْتَ أَنَّكَ لَقِيْتُ عَمْرَأُ وَالْأَبَ
وَإِنْ زَعَمْتَ أَنَّكَ لَقِيْتُ أَبَا عَمْرُو وَلَمْ تَلْقَهُ
رَفَعْتَ وَمِثْلُ ذَلِكَ زَيْدٌ لَقِيْتُهُ وَعَمْرُو إِنْ شِئْتَ
رَفَعْتَ وَإِنْ شِئْتَ قَلْتُ زَيْدٌ لَقِيْتُهُ وَعَمْرَأُ
وَتَقُولُ أَيْضاً زَيْدٌ أَلْقَاهُ وَعَمْرُو وَعَمْرَأُ فَهَذَا
يُقَوِّى (س. ٢٠) أَنَّكَ بِالْخِيَارِ فِي الْوَجْهَيْنِ
وَتَقُولُ زَيْدٌ ضَرَبْتَنِي وَعَمْرُو مَرَرْتُ بِهِ إِنْ
حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى زَيْدٍ فَهُوَ رَفْعٌ لِأَنَّهُ مَبْتَدَأٌ وَالْفِعْلُ
مَبْنِيٌّ عَلَيْهِ وَإِنْ حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى الْمَنْصُوبِ

¹¹The raised form, one choice.

¹²The erect form, another choice.

you would say *zaydun d'arabaniy wa samran marartu bihi* 'Zaid hit me and Amr I passed by him'. The *wagh* 'surface form' is *nas'ib* 'erect', because Zaid is not what the *fi'l* 'action' is built on *mubtada'an* 'as an initial', rather it is here with the status of the *tā?* [t] in *d'arab-tu-hu* 'I hit him'. You mentioned the *mafsuwl* 'acted-upon' in which the *nas'ib* 'erect' is permissible initially, so you related it to like what (I. Ch. 27. P. 37. L. 1) you related to it what was before it. And the surface form was, if it were to be like that with it in the *ħbtidā?* 'initial'. If you said *marartu bi-zaydin wa samran marartu bihi* 'I passed by Zaid and Amr I passed by him' you erected and it is the *wagh* 'surface form' because you began with the *fi'l* 'action' and you did not begin with *ħism* 'a name' on which to build it on. Rather, you said *fa'saltu* 'I did' then you built the *mafsuwl* 'acted-upon' on it, even if the *fi'l* does not reach it except by a *ħarf ħal-ħid'āfah* 'a particle of annexion'. It is as though he said *marartu zaydan* 'I passed Zaid'. Were it not like that, the surface form of *kalām* 'speech' would not be *ħa-zaydan mararta bihi?* 'Was it Zaid you pass by?' (I. Ch. 27. P. 37. L. 5) and *ħumtu wa samran marartu bihi* 'I got up and Amr I passed by him'. Similar to that is your saying *ħaššantu bis'adrihi* 'I roughed him at the chest'. The *s'adr* 'chest' is in the *mawd'if* 'location' of *nas'ib* 'erect' and the *bā?* [bi] did its work. Similar to it is *ħul kafā bi-ħal-lāhi šahiydan bayni wa baynakum* (SūrahXVII:96) 'Say, God is enough a witness between me and you'. It is *kafā ħal-lāhu* 'God is sufficient', but when you introduced the *bā?* [bi] it became effective and the *mawd'if* 'location' is the location of *nas'ib* 'erect' and the meaning is the meaning of *nas'ib* 'erect'. This is the saying of ħal-Khalīl, may God have mercy on him. If you were to say *ħabdu ħal-lāhi marartu bihi* 'Abdullah, I passed by him' you performed on the *ħism* 'name' the same operation after *zaydun laħiytu* 'Zaid, I met him', because *marartu bi-ħabdi ħal-lāhi* 'I passed by Abdullah' you make it follow the course of *laħiytu ħabda ħal-lāhi* 'I met Abdullah'. And you say *ħāḏā d'āribun ħabda ħal-lāhi wa zaydan yamurru bihi* 'this is a hitter of Abdulla and Zaid passes by him' if you related it (I. Ch. 27. P. 37. L. 10) to the *ħans'uwib* 'erect'. If you were to relate the *mubtada?* 'initial' and it is this, *ħafa'sta* 'you raised'. If you were to drop the *nuwn* [n] and you wanted its meaning, then it is in that status and that is in your saying *ħāḏā d'āribu zaydin yadan wa samran sa-yad'ribuhu* 'this is a hitter of Zaid tomorrow and Amr he will hit him'. Were it not like that, you would not have said *ħa-zaydan ħanta d'āribuhu*

قلت زيد ضربني وعمراً مررت به فالوجه
النصب لأن زيداً ليس بمبني عليه الفعل
مبتدأ وإنما هو هاهنا بمنزلة التاء في
ضربته وذكرت المفعول الذي يجوز فيه
النصب في الابتداء فحملته على مثل ما
(ص. ٣٧) حملت عليه ما قبله وكان الوجه
إذا كان ذلك يكون فيه في الابتداء وإذا قلت
مررت بزيد وعمراً مررت به نصبت وكان
الوجه لأنك بدأت بالفعل ولم تبدئي اسماً
تبنيه عليه ولكأنك قلت فعلت ثم بنيت عليه
المفعول وإن كان الفعل لا يصل إليه إلا
بحرف الإضافة كأنه قال مررت بزيداً. ولولا
أنه كذلك ما كان وجه الكلام أزيداً مررت
به (س. ٥) وقمت وعمراً مررت به. ونحو
ذلك قولك خشنت بصدري فالصدر في
موضع نصب والباء قد عملت ومثله قل
كفى بالله شهيداً بيني وبينكم إنما هو كفى
الله ولكأنك لما أدخلت الباء عملت والموضع
موضع نصب والمعنى معنى النصب وهذا
قول الخليل رحمه الله وإذا قلت عبد الله
مررت به أجريت الاسم بعده مجراه بعد
زيداً لقيته لأن مررت بعبد الله تجريه مجرى
لقيت عبد الله. وتقول هذا ضارب عبد الله
وزيداً يمر به إن حملته (س. ١٠) على
المنسوب فإن حملته على المبتدأ وهو هذا
رفعت فإن أقيت النون وأنت تريد معناها
فهو بتلك المنزلة وذلك قولك هذا ضارب
زيد غداً وعمراً سيضربه ولولا أنه كذلك لما
قلت أزيداً أنت ضاربه

wa mā zaydan ḥanā d'āribuhu 'Is it Zaid that you are hitting and it is not Zaid whom I am hitting'. This is like *marartu bi-zaydin* 'I passed by Zaid', because its meaning is the same whether *munawwan wa ḡayr munawwan* 'nunated or not nunated'. It is the same as if you said *marartu bi-zaydin* 'I passed by Zaid', it is as though you said *marartu zaydan* 'I passed Zaid'. And you say *d'arabtu zaydan wa samran ḥanā d'āribuhu* 'I hit Zaid and Amr I am hitting him'. You choose this, the way you choose the *ḥistifhām* 'interrogative'. What is chosen of the *nas'ib* 'erect' (I. Ch. 27. P. 37. L. 15) is the saying of the man: *man raḡayta wa ḡayyahum raḡayta* 'Whom did you see and 'which one of them did you see?' Then you say *zaydan raḡaytuhu* 'Zaid I saw him' you give him the status of your saying *kallamtu samran wa zaydan laḡiytuhu* 'I talked to Amr and Zaid, I met him'. Don't you see that the man says: *man raḡayta* 'whom did you see? And you say *zaydan* 'Zaid' as a response to his speech? This assumes the status of your saying *raḡaytu zaydan wa samran* 'I saw Zaid and Amr'. It follows the *fiḥl* 'action' like the other one followed the *wāw* '[w]and' towards the other. An example of that is your saying *ḡa-raḡayta zaydan* 'did you see Zaid?' He says *lā wa-lākin samran marartu bihi* 'No, but Amr, I passed by him'. Don't you see that if he were to say *lā wa-lākin samran* 'No, but Amr', it would follow on *ḡa-raḡayta* 'did you see?' If he were to say *man raḡaytahu wa ḡayyuhum raḡaytahu* 'whom did you see, and which one of them did you see?' You answered him and said *zaydan raḡaytuhu* 'Zaid, I saw him', except in the saying of the one (I. Ch. 27. P. 37. L. 20) who says *zaydan raḡatuhu* 'Zaid, I saw him', in the *mubtada'* 'initial', because this is like your saying *ḡayyuhum munt'aliḡun wa man rasuwlun* 'Which one of them is leaving and who is a messenger?' Then you say *fulānun* 'so and so'. If he were to say *ḡa-ḡabda ḡal-lāhi mararta bihi ḡam zaydan* 'Is it Abdullah that you passed by or Zaid?' You said *zaydan marartu bihi* 'it is Zaid, I passed by' as you did that with the first. If you were to say *lā bal zaydan* 'No, but Zaid', then *ḥins'ib* 'erect!' also, just as you would say *zaydan* 'Zaid', if he were to say *man ḡatayta* 'whom did you bring?' because *marartu bihi* 'I passed by him', its explanation is *laḡiytuhu* 'I met him' (I. Ch. 27. P. 38. L. 1) and similar ones. You make the *ḥism* 'name' bear what the questioner makes it bear as though they said *ḡayyahum ḡatayta faḡulta zaydan* 'whom did you go to and you said Zaid'. If he were to say *marartu bi-samrin wa zaydan* 'I passed by Amr and Zaid', that is Arabic. How does this come about? Because it is *fiḥl* 'an action'

وما زيداً أنا ضاربه. فهذا نحو مررت بزيد لأن معناه منوناً وغير منون سواء كما أنك إذا قلت مررت بزيد فكأنك قلت مررت زيداً وتقول ضربت زيداً وعمراً أنا ضاربه تختار هذا كما تختار في الاستفهام ومما يختار فيه النصب (س. ١٥) قول الرجل من رأيت وأيهم رأيت فنقول زيداً رأيتهُ نُزله منزلة قولك كلمت عمراً وزيداً لقيته. ألا ترى أن الرجل يقول من رأيت فنقول زيداً على كلامه فيصيرُ هذا بمنزلة قولك رأيت زيداً وعمراً فيجري على الفعل كما جري الآخر بالواو على الأول ومثل ذلك قولك رأيت زيداً فيقول لا ولكن عمراً مررت به. ألا ترى أنه لو قال لا ولكن عمراً لجرى على رأيت فإن قال من رأيتهُ وأيهم رأيتهُ فأجبتهُ قلت زيداً رأيتهُ إلا في قول من (س. ٢٠) قال زيداً رأيتهُ في المبتدأ لأن هذا كقولك أيهم منطلق ومن رسول فتقول فلان وإن قال أعبد الله مررت به أم زيداً قلت زيداً مررت به كما فعلت ذلك في الأول فإن قلت لا بل زيداً فأنصب أيضاً كما تقول زيداً إذا قال من رأيت لأن مررت به تفسيره لقيته (ص. ٣٨) ونحوها وإنما تحمّل الاسم على ما يحمّل السائل كأنهم قالوا أيهم أتيت فقلت زيداً ولو قال مررت بعمره وزيدا لكان عربياً فكيف هذا لأنه فعلٌ

and the *magruwr* ‘pulled’ is in the location of the *mans’uwb* ‘erected’ by *fi* ʔ ‘an action’ that does not contradict its meaning as Gariyr said: (ragaz)¹³ (I. Ch. 27. P. 38. L. 5)

gi ʔniy bi-mi ʔli baniy badrin li-Gawmihimi
ʔaw mi ʔla ʔusrati mand’uwri bni sayyāri

‘Bring me the likes of bani Badr towards their folks
Or the likes of the family of Mandhur bnu Sayyār’

And like it is the saying of ʔal-ʔaggāg: (ragaz)¹⁴

Yaḏhabna fiy nagdin wa ʔawran ʔāʔrā
‘They enter into Najd and deep valley’

