

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 46. This is a chapter on what is not affected by what precedes it of the *fi ʔ* ‘action’ which transitivises a *mafʕuwl* ‘acted-upon’ and no other because it is *kalām* ‘speech’ whose parts have affected each other so it can not be except a *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’ on which nothing before it affects it because the *ḥalif ḥal- ḥistifhām* ‘*ḥalif* of interrogation’ prevents it from that

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.120-122, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 99-102,
Haruwn vol.1. p. 235-241)

(L. 16) It is your saying *cad ḥalimtu ḥa-ḥabdu ḥal-lāhi ʕamma ḥam zaydun* ‘I learned , is it Abdulah there or Zaid’. *Wa cad ḥaraftu ḥabuwwan man zaydun* ‘and I learned father of whom Zaid is. *Wa cad ḥaraftu ḥayyuhum ḥabuwwa* ‘and I learned which one of them is your father’. *Wa ḥamā tarā ḥayyu barcin hā hunā* ‘Don’t you see what a lightening flash there is here’. This is in the *maudʕiʕ* ‘location’ of *mafʕuwl* ‘acted-upon’ just as (L. 20) if you said *ḥabdu ḥal-lāhi hal raḥaytahu* ‘Abdulah, did you see him’. This *kalām* ‘speech’ is in the location of what is built on the *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’ on which it operates and therefore raises it. An example of that is *layta šī ḥriy ḥa-ḥabdu ḥal-lāhi ʕamma ḥam zaydun* ‘I wonder whether Abdulah is there or Zaid?’ and *layta šī ḥriy hal raḥaytahu* ‘I wonder, did you see him?’ This is the place of *xabar* ‘predicate’ of *layta*. You introduced these things in your saying *ḥa-zaydun ʕamma ḥam ḥamrun* ‘Is Zaid there or ḥamr’ and *ḥayyuhum ḥabuwwa*. ‘Which one of them is your father’ (P. 100) due to what you needed of the meaning and we shall mention that on the chapter of *taswiyah* ‘equivalence;’ An example of that is the saying of the Glorious and Exalted *li-na ʕlama ḥayyu ḥal-hizbayni ḥaḥsʕā limā labi ʕuw ḥamadan* ‘(Sūrah XVIII:12) ‘in order that we know which of the two parties was the best at calculating the duration they had tarried’. And His saying, the Exalted,

هذا كتاب سيبويه
المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(٤٦) هذا باب ما لا يعمل فيه ما قبله من الفعل
الذي يتعدى إلى المفعول ولا غيره لأنه كلام قد
عمل بعضه في بعض فلا يكون إلا مبتدأ لا
يعمل فيه شيء قبله لأن ألف الاستفهام تمنعه
من ذلك

(م ١. ب ٤٦. ص ٩٩. س ١٦) وهو قولك قد
علمت أعبد الله ثم أم زيد وقد عرفت أبو من زيد وقد
عرفت أيهم أبوك وأما ترى أي برق هاهنا فهذا في
موضع مفعول كما أنك (س ٢٠) إذا قلت عبد الله هل
رأيت هذا الكلام في موضع المبنى على المبتدأ الذي
يعمل فيه فيرفعه ومثل ذلك كيت شعري أعبد الله ثم
أم زيد وليت شعري هل رأيت هذا في موضع خبر
ليت فإنما أدخلت هذه الأشياء على قولك أزيد ثم أم
عمرو وأيهم أبوك (ص ١٠٠) لما احتجت إليه من
المعنى وسنذكر ذلك في باب التسوية. ومثل ذلك قوله
عز وجل: لتعلم أي الحزبين أحصى لما لبثوا أمداً وقوله
تعالى:

¹Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

fa-lyanḏ'ur ḥayyuhā ḥazkā t'a ḥāman (Sūrah XVIII:19) 'let him look which is the most wholesome food'. Of that is also *gad ḥalimtu la-ḥabdu ḥal-lāhi xayrun minka* 'I have learned that Abdulah is better than you'. This *lām* [I] prevents *ḥamal* 'action/effect' just as the *ḥalif ḥal-ḥistifhām* 'ḥalif of interrogation' prevents it, because it is the *lām ḥal-ḥibtidā'* 'lām of initiation'. You introduce to it *ḥalimtu* 'I learned' just to confirm it and render it certain that you have known it and you do not defer (L. 5) to the knowledge of someone else. It is as though you said *gad ḥalimtu ḥa-zaydun ḥamma ḥam ḥamrun* 'I have learned whether Zaid was there or Amr'. You want to inform that you knew which one of them was there and you wanted to equalize the knowledge of the addressee with reference to both of them just as your knowledge of the matter was equal when you said *ḥa-zaydun ḥamma ḥam ḥamrun* 'is Zaid there or Amr'. An example of that is His saying, the Exalted and the Powerful, *wa-la-gad ḥalimuw laman ḥiṣṭarāhu mā lahu fīy ḥal-ḥāxirati min xalāḡin* 'and they learned that the buyers would not have a share in the happiness of the hereafter' (Sūrah II:102). If you were not to inquire and not to introduce the *lām ḥal-ḥibtidā'* 'lām of initiation' to *la-ḥa ḥmalta*, you treated *ḥalimtu* as you treat *ḥaraftu* and *raḥaytu*, and that in your saying *gad ḥalimtu zaydan xayran minka* 'I have learned that Zaid is better than you', just as He said *wa-la-gad ḥalimtum ḥal-laḏiyana ḥiṣṭadaw (L. 10) minkum fīy ḥal-sabti* 'and you knew those among you who transgressed in the matter of the sabbath' (Sūrah II:65), as he also said, the Exalted and the Powerful, *lā ta ḥlamuwnahumu ḥal-lāhu ya ḥlamuhum* 'you do not know them, God knows them' (Sūrah VIII:60) like your saying *lā ta ḥrifuwnahum ḥal-lāhu ya ḥrifuhum* 'you don't know them. God knows them'. He, the Glorious, said *wa-ḥal-lāhu ya ḥlamu ḥal-muḥsida mina ḥal-muḥsihi* 'God knows the mischievous from the virtuous' (Sūrah II:220). You say *gad ḥaraftu zaydan ḥabuw man huwa* 'I have known Zaid, whose father he is'. And *ḥalimtu ḥamran ḥa-ḥabuwka huwa ḥam ḥabuw ḥayrika* 'I have learned that Amr whether he is your father or someone else's. You engaged the *fi ḥl* 'the action' with the first *ḥism* 'name', because it has not been introduced with an interrogative particle just as if you were to say *ḥabdu ḥal-lāhi ḥa-ḥabuwka ḥam ḥabuw ḥayrika* 'Abdulah, is he your father or someone else's' or *zaydun ḥabuw man huwa* 'Zaid, whose father is he'. The *ḥāmil* 'operator' in this is *ḥal-ḥibtidā'* 'initiation', then you queried after it.