It is as though he said *yaslukna* ‘they enter’ a deep valley because the meaning of *yaḏhabna fiyhi* is *yaslukna* ‘they enter’. It is not permitted that *tud’mira* ‘you imply’ *fi* ʔ ‘an action’ that does not reach except with *ḥarf garr* ‘a particle of pulling/preposition’ because *ḥarf garr* ‘a particle of pulling/preposition’ cannot be implied. You shall see the proof for that. If that were permitted, you would say *zaydin* (I. Ch. 27. P. 38. L. 10) *turiydu, murra bi-zaydin* ‘Zaid you want, Zaid was passed by’ and an example of this *wa ḥuwrān ḥiynan* (Sūrah LVI:22) ‘and houris with beautiful eyes’ in the reading of *ʔubayyin*. If you were to say *Gad la ʔiytu zaydan wa ʔamma ʔamrun fa-Gad marartu bihi* ‘I have met Zaid, but as to Amr, I have passed by him’. *Wa la ʔiytu zaydan wa ʔā ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi yad’ribuhu ʔamrun* ‘And I met Zaid, and behold Abdulla, Amr was beating up on him’. It is *ʔal-raff* ‘the raising’ except in the saying of the one who said *zaidan ra ʔaytuhu wa zaydan marartu bihi* ‘Zaid, I saw him, and Zaid, I passed by him’ because *ʔamma* ‘as to’ and *ʔā* ‘if’, speech is interrupted with them. They are articles of initiation. They steer speech towards the beginning except that what *yans’ib* ‘erects’ enters them and neither one of them relates the other to the beginning like one relates with *ʔumma* ‘then’ and the *fāʔ* ‘and consecutive’. Don’t you see that they read *wa ʔammā ʔamuwdu fa-hadaynāhum* (Sūrah XLI:17) ‘and as for Thamoud we gave them guidance’, and before it is *nas’b* ‘erect’ that is because ((I. Ch. 27. P. 38. L. 15) it steers speech towards the beginning

والمجرورُ في موضع مفعولٍ منصوبٍ
ومعناه أتيتُ ونحوها فيُحْمَلُ الاسمُ إذا كان
العاملُ الأوَّلُ فعلاً وكان المجرورُ في
موضع المنصوب على فعلٍ لا يَنْقُضُ معناه.
كما قال جرير: (بسيط)

جئني بمثل بني بَدْرِ لِقَوْمِهِم
أو مثل أُسْرَةَ مَنْظُورِ بنِ سَيَّارِ

ومثله قول العجاج: (رجز)

يَذْهَبْنَ فِي نَجْدٍ وَغُورًا غَائِرًا

كأنه قال ويسلكن غوراً غائراً لأن معنى
يَذْهَبْنَ فيه يسلكن ولا يجوز أن تُضْمَرَ فعلاً
لا يَصِلُ إلا بحرف جرٍّ لأن حرف الجرِّ لا
يُضْمَرُ وسترى بيان ذلك ولو جاز ذلك لقلت
زيد (س. ١٠) تريد مُرَّ زِيدٍ ومثل هذا
وحوراً عيناً في قراءة أبي (بن كعب) فإن
قلت لقيت زيداً وأمّا عمرو فقد مررت به
ولقيت زيداً وإذا عبدُ الله يضربُه عمرو
فالرفعُ إلا في قول من قال زيداً رأيتُه وزيداً
مررت به لأنّ أمّا وإذا يُقَطَعُ بهما الكلامُ
وهما من حروف الابتداء يَصرفان الكلامَ
إلى الابتداء إلا أن يَدْخُلَ عليهما ما يَنْصِبُ
ولا يُحْمَلُ بواحدٍ منهما آخرٌ على أوّل كما
يُحْمَلُ بئمّ والفاء ألا ترى أنّهم قرأوا وأمّا
تَمُودُ فَهَدَيْنَاهُمْ وقبله نصبٌ وذلك لأنها (س.
١٥) تَصْرِفُ الكلامَ إلى الابتداء

¹³The meter of ragaz is: *Mustafīlun* (six times).

¹⁴The meter of ragaz is: *Mustafīlun* (six times).

except that a *fi* Ω 'action' occurs after it, like *amma Zaydan fad'arabtu* 'as to Zaid, I hit'. If you were to say *inna zaydan fiyhā* 'indeed, Zaid is in it' or *innā fiyhā zaydan wa samrun adxaltuhu law daxalta bihi* 'In it is Zaid and Amr, as for Zaid I came in with him'. You raised it except in the saying of the one who said *zaydan adxaltuhu wa zaydan daxaltu bihi* 'Zaid, I introduced him and Zaid, I came in with him', because *inna* 'accusative particle' is not a *fi* Ω 'an action' but it is likened to it. Don't you see that a *fā'il* 'actor' is not *yud'mar* 'implied' in it nor is the *ism* 'name' post-positioned' by it. It is rather with the status of *fi* Ω 'an action' just as *šīriyāna dirhamāna wa ṭalāṭiyyāna ragulan* 'twenty dirhams and thirty men' has in the status of *d'āribiyyāna sabda ṭal-lāhi* 'hitters of Abdullah'. It is neither *fi* Ω *wa-lā fā'il* 'an action nor an actor'. Similarly *mā ṭaḥsana sabda ṭal-lāhi wa zaydun ḡad* (I. Ch. 27. P. 38. L. 20) *ra ṭaynāhu* 'How nice is Abdullah and Zaid, we have seen him'. You make it, that is *ṭaḥsana* 'it is better', in these locations to follow the path of the *fi* Ω 'action' in its action though it is not like the *fi* Ω 'action', nor does it come with its examples, nor its implication, no its pre-positioning, nor its post-positioning nor its variations, rather it is with the status of *ladun* 'at, near', *yudwatan* 'morning' and *kam ragulan* 'how many men?' They (dual) operated with the action of the *fi* Ω 'action' but they are neither *fi* Ω 'an action' nor *fā'il* 'an actor'. On that in which the *nas'b* 'erect' is chosen due to to *nas'b* 'erect' of the first, and the particle that is between the first and the other with the status of *wāw* '[w] and', and a *fā'* '[f] consecutive and' and *ṭumma* 'then', in your saying: *laḡiytu* (I. Ch. 27. P. 39. L. 1) *ṭal-ḡawma kullahum ḡatta sabda ṭal-lāhi laḡiytuhu* 'I met the people, all of them, even Abdullah, I met him'. And *d'arabtu ṭal-ḡawma ḡatta zaydan d'arabtu ṭabāhu* 'I hit the people even Zaid, I hit his father'. And *ṭataytu ṭal-ḡawma ṭagma ṭiyyāna ḡatta zaydan marartu bihi* 'I came to the people altogether even to Zaid, I passed by him'. And *marartu bi-ṭal-ḡawmi ḡatta zaydan marartu bihi* 'I passed by the people even by Zaid, I passed by him'. *ḡatta* 'until/even' follows the path of *wāw* '[w] and' and *ṭumma* 'then' and it does not have the status of *ṭammā* 'however', because it may be in relation to the *kalām* 'speech' that is before it but it does not initiate. You say *ra ṭaytu ṭal-ḡawma ḡatta sabda ṭal-lāhi* 'I saw the people even Abdulla' and you keep quiet. Its meaning is that you have seen Abdullah with the people just as (I. Ch. 27. P. 39. L. 5) it was *ra ṭaytu ṭal-ḡawma wa sabda ṭal-lāhi ṭalā ḡālika* 'I saw the people and Abdullah like that'.

إلا أن يقع بعدها فعلٌ نحو أما زيدا فضربتُ ولو قلت: إن زيدا فيها أو إن فيها زيدا وعمرُو أدخلته أو دخلتُ به رفعتُه إلا في قول من قال زيدا أدخلته وزيدا دخلتُ به لأنَّ إن ليس بفعل وإنما هو مشبَّه به ألا ترى أنَّه لا يُضمَرُ فيه فاعلٌ ولا يُؤخَّرُ فيه الاسمُ وإنما هو بمنزلة الفعل كما أنَّ عشرين درهماً وثلاثين رجلاً بمنزلة ضاربين عبدَ الله وليس بفعل ولا فاعلٍ. وكذلك ما أحسنَ عبدَ الله وزيدٌ قد (س. ٢٠) رأيناه فإنما أجرينهُ - يعني أحسن - في الموضع مُجرى الفعل في عمله وليس كالفعل ولم يَجِيء على أمثله ولا على إضماره ولا تقديمه ولا تأخيرهِ ولا تصرفه وإنما هو بمنزلة لَدُنْ غُدُوَّةٍ وَكَمْ رَجُلًا فَقَدْ عَمِلَا عَمَلُ الْفَعْلِ وَلَيْسَا بفعل ولا فاعلٍ. ومما يُختار فيه النصبُ لنصبِ الأوَّلِ ويكون الحرف الذي بين الأوَّلِ والآخر بمنزلة الواو والفاء وتَمَّ قولك لقيتُ (ص. ٣٩) القومَ كلَّهم حتى عبدَ الله لقيته وضربتُ القومَ حتى زيدا ضربتُ أباه وأتيتُ القومَ أجمعين حتى زيدا مررتُ به ومررتُ بالقوم حتى زيدا مررتُ به فحتى تجري مجرى الواو وتَمَّ وليست بمنزلة أمَّا لأنها إنما تكون على الكلام الذي قبلها ولا تُبَدَأُ وتقول رأيتُ القومَ حتى عبدَ الله وتَسَكَّتْ فإنما معناه أنك قد رأيتَ عبدَ الله مع القوم كما (س. ٥) كان رأيتُ القومَ وعبدَ الله على ذلك

Similarly, *d'arabtu ʔal-ḡawma ḥatta zaydan ʔanā d'āribuhu* 'I hit the people even Zaid, I am hitting him'. And you say *hāḏā d'āribu ʔal-ḡawmi ḥatta zaydan yad'ribuhu* 'this one is hitting the people even Zaid, whom he is hitting', if you wanted the meaning of *tanwiyn* 'nunation'. It is like *wāw* '[w] and' except that *tagurru bihā* 'you pull with it', if it is the aim and the *magruwr* 'pulled' is *maḥḥuwl* 'an acted-upon'. Likewise *tagurr* 'you pull' in your saying *hāḏā d'āribu zaydin yadan* 'This is going to hit of Zaid tomorrow'. You limit the *nuwn* '[n]'. It is a *maḥḥuwl* 'acted upon' in its status *mans'uwban munawwanan* 'an erected that is nunated' what is before it. If you were to say *halaka ʔal-ḡawmu ḥatta zaydan ʔahlaktu* 'the people perished even Zaid, I destroyed him'. The *nas'b* 'erect' was chosen to be built on the *fiʔ* 'action' just as what was built before it whether *marfuw san kāna ʔaw mans'uwban* 'it was raised or erected' just as it was done (I. Ch. 27. P. 39. L. 10) after it was built on *fiʔ* 'action' and it was *magruwr* 'pulled'. If you were to say that it is so, due to the *nas'b ʔal-lafḏ'* 'erection of the expression', then raise after *marartu bi-zaydin* 'I passed by Zaid' and *ʔins'ib* 'erect' after *ʔinna fiyhā zaydan* 'indeed, Zaid is in it', even if it is the first, because in the meaning of *ḥadiyth* 'discussion', it is a *maḥḥuwl* 'acted-upon'. You do not raise after *ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi* if you were to say *ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi d'arabtu* 'Abdullah, I hit him'. If there is after it *wa-zaydan marartu bihi* 'and Zaid, I passed by him'. *Garr* 'pull' is good in all this and it is Arabic. And that is in your saying: *laḡiytu ʔal-ḡawma ḥatta ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi laḡiytu* 'I met the people even Abdullah, I met him'. He came up with *laḡiytu* 'I met him' as *tawkiydan* 'a confirmation' after he had made it *ʔāyah* 'an aim', just as you say *marartu bi-zaydin wa ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi marartu bihi* 'I passed by Zaid and Abdullah, I passed by him'. The poet (I. Ch. 27. P. 39. L. 15), who is ʔibn Marwān ʔal-Naḥwiyy, said: (kāmil)¹⁵

ʔalḡā ʔal-s'ahiyfata kay yuxaffifa raḥlahu
Wa ʔal-zāda ḥattā na ʔlihi ʔalḡāhā
 'He tossed away the shield so as to lighten up his ride
 And the food, even his sandals he tossed them away'

Raise is permissible just as it was permissible with *wāw* '[w] and' and *ḥumma* 'up to, then' and that is in your saying: *laḡiytu ʔal-ḡawma ḥatta ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi laḡiytu* 'I met the people even Abdullah, I met him'. You made Abdullah the *mubtada ʔan* 'initial'

¹⁵The meter of kāmil is: *mutafāʔilun* (six times).

وكذلك ضربتُ القومَ حتى زيداُ أنا ضاربُهُ
 وتقولُ هذا ضاربُ القومِ حتى زيداُ يضربه
 إذا أردتَ معنى التثوين فهي كالواوِ إلا أنك
 تُجرُّ بها إذا كانت غايَةً والمجرورُ مفعولٌ
 كما أنك قد تُجرُّ في قولك هذا ضاربُ زيدٍ
 غداً تُجرُّ وتُكفَّ النون وهو مفعولٌ بمنزلته
 منصوباً منوناً ما قبله ولو قلت هلك القومُ
 حتى زيداُ أهلكته اختير النصبُ ليُبينى على
 الفعل كما بُني ما قبله مرفوعاً كان أو
 منصوباً كما فعل (س. ١٠) ذلك بعد ما بُني
 على الفعل وهو مجرورٌ فإن قلت إنما هو
 لنصب اللفظ فارفع بعد مررتُ بزید وانصب
 بعد إنَّ فيها زيداُ. وإن كان الأولُ لأنه في
 معنى الحديث مفعولٌ فلا ترفعُ بعد عبدِ الله
 إذا قلت عبدُ الله ضربتهُ إذا كان بعده: وزيداُ
 مررتُ به. وقد يحسنُ الجرُّ في هذا كله وهو
 عربيٌّ وذلك قولك لقيتُ القومَ حتى عبدِ الله
 لقيتهُ وإنما جاء بليتهُ توكيداً بعد أن جعله
 غايَةً كما تقول مررتُ بزیدٍ وعبدِ الله مررتُ
 به. قال الشاعر وهو ابن مروان النحوي:

ألقي الصَّحيفةَ كي يُخفِّفَ رحلُهُ
 والزَّادَ حتى نعلُهُ ألقاهَا

والرفع جائزٌ كما جاز في الواوِ وثمَّ وذلك
 قولك لقيتُ القومَ حتى عبدُ الله لقيتهُ جعلتُ
 عبدَ الله مبتدأ

and you made *laġiytuhu* 'I met him' built on it just as it is permissible in the *ʔibtidāʔ* 'initial'. It is as though you said *laġiytu ʔal-ġawma ħatta zaydun malġiyyun* 'I met the people up to Zaid, he is met'. And *sarraħtu ʔal-ġawma ħatta zaydun musarraħun* 'I dispersed the people even Zaid, I let him go'. This cannot have anything (I. Ch. 27. P. 39. L. 20) except *raff* 'raise', because you did not mention a *fiʔ* 'action'. If it is to be at the beginning *zaydun laġiytuhu* 'Zaid, I met him' with the status of *zaydun muntʔliqun* 'Zaid is leaving', *raff* 'raise' is permissible here.

وجعلت لقيته مبنياً عليه كما جاز في
الابتداء كأنك قلت لقيت القوم حتى زيد
ملقي وسرحت القوم حتى زيد مسرّح وهذا
لا يكون فيه إلا الرفع (س. ٢٠) لأنك لم
تذكر فعلاً فإذا كان في الابتداء زيد لقيته
بمنزلة زيد منطلق جاز هاهنا الرفع.

Chapter 28. This is a chapter in which the *nasʿb* ‘erect’ is chosen and before it there is nothing *mansʿuwb* ‘erected ‘ built on the *fiʿl* ‘action’. It is the chapter on *ʔal-ʔistifhām* ‘interrogative’

(Bulaq vol. 1. P. 50, Derenbourg vol.1. p.39, Haruwn vol.1. p. 98)

(I. Ch. 28. P. 39. L. 22) That is, there are some *ħuruwf* ‘particles’ after which is not mentioned except the *fiʿl* ‘action’, nor can what follows them be other than them, whether *muḏʿharan ʔaw mudʿmaran* ‘explicit or implicit’. Of those that are not followed except by the *fiʿl* ‘action’ are *ʔad*, *sawfa*, *lammā* ‘indeed , future marker, when’ and their likes. If (I. Ch. 28. P. 40. L. 1) a poet is constrained , he may *ʔaddama* ‘pre-position’ the *ʔism* ‘name’. And he would have let the *fiʿl* ‘action’ occur with something on account of it but the *ħadd ʔal-ʔirāb* ‘definition of declension’ in not except the *nasʿb* ‘erect’, and that is like *lam zaydan ʔadʿribhu* ‘Zaid I did not hit him’. If a poet needs to, *ʔaddama* ‘he pre-positioned’. It can not be except *nasʿb* ‘erect’ in Zaid and no other if it is in poetry, because he makes the *fiʿl* ‘action’ implicit if it is not one of those that may be followed by *ʔism* ‘a name’ as they did that in locations, you shall see them, God willing. As to that in which the *fiʿl* ‘action’ is permitted both *muḏʿharan* ‘explicitly’ and *mudʿmaran* ‘implicitly’, both *muʔaddman* ‘pre-positioned’ and *muʔaxxaran* ‘post-positioned’, and it is not (I. Ch. 28. P. 40. L. 5) permitted to begin after them with *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’, they are *ħallā* ‘why not’, *lawlā* ‘if not for’ *lawmā* ‘where it not’ and *ʔallā* ‘lest’. If you were to say *ħallā zaydan dʿarabta*, *wa lawlā zaydan dʿarabta*, *wa ʔallā zaydan ʔatalta* ‘why Zaid, did you not hit, if not for Zaid you hit, lest Zaid you did not kill’. Were you to say *ʔallā zaydan wa ħallā zaydan* ‘lest Zaid, why not Zaid’ with the *fiʿl* ‘action’ implicit without your mentioning it, it is permitted. That is permitted because within it there is the meaning of *taħdʿiydʿ wa ʔal-ʔamr* ‘prodding and command’. It is allowed in it what is allowed in that. If you were to say *sawfa zaydan ʔadʿribu* ‘will, Zaid I hit’ is not good. Or *ʔad zaydan laʔiytu* ‘may be, Zaid I met’. It is not good, because they were posited for *ʔafsal* ‘actions’. However, *taħziyr* and *ħadʿmar* ‘post-positioning and implication’ were permitted in those other particles for the reasons I mentioned to you about *taħdʿiydʿ wa ʔal-ʔamr* ‘prodding and command’. Particles of (I. Ch. 28. P. 40. L. 10) *ʔistifhām* ‘interrogation’ likewise they were built for the *fiʿl* ‘action’, except that they have expanded them.

(٢٨) هذا باب ما يُختار فيه النصب وليس قبله منصوبٌ بُني على الفعل وهو باب الاستفهام

وذلك أنّ من الحروف حُرُوفاً لا يُذكر بعدها إلا الفعل ولا يكون الذي يليها غيره مُظهِراً أو مُضْمِراً. فمِمَّا لا يليه الفعل إلا مُظهِراً قَدْ وَسَوْفَ وَلَمَّا ونحوهنَّ فإن (ص. ٤٠) اضطرَّ شاعرٌ فَقَدِمَ الاسمَ وقد أوقع الفعلَ على شيء من سببه لم يكن حدُّ الإعراب إلا النَّصْبَ وذلك نحو لَمْ زيدا أضربه إذا اضطرَّ شاعرٌ فَقَدِمَ لم يكن إلا النصبُ في زيد ليس غيرُ لو كان في شعرٍ لأنه يُضْمِرُ الفعلَ إذا كان ليس ممَّا يليه الاسمُ كما فعلوا ذلك في مواضع ستراها إن شاء الله. وأمَّا ما يجوز فيه الفعلُ مُظهِراً ومُضْمِراً مقدِّماً ومُؤخَّراً ولا (س. ٥) يجوز أن يُبتدأ بعده الأسماءُ فهَلْا ولَوْلَا ولَوْمًا وألَا لو قلت هَلْا زيدا ضربتَ ولَوْلَا زيدا ضربتَ وألَا زيدا قتلتَ ولو قلتَ ألَا زيدا وهَلْا زيدا على إضمار الفعل ولا تذكره جاز. وإنما جاز ذلك لأنَّ فيه معنى التحضيض والأمر فجاز فيه ما جاز في ذلك ولو قلتَ سَوْفَ زيدا أضربُ لم يَحْسُنْ أو قد زيدا لقيتُ لم يَحْسُنْ لأنها إنما وُضِعَتْ للأفعال إلا أنه جاز في تلك الأحرف التأخيرُ والإضمارُ لما ذكرت لك من التحضيض والأمر وحروف (س. ١٠) الاستفهام كذلك بُنيت للفعل إلا أنهم قد توسَّعوا فيها.

So they begin with *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ after them, but the origin is not like that. Don’t you see that they say *hal zaydun muntʔaliʕun* ‘Is Zaid departing?’ and *hal zaydun fiy ʔaldāri* ‘Is Zaid in the house?’ and *kayfa zaydun ʔāxiðun* ‘How is Zaid taking?’ If you were to say *kayfa zaydan raʔayta wa hal zaydun yaðhabu* ‘How did you see Zaid and is Zaid going?’ It is *ʕabiyħ* ‘ugly/unacceptable’ and it is not permitted except in poetry, because when the *fi ʔ* comes with *ʔal-ʔism* together they process it according to the origin. If a poet needs to, *ʕaddama* ‘he pre-positioned’ the *ʔism* ‘name’ and *nasʔaba* ‘he erected’ as you were doing that with *ʕad* ‘indeed’ and its likes. It is better with these, because one begins with *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ after them. They, however, did this with the *ʔistifhām* ‘interrogation’ (I. Ch. 28. P. 40. L. 15) because it is like the *ʔamr* ‘imperative’ that it is not necessary and what one wants by it from the *muxāʔab* ‘addressee’ is a matter that is not settled with the questioner. Don’t you see that his answer is *gazmun* ‘with apocope’ that is why the *nasʔab* ‘erect’ was chosen. They hated *taʕdiyma* ‘pre-positioning’ the *ʔism* ‘name’ because they are particles that resemble what is after them after the particles of *gazāʔ* ‘result/apodosis’ and its *gawābuhā* ‘its answer/result’ is like their *gawāb* ‘answer/result’. They may become the meaning of the discussion with them, and they are not obligatory like the *gazāʔ* ‘result/apodosis’. For this reason *ʕabuħa* ‘it is ugly/unacceptable’ *taʕdiymu* ‘pre-positioning’ the *ʔism* ‘name’ except when you were to say *ʔayna ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔātihi* ‘Where is Abdullah, I will go to him?’ It is as though you said *ħayθu mā yakun ʔātihi* ‘Wherever he is, I will go to him’. As to the *ʔalif* [A], the pre-positioning of the *ʔism* ‘name’ with it before the *fi ʔ* ‘action’ is permissible just as it is permissible for you with (I. Ch. 28. P. 40. L. 20) *hallā* ‘why’, and that is because it is a particle of *ʔistifhām* ‘interrogation’ that does not switch from it to another. And *ʔistifhām* ‘interrogation’ originally has no other than it. The *ʔalif* is left out in *man, matā, hal* ‘who, when, interrogative marker’ and their likes, where they are assured of no confusion. Don’t you see that you introduce them to *man* ‘who’ if it is complemented with its connection as the saying of God, most Powerful and Glorious is He: *ʔa-fa-man yulḡā fiy ʔal-nāri xayrun ʔamman ya ʔtiy* (I. Ch. 28. P. 41. L. 1) *ʔāminan yawma ʔal-ḡiyāmati* (Sūrah XLI: 40) ‘which is better? He that is cast into the fire, or he that comes through safe on the day of judgement?’ And you say *ʔam hal* ‘or followed by the interrogative marker *hal*’,

فابتدءوا بعدها الأسماء والأصل غير ذلك
 ألا ترى أنهم يقولون هل زيد منطلق وهل
 زيد في الدار وكيف زيد أخذ فإن قلت كيف
 زيدا رأيت وهل زيد يذهب فبح ولم يجز إلا
 في الشعر لأنه لما اجتمع الاسم والفعل
 حملوه على الأصل فإن اضطر شاعر فقدم
 الاسم نصب كما كنت فاعلا ذلك بقد
 ونحوها. وهو في هذه أحسن لأنه يبتدأ بعدها
 الأسماء وإنما فعلوا هذا بالاستفهام (س.
 ١٥) لأنه كالأمر في أنه غير واجب وأنه
 يريد به من المخاطب أمراً لم يستقر عند
 السائل ألا ترى أن جوابه جزم فهذا اختيار
 النصب وكرهوا تقديم الاسم لأنها حروف
 ضارعت بما بعدها ما بعد حروف الجزاء
 وجوابها كجوابه وقد يصير معنى حديثها
 إليه وهي غير واجبة كالجزاء ففبح تقديم
 الاسم لهذا إلا أنك إذا قلت أين عبد الله آت
 فكانت قلت حيث ما يكن آت. فأما الألف
 فتقديم الاسم فيها قبل الفعل جائز كما جاز
 ذلك في (س. ٢٠) هلا وذلك لأنها حرف
 الاستفهام الذي لا يزول عنه إلى غيره وليس
 للاستفهام في الأصل غيره وإنما ترك الألف
 في من ومتى وهل ونحوهن حيث أمئوا
 الالتباس ألا ترى أنك تدخلها على من إذا
 تمت بصلتها كقول الله عز وجل أفمن يلقى
 في النار خيراً ممن يأتي (ص. ٤١) أمئاً يوم
 القيامة وتقول أم هل

but they have the status of *ḡad* ‘indeed’ but they left out the *ḡalif* [A] by doing without it, since this speech does not happen except in *ḡistifhām* ‘interrogative’, and you shall see it, God willing, also shown clearly. They have here the status of *ḡin* ‘if’ in the chapter of topic of result/apodosis, hence it became permitted *taḡdiym* ‘pre-positioning’ of the *ḡism* ‘name’ in them just as it was permitted in your saying: *ḡin ḡal-lāhu ḡamkananiy faḡaltu kaḡā wa kaḡā* ‘if God were to give me the ability, I will do such and such’. The *nas^b* ‘erect’ is chosen because you imply the *fiḡl* ‘action’ in it, because the *fiḡl* ‘action’ has priority, if it comes together with the *ḡism* ‘name’ (**I. Ch. 28. P. 41. L. 5**). Similarly, you would do with *ḡin* ‘if’ because it is for the *fiḡl* ‘action’ and you shall see the clarification of that, God willing. The *ḡalif* [A], if there is with it a *fiḡl* ‘action’ with the status of *lawlā wa hallā* ‘if not for and why not’, except that if you so wish, *rafaḡta* ‘you raised’ by their means, and *rafaḡ* ‘raise’ with the *ḡalif* [A] is more likely than with *matā* ‘when’ and its likes, because it has become in it and even though you begin after it with *ḡasmā?* ‘names’, you pre-position the *ḡism* ‘name’ before the *fiḡl* ‘action’. The *rafaḡ* ‘raise’ in it is permissible, but that is not permitted in *hallā wa lawlā* ‘why not and if not for’, because one does not begin after them with *ḡasmā?* ‘names’. The *rafaḡ* ‘raise’ is not permitted in *ḡalif* [A] like the permissibility of *rafaḡ* ‘raise’ in *d^farabtu zaydan wa samran kallamtuhu* ‘I hit Zaid and Amr I spoke to’, because (**I. Ch. 28. P. 41. L. 10**) here there is no particle that has priority with *fiḡl* ‘action’. Rather, this was chosen as an option to be one meaning. This is stronger and the one that is like it of the letters of *ḡistifhām* ‘interrogation’ is the *ḡalif* [A].