فَلْيَنْظُرْ أَيُّهَا أَزْكَى طَعَامًا وَمَنْ ذَلِكَ قَدْ عَلِمْتُ لَعِبْدُ اللَّهِ خَيْرٌ مِنْكَ. فَهَذِهِ اللَّامُ تَمْنَعُ الْعَمَلَ كَمَا تَمْنَعُ أَلْفَ الْاِسْتِفْهَامِ لِأَنَّهَا إِنَّمَا هِيَ لِأَمِّ الْاِبْتِدَاءِ وَإِنَّمَا أَدْخَلَتْ عَلَيْهِ عَلِمْتُ لِتَوْكُّدٍ وَتَجْعَلُهُ يَقِينًا قَدْ عَلِمْتَهُ وَلَا تُحِيلُ (س ٥) عَلَى عِلْمِ غَيْرِكَ كَمَا أَنَّكَ إِذَا قُلْتَ قَدْ عَلِمْتُ أَزِيدُ ثُمَّ أَمَّ عَمْرُو أَرَدْتُ أَنْ تُحْبِرَ أَنَّكَ قَدْ عَلِمْتَ أَيُّهُمَا ثُمَّ وَأَرَدْتُ أَنْ تَسَوِّيَ عِلْمَ الْمُخَاطَبِ فِيهِمَا كَمَا اسْتَوَى عِلْمُكَ فِي الْمَسْأَلَةِ حِينَ قُلْتَ أَزِيدُ ثُمَّ أَمَّ عَمْرُو. وَمِثْلُ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ وَلَقَدْ عَلِمُوا لَمَنِ اشْتَرَاهُ مَا لَهُ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنْ خَلَقٍ وَلَوْ لَمْ تَسْتَفْهَمْ لَمْ تُدْخِلْ لَامَ الْاِبْتِدَاءِ لِأَعْمَلْتَ عَلِمْتُ كَمَا تُعْمَلُ عَرَفْتُ وَرَأَيْتُ وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ قَدْ عَلِمْتُ زَيْدًا خَيْرًا مِنْكَ كَمَا قَالَ وَلَقَدْ عَلِمْتُمُ الَّذِينَ اعْتَدَوْا (س ١٠) مِنْكُمْ فِي السَّبْتِ وَكَمَا قَالَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ لَا تَعْلَمُوهُمْ اللَّهُ يَعْلَمُهُمْ كَقَوْلِكَ لَا تَعْرِفُونَهُمْ اللَّهُ يَعْرِفُهُمْ وَقَالَ سُبْحَانَهُ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ الْمُفْسِدَ مِنَ الْمُصْلِحِ وَتَقُولُ قَدْ عَرَفْتُ زَيْدًا أَبُو مَنْ هُوَ وَعَلِمْتُ عَمْرًا أَبُوكَ هُوَ أَمَّ أَبُو غَيْرِكَ فَأَعْمَلْتَ الْفِعْلَ فِي الْاِسْمِ الْأَوَّلِ لِأَنَّهُ لَيْسَ بِالْمُدْخَلِ عَلَيْهِ حَرْفُ الْاِسْتِفْهَامِ كَمَا أَنَّكَ إِذَا قُلْتَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ أَبُوكَ هُوَ أَمَّ أَبُو غَيْرِكَ أَوْ زَيْدُ أَبُو مَنْ هُوَ فَالْعَامِلُ فِي هَذَا الْاِبْتِدَاءِ ثُمَّ اسْتَفْهَمْتَ بَعْدَهُ.

What strengthens the *nas^ʿb* ‘erecting’ is your saying (L. 15) *cad ʕalimtuḥu ʔabuw man huwa* ‘I know him whose father he is’ and *cad ʕaraftuka ʔayyu ragulin ʔanta* ‘I have known you what kind of man you are’. You say *cad daraytu ʕabda ʔal-lāhi ʔabuw man huwa* ‘I reckoned Abdulah whose father he is’ as you said that in *ʕalimtu* ‘I learned’ and that is not taken except from the Arabs. Of this is *cad ɔ^ʿanantu zaydan ʔabuw man huwa* ‘I figured out Zaid, whose father he is’. If you so wish you say *cad ʕalimtu zaydun ʔabuw man huwa* ‘I learned whose father Zaid is’ just as you say that in what does not transitivize to the *maf^ʿuwl* ‘acted-upon’ and that is in your saying *ʔiḏhab faʔand^ʿur zaydun ʔabuw man huwa* ‘go and look, whose father is Zaid’. You do not say *naḏ^ʿartu zaydan* ‘I looked Zaid’ *wa ʔiḏhab wa sal zaydun ʔabuw man huwa* ‘and go and ask Zaid whose father he is’. The meaning is *ʔiḏhab fa-sal ʕan zaydin* ‘go and ask about Zaid’. If you were to say *ʔisʔal zaydan* ‘ask Zaid’ according (L. 20) to this definition, it is not allowed. An example of that is *daraytu* ‘I reckoned’ in most of their speech, because most of them say *mā daraytu bihi* ‘I did not reckon with it’ like *mā ʕaʔartu bihi* ‘I did not have a sense of it’.