Know that the letters of *ḡistifhām* ‘interrogation’, for all of them, it is ugly/unacceptable that *ḡism* ‘a name’ were to occur after them, if the *fiḡl* ‘action’ is after the *ḡism* ‘name’. If you were to say *hal zaydun ḡāma wa ḡayna zaydun d^farabtaḡu* ‘Did Zaid get up and where is Zaid you hit him?’ It is not permitted except in *ḡiḡr* ‘poetry’. If it were to occur in poetry you erected it except the *ḡalif* [A]. The *rafaḡ* ‘raise’ in it is permitted and the *nas^b* ‘erect’, because with the *ḡalif* [A], one begins with *ḡism* ‘a name’ after it. If you were to come up with a name with all the particles of interrogation (**I. Ch. 28. P. 41. L. 15**) and after that a name derived from an action like *d^fārib* ‘hitter’, it is permitted in speech but *nas^b* ‘erect’ is not permitted in it except in poetry.

فإنما هي بمنزلة قد ولكنهم تركوا الألف استغناءً إذ كان هذا الكلام لا يقع إلا في الاستفهام. وستراه إن شاء الله مبيناً أيضاً فهي هاهنا بمنزلة إن في باب الجزاء فجاز تقديم الاسم فيها كما جاز في قولك إن الله أمكنني فعلت كذا وكذا. ويختار فيها النصب لأنك تُضمِرُ الفعلَ فيها لأنَّ الفعلَ أولى إذا اجتمع هو والاسم (س. ٥) وكذلك كنت فاعلاً في إن لأنها إنما هي للفعل وسترى بيان ذلك إن شاء الله. فالألف إذا كان معها فعلٌ بمنزلة لولا وهلا إلا أنك إن شئت رفعتَ فيها والرفعُ مع الألفِ أمثلُ منه في متى ونحوها لأنه قد صار فيها مع أنك تبتدئُ بعدها الأسماءَ أنك تُقدِّمُ الاسمَ قبل الفعل والرفعُ فيها على الجواز. ولا يجوز ذلك في هلا ولولا لأنه لا يُبتدأُ بعدها الأسماءُ. وليس جوازُ الرفعِ في الألفِ مثلَ جوازِ الرفعِ في ضربتُ زيدا وعمراً كلمته لأنه (س. ١٠) ليس هاهنا حرف هو بالفعل أولى وإنما اختير هذا على الجواز وليكون معنىً واحداً فهذا أقوى والذي يُشبهه من حروف الاستفهام الألفُ.

واعلم أن حروف الاستفهام كلها يقبح أن يصيرَ بعدها الاسمُ إذا كان الفعلُ بعد الاسم لو قلت هل زيدٌ قام وأين زيدٌ ضربته لم يجز إلا في الشعر فإذا جاء في الشعر نصبته إلا الألف فإنه يجوز فيها الرفع والنصب لأن الألف قد يُبتدأُ بعدها الاسمُ فإن جئت في سائر حروف الاستفهام باسم (س. ١٥) وبعد ذلك الاسم اسمٌ من فعلٍ نحو ضارب جاز في الكلام ولا يجوز فيه النصب إلا في الشعر.

If you were to say *hal zaydun ʔanā dʿāribuhu* ‘Is Zaid I am his hitter?’, it would be good in speech, because *dʿārib* ‘hitter’ is a name for it is with the meaning of *fi ʔ* ‘action’. In poetry, *nasʿb* ‘erect’ is permissible.

لو قلت هل زيدٌ أنا ضاربُهُ لكان جيِّداً في
الكلام لأن ضارباً اسمٌ وإن كان في معنى
الفعل. ويجوز النصب في الشعر.

Chapter 29. This is a chapter of what *yantas'ibu* 'is erected' with the *ʔalif* [A]

(Bulaq vol. 1. P. 52, Derenbourg vol.1. p.41, Haruwn vol.1. p. 101)

(I. Ch. 29. P. 41. L.18) You say *ʔa-ʔabda ʔal-lāhi d'arabtahu* 'Is it a fact that you hit Abdullah', *ʔa-zyadin mararta bihi* 'Is it a fact that you passed by Zaid?', *ʔa-ʔamran ʔatalta ʔaxāhu* 'Is it a fact that you killed Amr's brother?', and *ʔa-ʔamran ʔiʔtaraytu lahu ʔawban* 'Is it a fact that it was for Amr for whom you bought a garment?' In all these *ʔad'marta* 'you have implied' between the *ʔalif* [A] and the *ʔism* 'name' a *fi ʔlan* 'an action'. This is its explanation just as you did in what *nas'abtahu* 'you erected' by these *ʔaʔruf* 'particles' in other than *ʔistifhām* 'interrogation'. Gariyr said: (wāfir)¹⁶

ʔa ʔa ʔlabata ʔal-fawārisa ʔaw riyāhan
ʔadalta bihim t'uhayyata wa ʔal-xiʔābā
'Was it the knights of ʔaʔlaba or Riyāh
That you favored over them t'uyahhah and ʔal-Xiʔābā'

(I. Ch. 29. P. 42. L.1) If you were to engage the *fi ʔlan* 'action' with it or on something that is on account of it, *nas'abtahu* 'you erect it'. Its explanation here is the explanation that was explained at the *ʔibtidāʔ* 'initial', that you imply a *fi ʔlan* 'action'. This is its explanation except it is the *nas'ab* 'erect' that is chosen here. And that is the definition of *kalām* 'speech'. As to the *ʔintis'āb* 'erection' there and here, they are of the same *wagh* 'surface form'. An example of that is *ʔa-ʔabda ʔal-lāhi kunta mi ʔlahu* 'was it a fact that it was Abdullah you were similar to?', because *kunta* is a *fi ʔlan* 'action' and *mi ʔl* 'similar' is annexed to it and it is *mans'uwb* 'erected'. And like it is *ʔa-zaydan lasta mi ʔlahu* 'Is it a fact that you are not similar to Zaid?', because (I. Ch. 29. P. 42. L.5) it is *fi ʔlan* 'an action'. It became with the status of your saying *ʔa-zaydan la ʔiyta ʔaxāhu* 'Is it a fact that it was Zaid, whose brother you met?' This is the saying of ʔal-Khalīl. An example of that is *mā ʔadriy, ʔa-zaydan marartu bihi ʔam ʔamran* 'I don't know, whether I passed by Zaid or Amr?'. And *mā ʔubāliy, ʔa-ʔabda ʔal-lāhi la ʔiytu ʔaxāhu ʔam ʔamran* 'I don't care whether I met the brother of Abdullah or Amr', because it is the particle of *ʔistifhām* 'interrogation' and it is that *ʔalif* [A] that is in your saying

(٢٩) هذا باب ما يَنْتَصِبُ فِي الْأَلْفِ

تقول: أَعْبَدَ اللهُ ضَرْبَتَهُ وَأَزِيداً مَرَّرْتُ بِهِ وَأَعْمراً قَتَلْتَ أَخَاهُ وَأَعْمراً اشْتَرَيْتَ لَهُ ثَوْباً. ففِي كُلِّ هَذَا قَدْ أَضْمَرْتَ بَيْنَ الْأَلْفِ وَالْإِسْمِ فِعْلاً هَذَا تَفْسِيرُهُ كَمَا فَعَلْتَ ذَلِكَ فِيمَا نَصَبْتَهُ فِي هَذِهِ الْأَحْرَفِ فِي غَيْرِ الْإِسْتِفْهَامِ. قَالَ جَرِيرٌ: (وَأَفِرُّ)

أَتَعَلَّبَةُ الْفَوَارِسِ أَمْ رِيحاً
عَدَلْتَ بِهِمْ طَهِيَّةً وَالْخِشَابَا

(ص. ٤٢) فإذا أوقعتَ عليه الفعلَ أو على شيء من سببه نصبته وتفسيره هاهنا هو التفسيرُ الذي فُسِّرَ في الابتداء أنك تضميرُ فعلاً هذا تفسيره إلا أنَّ النصب هو الذي يُختار هاهنا وهو حدُّ الكلام. فأما الانتصابُ ثمَّ وهاهنا فمن وجهٍ واحدٍ. ومثل ذلك أَعْبَدَ اللهُ كُنْتَ مِثْلَهُ لَأَنَّ كُنْتَ فَعْلٌ وَالْمِثْلُ مضافٌ إليه وهو منصوبٌ ومثله أزيداً لست مثله لأَنَّهُ (س. ٥) فَعْلٌ فَصَارَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِكَ أَزِيداً لَقِيتَ أَخَاهُ وَهُوَ قَوْلُ الْخَلِيلِ. ومثل ذلك ما أدري أزيداً مررتُ به أم عمراً وما أبالي أَعْبَدَ اللهُ لَقِيتُ أَخَاهُ أَمْ عَمراً لَأَنَّهُ حَرَفٌ الْإِسْتِفْهَامِ وَهِيَ تِلْكَ الْأَلْفُ الَّتِي فِي قَوْلِكَ

¹⁶The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun fa ʔuwlun* (twice).

ʔa-zaydan laʔiytahu ʔam samran ‘Is it a fact that it was Zaid whom you met or Amr?’ And you say *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lahi dʔaraba ʔaxuwahu zaydan* ‘Was it a fact that Abdullah hit his brother Zaid?’ It can not be except *raff* ‘raise’, because the one on whose account Abdullah is *marfuw* ‘raised’ is *fāʔilun* ‘actor’, and the one on account of which it is not is *maʔfuwl* ‘an acted upon’. It rises when the one caused by it rises, just as *yantasʔibu* ‘it erects’ if it erects. And the *mudʔmar* ‘implicit’ is what raises just as you implied in the first (I. Ch. 29. P. 42. L.10) what erects. This *maʔʔhar* ‘explicitness’ was made a proof of what is like it. If you were to make Zaid the *fāʔil* ‘actor’, you would say: *ʔa-sabda ʔal-lāhi dʔaraba ʔaxāhu zaydun* ‘Is it a fact that it was Zaid who hit the brother of Abdullah?’ and you say *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi dʔaraba ʔaxuwahu yulāmahu* ‘Was it a fact that it was Abdulla whose brother hit his son?’ if you were to consider the *yulām* in place of Zaid, where you said *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi dʔaraba ʔaxuwahu zaydan* ‘Is it a fact that it was Abdull whose brother hit Zaid?’ This becomes an explanation for something that raised Abdullah, because it is making happen the *fiʔl* ‘action’ which is on account of it just as it makes it happen where it is not on account of it. It is as though he said by way of exemplification even though it is not so spoken *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔahāna yulāmahu ʔaw ʔāʔaba yulāmahu* ‘Was it Abdullah who insulted his son or punished his son’, or came to be in this state with (I. Ch. 29. P. 42. L.15) the questioner even if it did not happen, then he explained. If you were to place the *yulām* ‘son’ in the location of Zaid when *rafaʔta zaydan* ‘you raised Zaid’, then *nasʔabta* ‘you erected’ and you said *ʔa-zaydan dʔaraba ʔaxāhu yulāmuhu* ‘Was it Zaid whose son hit his brother?’ It is as though he made an explanation for the *fiʔl* ‘action’ *yulāmuhu* ‘his son’, *ʔawʔaʔahu* ‘he made it happen to him’, because a *fiʔl* ‘action’ may occur with it because it is on account of it, just as he makes it occur with what accounts for it. And that is in your saying *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi dʔaraba ʔabāhu wa ʔa-sabda ʔal-lahi dʔarabahu ʔabuwhu* ‘Was it Abdullah who hit his father, and was it Abdullah whose father hit him’. It followed the course of *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi dʔaraba zaydan wa ʔa-sabda ʔal-lāhi dʔarabahu zaydun* ‘Was it Abdullah who hit Zaid, and Was it Abdulla whom Zaid hit?’ It is as though by exemplification is an explanation to his saying: *ʔa-sabda ʔal-lāhi ʔahāna ʔabāhu yulāmuhu wa ʔa-sabda ʔal-lāhi dʔaraba* (I. Ch. 29. P. 42. L.20) *ʔaxāhu yulāmuhu* ‘Was it Abdullah whose son insulted his father; and was it Abdullah whose son hit his brother?’

أزیداً لقیئیه أم عمراً وتقول أعبدُ الله ضربَ أخوه زیداً لا يكون إلا الرفعُ لأنّ الذي من سبب عبدِ الله مرفوعٌ فاعلٌ والذي ليس من سببه مفعولٌ فيرتفع إذا ارتفع الذي من سببه كما ينتصب إذا انتصب ويكون المضمراً ما يرفعُ كما أضمرت في الأوّل (س. ١٠) ما ينصبُ فإنما جعلَ هذا المظهرَ بياناً ما هو مثله. فإن جعلتَ زیداً الفاعلَ قلتَ أعبدُ الله ضربَ أخاه زیداً وتقول أعبدُ الله ضربَ أخوه غلامه إذا جعلتَ الغلامَ في موضع زيد حين قلتَ أعبدُ الله ضربَ أخوه زیداً فيصيرُ هذا تفسيراً لشيءٍ رفعَ عبدُ الله لأنه يكون موقِعاً الفعلَ بما يكون من سببه كما يوقِعُه بما ليس من سببه كأنه قال في التمثيل وإن كان لا يُتكلّمُ به أعبدُ الله أهانَ غلامه أو عاقبَ غلامه أو صار في هذه الحال عند (س. ١٥) السائل وإن لم يكن ثم فسّر. وإن جعلتَ الغلامَ في موضع زيد حين رفعتَ زیداً نصبتَ فقلتَ أزیداً ضربَ أخاه غلامه كأنه جعله تفسيراً لفعلِ غلامه أوقِعَهُ عليه لأنه قد يوقِعُ الفعلَ عليه ما هو من سببه كما يوقِعُه هو على ما هو من سببه وذلك قولك أعبدُ الله ضربَ أباه وأعبدُ الله ضربَ أبوه فجرى مجرى أعبدُ الله ضربَ زیداً وأعبدُ الله ضربَ زیداً كأنه في التمثيل تفسيرٌ لقوله أعبدُ الله أهانَ أباه غلامه وأعبدُ الله ضربَ (س. ٢٠) أخاه غلامه.

It does not matter to you whether *Gaddamta* ‘you pre-positioned’ *ʔal-ʔax* ‘the brother’ or *ʔaxxarta* ‘you post-positioned’ it. Either one of the two you make it, like Zaid, *maʔsuwl* ‘an acted-upon’, then the first is raised. If you make it like Zaid, *fāʔilan* ‘an actor’, then the first *nasʔbun* ‘is erect’. You say *ʔāl-sawtʔa dʔuriba bihi zaydun* ‘Was it the whip that Zaid was struck with?’ and it is like your saying *ʔāl-sawtʔa dʔuribta bihi* ‘Was it the whip that you were hit with’. Similarly, *ʔāl-xiwana ʔukila ʔal-laʔmu ʔalayhi* ‘Was it the table that the food was eaten off?’ Similarly, *ʔa-zyadun summiyta bihi* ‘Was it Zaid you were named with?’ or *summiya bihi ʔamrun* ‘Amr was named with it’, because this is in the location of *nasʔb* ‘erect’, but you consider it as though you said *ʔālsawtʔa dʔuribta* ‘Was it with a whip you were struck?’ This is *kalām* ‘meaningful seech’ or *ʔal-xiwāna ʔukilta* ‘Were you off the table fed?’ It cannot be except *nasʔban* ‘erect’. Likewise, if you were to say *ʔa-zaydan mararta* ‘Was it by Zaid you passed by?’ It is *kalāmun* ‘speech’. It cannot be except *nasʔb* ‘erect’. Hence, **(I. Ch. 29. P. 43. L.1)** this *ʔiʔ* ‘action’, whose explanation does not appear, became the explanation of what *yansʔib* ‘erects’. So learn a lesson from what was difficult for you of this with that.

If you were to say: *ʔa-zydun ʔuhiba bihi* ‘Was it Zaid who was taken away?’ Or *ʔa-zaydun ʔuntʔuliGa bihi* ‘Was it Zaid who was made to leave?’ it can not be but *raʔʔan* ‘a raise’, because if you were not to speak with it, then it is *kalāman* ‘speech’ that can not be except *raʔʔan* ‘raise’ as you said *ʔa-zaydun ʔahaba ʔaxuwhu* ‘Was is Zaid whose brother went?’, because if you were to say *ʔa-zaydun ʔahaba* ‘Was it Zaid who went?’, it cannot be except *raʔʔan* ‘raise’. And you say: *ʔazaydan dʔarabta ʔaxāhu* ‘Was it Zaid whose brother you hit?’, because if you were to drop the *ʔax* ‘brother’ you would say: *ʔazaydan dʔarabta* ‘Was it Zaid that you hit?’ **(I. Ch. 29. P. 43. L.5)** Consider this with this other one then make each one that you came up with an explanation to what is like it. *ʔal-yawm wa ʔal-ʔʔuruwfu* ‘the day and the envelopes of time/place’ have the status of Zaid and Abdullah if they are not *ʔʔuruwfan* ‘envelopes of time/place’. And that is in your saying: *ʔa-yawma ʔal-gum ʔati yantʔaliGa fih* *ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘Is it the day of Friday on which Abdullah departs?’ This is like your saying: *ʔa-ʔamran takallama fih* *ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘Was it Amr whom Abdullah spoke of’ and *ʔa-yawmu ʔal-gum ʔati yuntʔalaGa fih* ‘Was it the day of Friday on which one leaves? This is like your saying

ولا عليك أقدمت الأخ أم أخرته أيهما ما جعلته كزيد مفعولاً فالأول رفع وإن جعلته كزيد فاعلاً فالأول نصب. وتقول السوط ضرب به زيد وهو كقولك السوط ضربت به وكذلك الخوان أكل اللحم عليه وكذلك أزيدياً سميت به أو سمي به عمرو لأن هذا في موضع نصب وإنما تعتبره بأنك لو قلت السوط ضربت فكان هذا كلاماً أو الخوان أكلت لم يكن إلا نصباً كما أنك لو قلت أزيدياً مررت فكان كلاماً لم يكن إلا نصباً فمن (س. ٤٣) ثم صار هذا الفعل الذي لا يظهر تفسيره تفسير ما ينصب فاعتبر ما أشكل عليك من هذا بدأ.

فإن قلت أزيدياً ذهب به أو أزيدياً أنطلق به لم يكن إلا رفعاً لأنك لو لم تقل به فكان كلاماً لم يكن إلا رفعاً كما قلت أزيدياً ذهب أخوه لأنك لو قلت أزيدياً ذهب لم يكن إلا رفعاً وتقول أزيدياً ضربت أخاه لأنك لو ألقيت الأخ قلت أزيدياً ضربت (س. ٥) فاعتبر هذا بهذا ثم اجعل كل واحد جئت به تفسير ما هو مثله. واليوم والظروف بمنزلة زيد وعبد الله إذا لم يكن ظرفاً وذلك قولك أيوم الجمعة ينطلق فيه عبد الله كقولك أعماراً تكلم فيه عبد الله وأيوم الجمعة ينطلق فيه كقولك

ʔa-zaydun yuḏhabu bihi ‘Is it Zaid who is taken away?’ And you say *ʔa-ʔanta sabdu ʔal-lāhi dʿarabtahu* ‘Are you the one who hit Abdullah?’ you make it here follow the course of: *ʔanā zaydun dʿarabtuḥu* ‘I hit Zaid’, because the one that follows *ḥarf ʔal-ʔistifhām* ‘the particle of interrogation’ is *ʔanta* ‘you’ then you began this and there is no particle of interrogation before it. There is nothing that is prior to pre-positioning of the *fiʔl* ‘action’ except **(I. Ch. 29. P. 43. L.10)** if you so wish, *nasʿabtahu* ‘you erected it’ as you erected *zaydan dʿarabtuḥu* ‘Zaid, I hit him’ which is good Arabic. The concern here is with your saying *zaydun dʿarabtuḥu* ‘Zaid, I hit him’. If you were to say *ʔa-kulla yawmin zaydan tadʿribuḥu?* ‘Is it that every day, you hit Zaid?’ It is *nasʿabun* ‘erect’ like your saying: *ʔa-zaydan tadʿribuḥu kulla yawmin* ‘Is it Zaid whom you hit every day?’, because the *ḏʿarf* ‘envelope of time’ does not separate in your saying: *mā ʔal-yawma zaydun ḏāhiban* ‘It is not today that Zaid is going’, and *ʔinna ʔal-yawma samran muntʿaliḡun* ‘Indeed, today Amr is leaving’. It is not permitted here, as it is not permitted there. You say: *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔaxuwḥu tadʿribuḥu* ‘Is it Abdullah whose brother you hit?’ as you did in your saying: *ʔa-ʔanta zaydun dʿarabtahu* ‘Were you the one who hit Zaid?’, because the *ʔism* ‘name’ here has the status of the *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’. There is nothing before it. If you were to erect it on the pattern of your saying: *zaydan* **(I. Ch. 29. P. 43. L.15)** *dʿarabtahu* ‘Zaid, you hit him’, you would say: *ʔa-zaydan ʔaxāḥu tadʿribuḥu* ‘Is Zaid whose brother you hit?’ You erected the one that this is on account of it due to the *fiʔl* ‘action’. This is its explanation. Whoever said *zaydan dʿarabtuḥu* ‘Zaid, I hit him’, also said: *ʔa-zaydan ʔaxāḥu tadʿribuḥu* ‘Is it Zaid whose brother you hit?’ You erected *zaydan*, because the *ʔalif ʔal-ʔistifhām* ‘[A] of interrogation’ occurred with it, and the one on account of it is *mansʿuwb* ‘erected’. *Raff* ‘raising’ is permitted in: *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi mararta bihi* ‘Was it Abdullah that you passed by?’ according to what I mentioned to you. And *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi dʿarabta ʔaxāḥu* ‘Was it Abdullah whose brother you hit?’ As to your saying: *ʔa-zaydan marararta bihi* ‘Was it Zaid that you passed by?’ has the status of your saying: *ʔa-zaydan dʿarabtahu* ‘Was it Zaid whom you hit’. *Raff* ‘raising’ in this is stronger than in: *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi dʿarabtahu* ‘Was it Abdullah that you hit?’ It is also permissible, if this is permissible, **(I. Ch. 29. P. 44. L.1)** as it was that in what was before it in the *ʔibtidāʔ* ‘initial’