An example of that is *layta ʕi ʕri zaydun ʔa-ʕindak huwa ʔam ʕinda ʕamrin* ‘I wonder, Is Zaid with you or with Amr?’. It is necessary to have *huwa* ‘he’ because the particle of interrogation cannot do without what is before it, but it can do without what is after it. Rather, you come up (P. 101) with the *fi ʕl* ‘action’ after a *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’. The interrogative may be put in the location of what it is built on that which raises it, so you introduced it to it just as you introduced it to your saying *cad ʕaraftu la-zaydun xayrun minka* ‘I knew that Zaid is better than you’. This is permitted in it with the interrogative, because in reference to the meaning it is what is interrogated about; just as it was permitted for you to say *ʔinna zaydan fiyhā wa-ʕamrun*. ‘Indeed, Zaid is in it and Amr’. And like it is *ʔanna ʔal-lāha bariy^ʿun mina ʔal-muʕrikiyna wa rasuwluhu* ‘Indeed, God and His messenger are innocent of the pagans’s ways’(Sūrah III: 9). He started with the *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’ because the meaning of the discourse is when he said *ʔinna zaydan munt^ʿaligun* ‘that Zaid is departing’ is (L. 5) *zaydun munt^ʿaligun* ‘Zaid is departing’ but he confirmed with *ʔinna* just as he confirmed and expressed Zaid and implied it.

وما يُقَوِّي النصبَ قولك (س ١٥) قد علمته أبو من هو وقد عرفتك أي رجل أنت وتقول قد دريت عبد الله أبو من هو كما قلت ذلك في علمت ولم يؤخذ ذلك إلا من العرب ومن ذلك قد ظننت زيدا أبو من هو وإن شئت قلت قد علمت زيد أبو من هو كما تقول ذاك فيها لا يتعدى إلى مفعولٍ وذلك قولك إذ هب فانظر زيد أبو من هو ولا تقول نظرت زيدا وأذهب وسأل زيد أبو من هو وإنما المعنى إذ هب فسأل عن زيد ولو قلت إسأل زيدا (س ٢٠) على هذا الحد لم يجوز.

ومثل ذلك دريت في أكثر كلامهم لأن أكثرهم يقول ما دريت به مثل ما شعرت به ومثل ذلك ليت شعري زيد أعندك هو أم عند عمرو ولا بُد من هو لأن حرف الاستفهام لا يستغنى بما قبله إنما يستغنى بما بعده فإنما جئت (ص ١٠١) بالفعل بعد مبتدئ قد وُضِع الاستفهام في موضع المبنى عليه الذي يرفعه فأدخلته عليه كما أدخلته على قولك قد عرفت لزيد خير منك وإنما جاز هذا فيه مع الاستفهام لأنه في المعنى مستفهم عنه كما جاز لك أن تقول إن زيدا فيها وعمرو ومثله أن الله برىء من المشركين ورَسُولُهُ فابتدأ لأن معنى الحديث حين قال إن زيدا منطلق (س ٥) زيد منطلق ولكنّه أكّد بأن كما أكّد فأظهر زيدا وأضمره.