أزیدٌ يُدْهَبُ به. وتقول أنت عبدُ الله ضربته تُجْرِيه هاهنا مُجْرَى أنا زیدٌ ضربته لأنّ الذي يلي حرف الاستفهام أنتَ ثم ابتدأتَ هذا وليس قبله حرفُ استفهامٍ ولا شيءٌ هو بالفعل وتقدّمه أولى إلا (س. ١٠) أنك إن شئت نصبتَه كما نصبتَ زیداً ضربته فهو عربيٌّ جيّدٌ وأمره هاهنا على قولك زیدٌ ضربته فإن قلت أكلّ يوم زیداً تُضْرِبُه فهو نصبٌ كقولك أزیداً تُضْرِبُه كلّ يوم لأنّ الظرف لا يفصل في قولك ما اليوم زیدٌ ذاهباً وإنّ اليوم عمراً منطلقٌ فلا يحجز هاهنا كما لم يحجز ثمةً وتقول أعبدُ الله أخوه تُضْرِبُه كما فعلت ذلك في قولك أنتَ زیدٌ ضربته لأنّ الاسم هاهنا بمنزلة مبتدأ ليس قبله شيءٌ وإن نصبتَه على قولك زیداً (س. ١٥) ضربته قلت أزیداً أخاه تضربه لأنك نصبت الذي من سببه بفعل هذا تفسيره ومن قال زیداً ضربته قال أزیداً أخاه تضربه وإنما نصبتَ زیداً لأن ألف الاستفهام وقعت عليه والذي من سببه منصوبٌ. وقد يجوز الرفع في أعبدُ الله مررتَ به على ما ذكرت لك وأعبدُ الله ضربتَ أخاه. وأما قولك أزیداً مررتَ به فبمنزلة قولك أزیداً ضربته والرفع في هذا أقوى منه في أعبدُ الله ضربته وهو أيضاً قد يجوز إذا جاز هذا (ص. ٤٤) كما كان ذلك فيما قبله من الابتداء

and what occurred after that was built on the *fi* Ω 'action', and that he began with *ṣabda ṭal-lāhi* and placed the *fi* Ω 'action' in the location of what *mabniy ṣalayhi* 'built on'. It is as though he said: *ṭa-ṣabdu ṭal-lāhi ṭaxuwka* 'Is Abdullah your brother?' Whoever claims that if he said: *ṭa-zaydan mararta bihi* 'Was it Zaid that you passed by?', he erects it with this *fi* Ω 'action'. He is obliged *yagurrahu* 'to pull it', because it does not reach it except by particle of annexation. If the Arabs did something *mudʿharan* 'implied', it does not abandon its action *muḏʿharan* 'explicitly' in the *garr* 'pull', the *nasʿb* 'erect' and (I. Ch. 29. P. 44. L.5) the *raff* 'raise'. You say: *wa baladin* 'and a town' (in the *garr*), you mean *wa rubba baladin* 'how many a town'. You say: *zaydan* 'Zaid (in the *nasʿb* 'erect') you mean *ṣalayka zaydan* 'Get Zaid', and you say: *ṭal-hilalu* 'the crescent (in the *raff* 'raise'), you mean *hāḏā ṭal-hilālu* 'this crescent'. Each one does its own work *muḏʿharan* 'explicitly'. What *yaḡbuḡu* is 'ugly/ unacceptable' in following it is beginning with *ṭasmāʿ* 'names' and there is an *ṭism* 'name' after it, if you were to make occur the *fi* Ω 'action' with something on account of it, and it is a *nasʿb* 'erect' in the pattern: *ṭḏā* 'if' and *ḡayḡu* 'wherever'. You say *ṭḏā ṣabda ṭal-lāhi talḡāhu fa-ṭakrimhu* 'If you were to meet Abdullah, honor him'. And *ḡayḡu zaydan tagidhu faṭakrimhu* 'wherever you find Zaid, honor him', because they would be with the meaning of the *ḡuruwf ṭal-muḡāzāt* 'letters of payment/conditionals'. It is bad to begin with *ṭasmāʿ* 'names' after them, if there is a *fi* Ω 'action' after it. If you were to say: *ṭḡlis ḡayḡu zaydun ḡalasa* 'sit where Zaid (with raise) sat' or *ṭḡlis* (I. Ch. 29. P. 45. L. 1) *ṭḏā zaydun yḡlisu* 'sit if Zaid (with raise) is sitting', it is worse than your saying *ṭḏā ḡalasa zaydun* 'if Zaid sat', *ṭḏā yḡlis* 'if he is sitting', *ḡayḡu yḡlis* 'where he is sitting', and *ḡayḡu ḡalasa* 'where he sat'. *Raff* 'raising' after them is permissible, because you may begin with *ṭasmāʿ* 'names' after them and say: *ṭḡlis ḡayḡu ṣabdu ṭal-lāhi ḡālisun* 'sit where Abdullah is sitting', and *ṭḡlis ṭḏā ṣabdu ṭal-lāhi ḡalasa* 'sit if Abdullah sat'. For *ṭḏā* 'if' there is another *mawḏʿif* 'location' in which the occurrence of names after it is good. You say: *naḏʿartu fa-ṭḏā zaydun yaḏʿribuhu ṣamrun* 'I looked and there was Zaid being hit by Amr', because if you were to say *naḏʿartu fa-ṭḏā zaydun yaḏʿhabu* 'I looked and there was Zaid going', it is good. As to *ṭḏ* 'while', it is good (I. Ch. 29. P. 45. L. 5) to begin with a name after it.

وما جاء بعد ما بُني على الفعل وذلك أنه ابتداء عبد الله وجعل الفعل في موضع المبني عليه فكأنه قال أعبد الله أخوك فمن زعم أنه إذا قال ازيداً مررت به إنما ينصبه بهذا الفعل فهو ينبغي له أن يجره لأنه لا يصل إلا بحرف إضافة وإذا عملت العرب شيئاً مضمراً لم يخرج عن عمله مظهراً في الجر والنصب (س. ٥) والرفع تقول وبلد تريد ورب بلد. وتقول زيداً تريد عليك زيداً. وتقول الهلال تريد هذا الهلال فكأنه يعمل عمله مظهراً. ومما يقبح بعده ابتداء الأسماء ويكون الاسم بعده إذا أوقعت الفعل على شيء من سببه نصباً في القياس إذا وحيث تقول إذا عبد الله تلقاه فأكرمه وحيث زيداً تجده فأكرمه لأنهما يكونان في معنى حروف المجازة ويقبح ابتداء الأسماء بعدهما إذا كان بعده الفعل لو قلت اجلس حيث زيداً أو اجلس (ص. ٤٥) إذا زيداً يجلس كان أقبح من قولك إذا جلس زيداً وإذا يجلس وحيث يجلس وحيث جلس والرفع بعدهما جائز لأنك قد تبتدئ الأسماء بعدهما فتقول اجلس حيث عبد الله جالس واجلس إذا عبد الله جلس وإذا موضع آخر يحسن فيه ابتداء الاسم بعدها تقول نظرت فإذا زيداً يضربه عمر وأما إذ فيحسن (س. ٥) ابتداء الاسم بعدها

So you say: *giʔtu ʔið sabdu ʔal-lāhi Gāʔimun* ‘I came while Abdullah was standing’ and *giʔtu ʔið sabdu ʔal-lāhi yaGurwmu* ‘I came while Abdullah was getting up’. However, it is no good with *faʔala* in your saying: *giʔtu ʔið sabdu ʔal-lāhi Gāma* ‘I came while Abdullah stood’. However, *ʔið* occurs in *kalām ʔal-wāgib* ‘obligatory speech’ that is why this co-occurred with it. You begin with a name after it, so *raff* ‘raise’ is good. Among those whose beginning is erected because its end is *multabisun* ‘confused’ with the first is his saying: *ʔa-zaydan dʔarabta samran wa ʔaxāhu* ‘As to Zaid, did you hit Amr and his brother?’ And *ʔa-zaydan dʔarabta ragulan yuḥibbuhu* ‘As to Zaid, did you hit a man who loves him?’ And *ʔa-zaydan dʔarabta gāriyatayni yaḥubbuhumā* ‘as to Zaid, did you hit two maids whom he loves?’ You erected the first, because the other is confused with it, since *sʔifatuhu* ‘its description’ is confused with it. **(I. Ch. 29. P. 45. L. 10)** If you want to know its confusion with it, then include it in the chapter where *tuGaddimu* ‘you pre-position’ the *sʔifah* ‘descriptive’. What makes pre-positioning its *sʔifah* ‘descriptive/adjective’ good is because it is confused with the first, and what makes it not good is that it is not confused with it. Don’t you see that you say *marartu bi-ragulin muntʔaliGatin gāriyatāni yaḥubbuhumā* ‘I passed by a man with two maids leaving whom he loves’. *Marartu bi-ragulin muntʔaliGin zaydun wa ʔaxuwḥu* ‘I passed by a man leaving whose brother and Zaid’, because when you shared between them by way of *fiʔl* ‘an action’, Zaid became confused with the *ʔax* ‘brother’ and became confused with *ragul* ‘a man’. If you were to say: *ʔa-zaydan dʔarabta samran wa dʔarabta ʔaxāhu* ‘Was it Zayd you hit Amr and you hit his brother’ is not meaningful speech, because Amr is not on account of the first nor confused with it. Don’t you see **(I. Ch. 29. P. 45. L. 15)** that if you were to say *marartu bi-ragulin Gāʔimin samrun wa Gāʔimin ʔaxuhu* ‘I passed by a man standing with Amr and his brother’ it is not permitted, because one of them is confused with the first but the other is not confused.

فتقول جئتُ إذ عبدُ الله قائمٌ وجئتُ إذ عبدُ الله يقومُ إلا أنها في فَعَلٍ قبيحةٌ نحو قولك جئتُ إذ عبدُ الله قام. ولكن إذ إنما يقع في الكلام الواجب فاجتمع فيها هذا وأنتك تبتدئ الاسم بعدها فحسن الرفع. ومما يُصَبُّ أوله لأن آخره ملتبس بالأول قوله أزيداً ضربتَ عمراً وأخاه وأزيداً ضربتَ رجلاً يُحِبُّه وأزيداً ضربتَ جاريتين يُحِبُّهما فإنما نصبت الأول لأن الآخر ملتبس به إذ كانت صفته ملتبسة به (س. ١٠) وإذا أردت أن تُعلم التباسه به فأدخله في الباب الذي تُقَدِّم فيه الصفة فما حسن تقديم صفته فهو ملتبس بالأول وما لا يحسن فليس ملتبسا به. ألا ترى أنك تقول مررت برجل منطلقاً جاريتان يُحِبُّهما ومررت برجل منطلق زيداً وأخوه لأنك لما أشركت بينهما في الفعل صار زيد ملتبسا بالأخ فالتبس برجل ولو قلت أزيداً ضربتَ عمراً وضربتَ أخاه لم يكن كلاماً لأن عمراً ليس من سبب الأول ولا ملتبسا به. ألا ترى (س. ١٥) أنك لو قلت مررت برجل قائمٍ عمرٌو وقائمٍ أخوه لم يجز لأن أحدهما ملتبس بالأول والآخر ليس ملتبسا.

Chapter 30. This is a chapter on what in *ʔistifhām* ‘interrogation’ followed the course of *fī ʔ* ‘action’ in the *ʔasmāʔ ʔal-fāʔiliyn wa ʔal-mafʔuwliyn* ‘names of actors/active participles and acted-upons/passive participles’ just as it follows the course of the *fī ʔ* ‘action’ in others than it

(Buwḷāq vol. 1. P. 55, Derenbourg vol.1. p.45, Haruwn vol.1. p. 108)

And that is in your saying *ʔa-zaydan ʔanta dʔāribu-hu* ‘Is it Zaid that you are striking (him)?’ And *ʔa-zaydan ʔanta dʔāribun lahu?* Is it Zaid whose striker is you?’ *ʔa-ʔamran ʔanta mukrimun ʔaxāhu* ‘Is it Amr whose brother you are honoring?’ *ʔa-zaydan ʔanta nāzilun ʔalayhi* ‘Is it Zaid whom you are staying with?’ It is as though you said *ʔanta dʔāribun* ‘you are a striker’, *ʔanta mukrimun* ‘you are honoring’, and *ʔanta nāzilun* ‘you are staying’. (L.20) That was with the *fī ʔ* ‘action’, because it follows its course and it operates with *ʔal-ma ʔrifah* ‘the definite’, all of it, and with *ʔal-nakirah* ‘the indefinite’, whether *muʔaddaman* ‘pre-positioned’ or *muʔaxxaran* ‘post-positioned’, *muḏʔharan* ‘explicit’ or *muḏʔmaran* ‘implicit’. Similarly, *ʔā-l-dāra ʔanta nāzilun fiyhā* ‘Is it the house that you are staying in?’ And you say *ʔa-ʔamran ʔanta wāgidan ʔalayhi* ‘Is it Amr whom you are upset with?’ *ʔa-xālidan ʔanta ʔālimun bihi* ‘Is it Xalid whom you have knowledge of?’ and *ʔa-zaydan ʔanta rāyibun fiyhi* ‘Is it Zaid whom you are looking for?’ For if you were to discard *ʔalay-hi*, ‘on him’, *bi-hi* ‘with him’ and *fiy-hi* ‘in him’, as is the case here, in order to consider what was to become, except what is erected. It is as though he said: *ʔa-ʔabda ʔal-lāhi ʔanta tarʔabu fiyhi* ‘Is it Abdulah you are looking for?’ And *ʔa-ʔabda ʔal-lāhi ʔanta taʔlam bihi* ‘is it Abdulah whom you know about.’ And *ʔa-ʔabda (I.p.46) ʔal-lāhi ʔanta tagidu ʔalayhi* ‘Is it Abdulah you have a dislike for?’ You have queried him about his knowledge of him and his search for him in the case of your situation. If he were to say *ʔā-l-dāru ʔanta nāzilun fiyhā* ‘Is it the house that you are staying in?’, he made *nāzilan* ‘one staying’ *ʔisman* ‘a name’. He raised as though he said *ʔā-l-dāru ʔanta ragulun fiyhā* ‘is it the house, you are a man staying in it?’ If he were to say *ʔa-zaydun ʔanta dʔāribuhu* ‘Is it Zaid, whom you are striking?’, he gave the status of *ʔa-zaydun ʔanta ʔaxuwu* ‘Is it Zaid, whose brother you are?’ It is permitted. Like that in *nasʔb* ‘erection’ is *ʔa-zaydan ʔanta maḥbusun ʔalayhi* ‘Is it Zaid, whom you are devoted to?’

(٣٠) هذا باب ما جرى في الاستفهام من أسماء الفاعلين والمفعولين مجرى الفعل كما يجري في غيره مجرى الفعل

وذلك قولك أزيداً أنت ضاربُهُ وأزيداً أنت ضاربٌ له وأعمراً أنت مُكْرِمٌ أخاه وأزيداً أنت نازلٌ عليه. كأنك قلت: أنت ضاربٌ وأنت مُكْرِمٌ وأنت نازلٌ كما (س. ٢٠) كان ذلك في الفعل لأنه يجري مجراه ويعمَلُ في المعرفة كلها والنكرة مقدّماً ومؤخراً ومظهراً ومضمراً. وكذلك: الدارُ أنت نازلٌ فيها. وتقول أعمراً أنت واجدٌ عليه وأخالداً أنت عالم به وأزيداً أنت راغبٌ فيه لأنك لو ألقيت عليه وبه وفيه مما ها هنا لتعتبر لم تكن لتكون إلا مما ينتصب كأنه قال أعبَدَ الله أنت ترعَبُ فيه وأعبَدَ الله أنت تعلمُ به وأعبَدَ (ص. ٤٦) الله أنت تجد عليه فإنما استفهمته عن علمه به ورغبته فيه في حال مسألتك ولو قال الدارُ أنت نازلٌ فيها فجعل نازلاً اسماً رفع كأنه قال الدارُ أنت رجلٌ فيها ولو قال أزيداً أنت ضاربُهُ فجعله بمنزلة قولك أزيداً أنت أخوه جاز ومثل ذلك في النصب أزيداً أنت محبوسٌ عليه

and *ʔa-zaydan ʔanta mukābarun lahu* ‘Is it Zaid, whom you are contemptuous about?’ If he did not want the *fiʔl* ‘action’ but he wanted the surface of the *ʔism* ‘name’, he raised. (L. 5) Similarly is all this. A *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ is like *yufʔalu*, and a *fāʔil* ‘actor’ is like *yafʔalu*, and whatever you wish to follow in the course of the *ʔasmāʔ ʔal-fāʔiliyn* ‘names of actors/active participles’ is *fawāʔil*; they made it follow in the course of *fāʔilatin* where they pluralize it according to its broken pattern, as they did with *fāʔiliyna* and *fāʔilātin*. Of that is their saying *hunna ʔawāggun bayta ʔal-lāhi* ‘They-f are pilgrims to the house of God.’ Abuw kabiyar ʔal-ḥadaliyyu said: (kāmīl)¹⁷

Mimman ʔamalna bihi wa hunna ʔawāggidun
ʔubuka ʔal-nitʔāgi fa ʔaʔa ʔayra muhabbali
 ‘Of those who bore him and they are bound
 By the wrapping band, he lived without being fettered’

and ʔal-ʔaggāg said: (ragaz)¹⁸ (L. 10)

ʔawālifan makkata min wurʔi ʔal-ʔami
 ‘The greenish doves are dwellers of Makka’

Some of them have made the pattern *fuʔʔālan* with the status of *fawāʔila* and they said *ʔutʔʔānun makkata* ‘dwellers of Mecca’ and *sukkānun ʔal-balada ʔal-ʔarāma* ‘people of the sacred town’, because it is *gamʔun* ‘plural’ like *fawāʔil* pattern. They followed the course in *ʔism ʔal-fāʔil* ‘name of actor’ if they wished to exaggerate in the matter if it were in the construction of the *fāʔil* ‘actor’, because they want from it what they want from *fāʔil* ‘actor’ in the occurrence of the *fiʔl* ‘action’, except that they want it to tell about *ʔal-mubālaʔah* ‘the exaggeration’. Of what comes according to the *ʔasʔl* ‘root’ on which depends most of this meaning are: *faʔuwlun*, *mifʔālun*, *faʔʔālun*, and *faʔilun*. *faʔiylun* occurs in *raʔiymun* ‘merciful’, (L. 15) *ʔalimun* ‘knowledgeable’, *ʔadiyrun* ‘capable’, *samiyʔun* ‘listening’, and *basʔiyrun* ‘seeing’. In them is permitted what was permitted in the *fāʔil* ‘actor’ concerning the *taʔdiym* ‘pre-positioning’, *taʔxiyr* ‘post-positioning’, *ʔdʔhār* ‘expressing’, and *ʔdʔmār* ‘implying’. If you were to say *ʔādā dʔaruwbu ruʔuwsu ʔal-rigāli wa suwʔa ʔal-ʔibli* ‘this is a hitter/cutter of the heads of men and the legs of camels’ according to *dʔaruwbun suwʔa ʔal-ʔibli* ‘hitter of the legs of the camels’. It is permitted

¹⁷The meter of kāmīl is: *mutafāʔilun* (6 times).

¹⁸The meter of ragaz is: *mustafʔilun* (6 times).

وأزیداً أنت مُكَابِرٌ عليه. وإن لم يرد به الفعل
 وأراد به وجه الاسم رَفَع. (س. ٥) وكذلك
 جميعُ هذا فمفعولٌ مثلُ يُفَعَلُ وفاعِلٌ مثلُ
 يُفَعَلُ. ومما تُجرِيه مجرى أسماء الفاعلين
 فَوَاعِلٌ أُجْرَوْه مُجْرَى فاعِلَةٍ حيث كانوا
 جمعوه وكسروه عليه كما فعلوا ذلك بفاعلين
 وفَاعِلَاتٍ. فمن ذلك قولهم هنَّ حَوَاجٌ بيتُ
 الله. وقال أبو كبير الهذلي: (كامل)

مَمَّن حَمَلَنَ به وهنَّ عَوَاقِدٌ
 حُبُّكَ النِّطَاقِ فَعَاشَ غَيْرَ مُهَبَّلٍ

وقال العجاج: (رجز) (س. ١٠)

أوالفا مَكَّةَ مِنْ وُرُقِ الحَمِي

وقد جعل بعضهم فَعَالاً بمنزلة فَوَاعِلٍ فقالوا
 فُطَانٌ مَكَّةَ وَسُكَّانُ البَلَدِ الحَرَامِ لأنه جمعُ
 كَفَوَاعِلٍ. وأجروا اسمَ الفاعلِ إذا أرادوا أن
 يبالغوا في الأمر مجراه إذا كان على بناء
 فاعلٍ لآته يريد به ما أراد بفاعلٍ من إيقاع
 الفعلِ إلا أنه يريد أن يُحَدِّثَ عن المبالغة. فما
 هو الأصلُ الذي عليه أكثرُ هذا المعنى فَعُولٌ
 ومِفْعَالٌ وفَعَالٌ وفَعِلٌ وقد جاء فَعِيلٌ كَرَحِيمٍ
 (س. ١٥) وَعَلِيمٍ وَقَدِيرٍ وَسَمِيعٍ وَبَصِيرٍ
 يجوز فيهنَّ ما جاز في فاعِلٍ من التقديم
 والتأخير والإظهار والإضمار لو قلت: هذا
 ضَرُوبٌ رُؤُوسِ الرِّجَالِ وَسُوقِ الإِبِلِ على
 وضروبٌ سوقِ الإبلِ جاز

just as you say *hāḏā d'āribu zaydin wa samran* 'this is a hitter of Zaid and Amr'. You imply *wa d'āribun samran* 'and the hitter of Amr'. And whatever is permitted of *muḡaddam* 'pre-positioned' and *muḡaxxar* 'post-positioned' according to what occurs in *fāḡil* 'actor' is the saying of ḏiy Rumma: (t'awiyl)¹⁹

haguwmun ṣalayhā nafsahu ḡayra ḡannahu
matā yurma fīy ṣaynayhi bi-ḡal-ṣabḡhi yanhad'ī
'He throws himself on them and protects them except that
When a ghost comes into his sight, he gets up and flees'

(L. 20) ḡabuw ḏuḡayb ḡal-haḏaliyy said: (t'awiyl)²⁰

ḡalā diynahu wa-htāḡa li-l-ṣawḡi ḡinnahā
ṣalā ḡal-ṣawḡi ḡixwāna ḡal-ṣazāḡi hayuwḡu
'He burned/left his religion and raged with desire (for her)
She makes (even) those in mourning rage with desire'

(I. P. 47) ḡal-Gulāxu said: (t'awiyl)²¹

ḡaxā ḡal-ḡarbi labbāsan ḡilayhā ḡilālahā
wa-laysa bi-wallāḡi ḡal-xawāliḡi ḡa ḡalā
'Brother of war wearing its gear
I am not one to take refuge in the houses knocked kneed.'

We have heard some of them say *ḡamma ḡal-ṣasala fa-ḡanta ṣarrābun* 'as for honey, I am a drinker' and he said: (t'awiyl)²²

Bakaytu ḡaxā ḡal-la ḡwāḡi yuḡmadu yawmuhu
kariymun ru ḡuwsa ḡal-dāri ḡayna d'aruwbu
'I cried for the brother of austerity, grateful for his day
Noble, doing away with the heads of the armored'

ḡabuw t'ālib bin ṣabd ḡal-mut t'ālib said: (t'awiyl)²³

d'aruwbun bi-nas'li ḡal-sayfi suwḡa simānihā
ḡḏā ṣadimuw zādan fa-ḡinnaka ṣāḡiru
'Striking with the edge of the sword the legs of its fat ones
If they lacked food, it is because you have none.'

¹⁹The meter of t'awiyl is: *fa ḡuwlun mafāḡiylun* (4 times).

²⁰The meter of t'awiyl is: *fa ḡuwlun mafāḡiylun* (4 times).

²¹The meter of t'awiyl is: *fa ḡuwlun mafāḡiylun* (4 times).

²²The meter of t'awiyl is: *fa ḡuwlun mafāḡiylun* (4 times).

²³The meter of t'awiyl is: *fa ḡuwlun mafāḡiylun* (4 times).

كما تقول هذا ضاربُ زيدٍ وعمرا تُضمير
وضاربُ عمرا ومما جاز فيه مقدّما
ومؤخّرا على ما جاء في فاعلٍ قول ذي
الرّمّة: (طويل)

هَجُومٌ عَلَيْهَا نَفْسَهُ غَيْرَ أَنَّهُ
مَتَى يُرْمَمَ فِي عَيْنَيْهِ بِالشَّبَحِ يَنْهَضُ

(س. ٢٠) وقال أبو ذؤيب الهذلي: (طويل)

قَلَى دِينَهُ وَاهْتَاكَ لِلسُّوقِ إِثْمًا
عَلَى الشُّوقِ إِخْوَانَ الْعَزَاءِ هَيَّوْجُ

(ص. ٤٧) وقال الفلاح: (طويل)

أَخَا الْحَرْبِ لَبَّاسًا إِلَيْهَا جَلَالُهَا
وَلَيْسَ بَوْلَاجِ الْخَوَالِفِ أَعْقَلًا

وَسَمِعْنَا بَعْضَهُمْ يَقُولُ: أَمَّا الْعَسَلُ فَأَنَا
شَرَّابٌ. وقال: (طويل)

بَكَيْتُ أَخَا اللَّأْوَاءِ يُحْمَدُ يَوْمَهُ
كَرِيمٌ رُؤُوسَ الدَّارِ عَيْنَ ضَرُوبِ

(س. ٥) وقال أبو طالب بن عبد المطلب:
(طويل)

ضَرُوبٌ بَنَصْلِ السَّيْفِ سَوْقَ سِمَانِهَا
إِذَا عَدِمُوا زَادًا فَإِنَّكَ عَاقِرُ

It has occurred in *fa ḥilin*, but it is not with the frequency of that. The poet said: (kāmil)²⁴

ḥaḍirun ḥumuwrān lā tudʿiyru wa-ḥāminun
mā laysa mungiyahu min ḥal-ḥaḍārī
 ‘Cautious in matters that do not harm and secure
 From the hazards he can not escape’

Labiyyd said: (kāmil)²⁵

ḥaw miḥalun ṣanigun ḥidʿādata samḥagin
Bi-sarātihā nadabun lahu wa-kuluwmu
 ‘Or a wild ass raging towards a she-ass
 On top he leaves traces of bites’

And he said it is for the slaughter of the fattened one. *fa ḥilun* pattern is less frequent than *fa ḥiyl* by much. They made it follow the course when they constructed it for the plural with the meaning of *fa ḥuwl* as it was made to follow the course in the singular to become like *fawāḥil* when it was made to follow the course like a *fāḥil* ‘actor’. A case of that is the saying of tʿarafah: (ramal)²⁶

ḥumma zāduw ḥannahum fiy ḥawmihim
ḥufurun ḍanbahumu ḥayru fuxur
 ‘Then they increased (their favor) in their people
 Being forgiving of their faults without boasting’

On this subject is the saying of Ruḥbah: (ragaz)²⁷

Bira ḥsi dammāyin ru ḥuwsa ḥal-ḥizzi
 ‘With a head of sharp brain are the heads of the pride’

and of it is the saying of Sāḥidah ḥibn Guḥayyah: (basiyt)²⁸

ḥatta ṣāḥahā kaliylun mawḥinan ṣamilun
Bātat tʿirāban wa bāta ḥal-layla lam yanami
 ‘Until successive lightning with labor
 Agitated her and spent the night sleepless’

وقد جاء في فعلٍ وليس ككثرة ذلك. قال
 الشاعر: (كامل)

حذرٌ أموراً لا تُضيرُ وآمنٌ
 ما ليس مُنجيهُ من الأقدار

وقال لبيد: (كامل)

(س. ١٠) أو مسحلٌ شنجٌ عِضادةٌ سَمَحَجٌ
 بسراتها نَدَبٌ لها وِكلومٌ

وقل إنّه لمُحارٌ بوائِكها وفعلٌ أقلُّ من فَعِيلٍ
 بكثير. وأجروه حين بنوه للجمع يعني فَعولاً
 كما كان أجرى في الواحد ليكون كَفَوَاعِلَ
 حين أجرى مثل فاعِلٍ من ذلك قول طرفة:
 (رمل)

ثم زادوا أنّهم في قومهم
 عُفْرٌ ذنبهم غيرُ فُحْرٌ

(س. ١٥) ومن هذا الباب قول
 رؤبة: (رجز)

برأس دماغِ رؤوسِ العِزِّ

ومنه قول ساعدة بن جُوَيَّة: (بسيط)

حتّى شأها كليلٌ مَوْهناً عمِلٌ
 باتت طراباً وبات الليل لم يَنم

²⁴The meter of kāmil is: *mutafāḥilun* (6 times).

²⁵The meter of kāmil is: *mutafāḥilun* (6 times).

²⁶The meter of ramal is: *fāḥilātun fāḥilātun fāḥilun* (twice).

²⁷The meter of ragaz is: *mustafāḥilun* (6 times).

²⁸The meter of basiyt^f is: *mustafāḥilun fāḥilun* (4 times).

And ʔal-Kumiyyt said: (basiyṯ)²⁹

šummun mahāwiynu ʔabdāna ʔal-gazuwri maxā-
-miys^u ʔal-šašiyāti lā xuwrun wa lā ʔuzumu
 ‘Noses held high, the killers of bodies with bellies retracted
 The evening suppers for the weak and the small’

(P. 48) And of them are *ʔadiyr* ‘powerful’, *ʔaliym* ‘omniscient’, *raḥiym* ‘merciful’, because he wants the *mubālayah* ‘exaggeration’ in the *fiʔl* ‘action’ and this is not of the status of your saying *ḥasanun wagha ʔal-ʔaxi* ‘handsome is the face of the brother’, because this can not be *yuglab* ‘exchanged’ or *yud^umaru* ‘implied’ but its definition is that it be spoken with *ʔalif* and *lām* or *nakirah* ‘indefinite’ and you do not mean by it that you made an action happen previously towards someone, nor is it good to separate between them and say *huwa kariymun fiyhā ḥasaba ʔal-ʔabi* ‘he is generous in it according to the father’. What followed the course of the *fiʔl* ‘action’ is the saying of the poet: (t^uawiyl)³⁰

Yamurruwna bi-ʔal-dahnā xifāfan siyābuhum
Wa-yargi ʔna min dāriyna bugra ʔal-ḥaḡāʔibi
ʔalā ḥiyna/i ʔalhā ʔal-nāsa gullu ʔumuwrihim
fa-nadlan zurayḡu ʔal-māla nadla ʔal-ḡa ʔālibi

‘They pass by Dahna with light sacks
 And return from Dariyn with filled bags
 While the people are busy with their affairs
 They snatch money from Zurayq as foxes snatch’

It as though he said *ʔundul* ‘snatch’. Mirrār ʔal-ʔasadiy said: (kāmil)³¹

ʔa-ʔalāḡatan ʔumma ʔal-wulayyidi ba ʔda mā
ʔafnānu ra ʔsika ka-ʔal-ḡa yāmi ʔal-muxlisi
 ‘Is there a relation, mother of the little one after
 The tufts of your hair have turned gray?’

And he said: (wāfir)³²

bi-d^uarbin bi-ʔal-suyuwfi ru ʔuwsa ʔawmin
ʔazalnā ḥāmahunna ʔani ʔal-maḡiyli
 ‘By striking with swords the necks of people
 We erased their worries from consideration’

وقال الكُمييت: (بسيط)

شُمُّ مَهاوِينُ أُبدانِ الجَزُورِ مَحا –
 مِيسُ العَشيَّاتِ لا خُورٌ ولا فُزْمٌ

(ص. ٤٨) ومنه قَدِيرٌ وعلِيمٌ ورَحِيمٌ لأنه يريد المبالغة في الفعل وليس هذا بمنزلة قولك حسنٌ وجهُ الأخ لأن هذا لا يُقَلَّبُ ولا يضمُرُ وإنما حدُّه أن يُتكلَّم به في الألف واللام أو نكرةٌ ولا تُعني به أنك أوقعت فعلاً سلفاً منك إلى أحدٍ ولا يَحسُنُ أن تفصل بينهما فتقول هو كريمٌ فيها حسب الأب ومما أُجري مجرى الفعل من المصادر قول الشاعر: (طويل) (س. ٥)

يَمَرُونَ بالدَهْنا خِفافاً عِبابَهُم
 وَيَرْجِعْنَ من دارينَ بُجرَ الحَقائِبِ
 على حينَ ألهى الناسَ جُلُّ أُمورِهِم
 فَندلاً زُرَيْقُ المالَ نَدَلَ الثَّعالِبِ

كأنه قال انذُلْ وقال المرار الأسدي: (كامل)

أَعلاقَةٌ أمُّ الوَليدِ بعد ما
 أَفنانُ رَأسِكَ كالثَّغامِ المُخْلِيسِ

وقال: (وافر) (س. ١٠)

بضربِ بالسُّيوفِ رُؤوسَ قَومٍ
 أزلنا هامَهُنَّ عن المَقيلِ

²⁹The meter of basiyṯ is: *mustafīlun fāfīlun* (4 times).

³⁰The meter of t^uawiyl is: *fa fuwlun mafāfīylun* (4 times).

³¹The meter of kāmil is: *mutafāfīlun* (6 times).

³²The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun fa fuwlun* (2 times).

And you say *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔanta rasuwlun lahu wa rasuwluhu* ‘Are you the messenger of Abdulah and his messenger?’, because you don’t want a *fa ʔuwl* here what you want in *dʔaruwb* ‘striking’, because you don’t want to impose a *fi ʔl* ‘action’ out of it on it. It is rather with the status of your saying *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔanti ʔaguwzun lahu* ‘are you an old woman for Abdulah?’ And you say *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔanta lahu ʔadiylun* ‘are you to Abdulah an equal?’ and *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔanta lahu galiysun* ‘Are you to Abdulah a companion?’, because you don’t want *mubālayah* ‘exaggeration’ in *fi ʔl* ‘an action’ and you did not say *mugālisun* ‘keeping company with’ so it would become like *fāʔil* ‘actor’. It is rather an *ʔism* ‘name’ with the status of your saying *ʔanta wasʔiyfun lahu* ‘you are a page to him’ or (L. 15) *ʔulāmun lahu* ‘a servant to him’. Similarly, *ʔāl-basʔratu ʔanta ʔalayhā ʔamiyrun* ‘Basrah, you are a governor over it?’ As to the fundamentally most common *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ that follow the course of *fi ʔl* is *fāʔil* ‘actor’. It is, however, permitted for those that are constructed for *mubālayah* ‘exaggeration’, because they are constructed for the *fāʔil* ‘actor’ from *lafʔihi* ‘its expression’ and the meaning is one. It is not of the nature of structures that they fundamentally follow the course of the *fi ʔl* ‘action. What leads you to that is that they are few and if they do not have in them the *mubālayah* ‘exaggeration’ of the *fi ʔl* ‘action’, they have the status of *ʔulām* ‘youth’ and *ʔabd* ‘servant’, because the *ʔism* ‘name’ comes according to *fa ʔala, yaʔʔalu, fāʔilun*, and comes according to *fu ʔila, yuʔʔalu, maʔʔuwlun*. If it is not one of them nor one for the *mubālayah* ‘exaggeration’ of the (L. 20) *fāʔil* ‘actor’ nothing occurs with it except the *raʔʔ* ‘raising’. You say *ʔa-kullu yawmin ʔanta fiyhi ʔamiyrun* ‘Are you a governor every day?’ You raise it, because it is not *fāʔil* ‘an actor’. And *kullu* ‘all/every’ is outside being a *dʔarf* ‘envelope of place’ so it occurs with the status of *ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi*. Don’t you see that if you were to say *ʔa-kullu yawmin yuntʔalagu* (I. P. 49) *fiyhi* ‘Does one leave every day?’ It is like your saying *ʔā-zaydun yuḏhabu bihi* ‘Is Zaid taken away?’ If it were permitted that you *tansʔiba kulla yawmin* ‘erect every day’ and you intend *ʔamiyr* for the *ʔism* ‘name’, you would say *ʔa-sabda ʔal-lāhi ʔalayhi ḏawbun* ‘Does Abdulah have a garment on him?’ If you were to permit the *nasʔb* ‘erecting’, because you say *ʔa-kulla yawmin laka ḏawbun* ‘Do you have a garment every day?’, it becomes *nasʔb* ‘erect’.

وتقول أعبدُ الله أنت رسولٌ له ورسوله لأنك لا تريد بفعلٍ ههنا ما تريد به في ضروبٍ لأنك لا تريد أن تُوقِعَ منه فعلاً عليه فإنما هو بمنزلة قولك أعبدُ الله أنت عَجوزٌ له وتقول أعبدُ الله أنت له عديلٌ وأعبدُ الله أنت له جليسٌ لأنك لا تريد به مبالغةً في فعلٍ ولم تقل مجاليسٌ فيكونُ كفاعلٍ فإنما هذا اسمٌ بمنزلة قولك أزيدٌ أنت وصيفٌ له أو (س. ١٥) غلامٌ له. وكذلك: البصرةُ أنت عليها أميرٌ فأما الأصلُ الأكثرُ الذي جرى مجرى الفعل من الأسماء ففاعلٌ. وإنما جاز في التي بُنيت للمبالغة لأنها بُنيت للفاعل من لفظه والمعنى واحدٌ وليست بالأبنية التي هي في الأصل أن تجري مجرى الفعل يدلك على ذلك أنها قليلة. فإذا لم يكن فيها مبالغة الفعل فإنما هي بمنزلة غلامٍ وعبدٍ لأن الاسم على فَعَلٍ يَفْعَلُ فاعِلٌ وعلى فُعِلَ يُفَعَلُ مَفْعولٌ. فإذا لم يكن واحدٌ منهما ولا الذي لمبالغة (س. ٢٠) الفاعل لم يكن فيه إلا الرفع وتقول أكلٌ يوم أنت فيه أميرٌ ترفعه لأنه ليس بفاعلٍ وقد خرج كلُّ من أن يكون ظرفاً فصار بمنزلة عبد الله ألا ترى أنك إذا قلت أكلٌ يوم يُنطلقُ (ص. ٤٩) فيه صار كقولك أزيدٌ يُذهبُ به ولو جاز أن تُنصِبَ كلَّ يوم وأنت تريد بالأمير الاسمَ لقلتُ أعبدَ الله عليه ثوبٌ فإن جَوَزتَ النصبَ لأنك تقول أكلٌ يوم لك ثوبٌ فيكون نصباً.

If you were to engage the *fi* ʔ 'action', *nasʔabta* 'you erected with an [a]' and you said *ʔa-kulla yawmin laka fiyhi ʔawbun* 'Is it everyday in which you have a garment?'

فان شغلتَ الفعلَ نصبتَ فقلتَ أكلَ يومَ لك
فيه ثوبٌ.