Rafʿ ‘raising’ is the saying of Yuwnis. If you were to then say *ʕaraftu ʔabuw man zaydun* ‘I knew whose father Zaid is’ nothing is permitted except *rafʿ* ‘raising’, because you began with what cannot be except interrogative. You began it then you built on it, so it has the status of your saying *cad ʕalimtu ʔa-ʔabuwka zaydun ʔam ʔabuw ʕamr* ‘I learned is Zaid your father or the father of Amr’. If you were to say *cad ʕariftu ʔabā man zaydun makniyyun* ‘I knew the father of whom is Zaid surnamed’. It is erected due to *makniyyun* ‘being surnamed’. It is as though you said *ʔabā man zaydun makniyyun* ‘whose father is Zaid surnamed’, then you introduced *ʕaraftu* ‘I learned’ to it. Similar to it is your saying *cad ʕalimtu ʔa-ʔabā zaydin tuknā ʔam ʔabā ʕamrin* ‘I learned whether it is the father of Zaid you are surnamed or the father of Amr’ (L. 10), it is as though you said *ʔa-ʔabā zaydin tuknā ʔam ʔabā ʕamrin* ‘is it the father of Zaid that you are surnamed or the father of Amr’ then you introduced to it *ʕalimtu* ‘I learned’, just as you introduce it to it when there is nothing after it except a *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’. It does not erect except with this last *fi ʕl* ‘action’, just as it is not in the first except *mubtadaʔan* ‘as initial’. If you were to say *cad ʕaraftu zaydan ʔabuw man huwa* ‘I knew Zaid, whose father he is’ you also said *cad ʕaraftu zaydan ʔabā man huwa makniyyun* ‘I knew Zaid whose father he is surnamed after’. Whoever raised Zaid there, raised Zaid here too and erected the other as he erected it when he said *cad ʕaraftu ʔabā man ʔanta makniyyun* ‘I knew whose father you are surnamed after’. It is as though he said *zaydunn ʔabā man huwa makniyyun* ‘Zaid, the father of whom is he surnamed’ then he introduced the *fi ʕl* to it and it is as though he said *zaydun* (L. 15) *ʔa-ʔabā bišrin yuknā ʔam ʔabā ʕamrin* ‘Zaid, is he surnamed to be father of Bishr or father of Amr’, then he introduced the *fi ʕl* ‘action’ to it and the other *fi ʕl* ‘action’ acted when it was after the *ʔalif* of ‘interrogation’ and you may say *ʕaraftu zaydan ʔabuw ʔayyuhum yuknā bihi* ‘I knew Zaid, the father of which one of them he is to be surnamed’, and *ʕalimtu bišran ʔayyuhum yuknā bihi* ‘I knew bišr, whoever of them is he surnamed with’. You raise just as you raised *ʔayyuhum dʕarabtahu* ‘who of them did you strike’. You say *ʔa-raʔaytaka zaydan ʔabuw man huwa* ‘Did you see Zaid whose father he is’ and *ʔa-raʔaytaka ʕamran ʔa-ʕindaka huwa ʔam ʕinda fulānin* ‘did you see Amr, is he with you or is he with so and so’ Nothing in it is acceptable except the *nasʕb* ‘erecting’ of Zaid. Don’t you see that if you were to say:

والرفع قول يونس فإن قلت قد عرفت أبو من زيد لم
يجز إلا الرفع لأنك بدأت بما لا يكون إلا استفهاماً
وابتدأته ثم بنيت عليه فهو بمنزلة قولك قد علمت
أبوك زيد أم أبو عمرو فإن قلت قد عرفت أبا من زيد
مكني انتصب على مكني كأنك قلت أبا من زيد مكني
ثم أدخلت عرفت عليها ومثله قولك قد علمت أبا
زيد تكتي أم أبو عمرو (س ١٠) كأنك قلت أبا زيد
تكتي أم أبو عمرو ثم أدخلت عليه علمت كما أدخلته
حين لم يكن ما بعده إلا مبتدأ فلا يتنصب إلا بهذا
الفعل الآخر كما لم يكن في الأول إلا مبتدأ وإذا قلت
قد عرفت زيداً أبو من هو قلت قد عرفت زيداً أبا من
هو مكني ومن رفع زيداً ثم رفع زيداً هنا ونصب
الآخر كما نصبه حين قال قد عرفت أبا من أنت مكني
وكانه قال زيداً أبا من هو مكني ثم أدخل الفعل عليه
وكانه قال زيداً (س ١٥) أبا بشر يكتي أم أبو عمرو ثم
أدخل الفعل عليه وعمل الفعل الآخر حين كان بعد
ألف الاستفهام. وتقول قد عرفت زيداً أبو أيهم
يكتي به وعلمت بشراً أيهم يكتي به ترفعه كما ترفع
أيهم ضربته وتقول أرايتك زيداً أبو من هو وأرايتك
عمرأ أعندك هو أم عند فلان لا يحسن فيه إلا النصب
في زيد ألا ترى أنك لو قلت:

Paraḥayta ḥabuw man ḥanta ‘did you see whose father you are’ or *Paraḥayta ḥa-zaydun ḥamma ḥam fulānun* ‘did you see whether Zaid was there or someone else’. It is not good, because it includes the meaning of *ḥaxbirniy* ‘inform me’ about Zaid’ and it is the *fi ʕl* ‘action’ (L. 20) that silence does not dispense with its first *mafʕuwl* ‘acted upon’. So the introduction of this meaning into it does not give it the status of *ḥaxbirniy* ‘inform me’ in doing without it. It was patterned on this and the interrogation became in the location of the second *mafʕuwl* ‘acted-upon’. You may say *gad ḥaraftu ḥayya yawmin ḥal-gumuḥatu* ‘I knew which day is Friday’. You erect because it is a *dʕarf* ‘envelope of time’ not on account of *ḥaraftu* ‘I knew’. If you don’t make it a *dʕarf* ‘envelope of time’ you raised (P. 102). Some Arabs say *la-gad ḥalimtu ḥayya ḥiynin ḥuḥbatiy* ‘I knew at what time was my riding turn’. And some of them say *la-gad ḥalimtu ḥayyu ḥiynin ḥuḥbatiy* ‘I knew at what time was my riding turn’. As to his saying, (*basiyt*)²

ḥatta ka ḥan lam yakun ḥillā taḥakkuruhu
Wa-ḥal-dahru ḥayyamā ḥālin dahāriyru

‘Until as if there is nothing except its remembering
And the age, under any circumstances, is age’

it has the status of your saying *ḥal-dahru dahāriyru* ‘age is ages’ *kulla ḥālin* ‘every circumstance’ and *kulla marratin* ‘every time’ that is *fiy kulli ḥālin wa fiy kulli marratin* ‘in every circumstance and at every time’. (L. 5) He erected, because it is *dʕarf* ‘envelope of time’ just as you say *ḥal-gitālu kulla marratim wa kulla ḥaḥwāli ḥal-dahri* ‘fighting every time and all circumstances of time’.

أرأيتَ أبو من أنت أو أرأيتَ أزيدُ ثمَّ أم فلانٌ لم يحسن
لأنَّ فيه معنى أَخْبِرْنِي عن زيد وهو الفعل الذي لا (س
٢٠) يَسْتَعْنِي السكوتُ على مفعوله الأول فدخولُ هذا
المعنى فيه لم يجعله بمنزلة أَخْبِرْنِي في الاستغناء فعلى هذا
أَجْرِي وصار الاستفهامُ في موضع المفعول الثاني
وتقول قد عرفتُ أيَّ يومِ الجُمُعَةِ فتَنَصَّبَ على أَنه
ظرفٌ لا على عرفتُ وإن لم يجعله ظرفاً رفعتُ (ص
١٠٢) وبعضُ العرب يقول لقد علمتُ أيَّ حينِ عُقْبَتِي
وبعضهم يقول لقد علمتُ أيَّ حينِ عُقْبَتِي وأما قوله:
(بسيط)

حتى كأن لم يكن إلا تذكُّرُه

والدهرُ أَيْتَمًا حالٍ دَهَارِيْرُ

فإنما هو بمنزلة قولك والدهرُ دَهَارِيْرُ كلِّ حالٍ وكلِّ
مرّةٍ أي في كلِّ حالٍ وفي كلِّ مرّةٍ فانتصب لأنه ظرف
كما تقول القتالُ كلِّ مرّةٍ وكلِّ أحوال الدهر.

² The meter for *basiyt*² is: *mustafʕilun fā ʕilun mustafʕilun fa ʕilun* (twices).

Chapter 47. This is a chapter on the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ in which the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ is named by means of names not taken from examples of *ʔal-fi ʔl ʔal-hādiθ* ‘the occurring action’. Their location in speech is *ʔal-ʔamru wa ʔal-nahiyu* ‘the imperative and the prohibitive’

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.122-123, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 102-103, Haruwn vol.1. p. 241-243)

(I. Chapter 47. P. 102. L. 6) Some of them require the *ma ʔmuwra bihi* ‘the thing commanded’ and some of them do not require *ʔal-ma ʔmuwra* ‘the commanded’. Some of them require *ʔal-manhiyyiy ʔanhu* ‘what is prohibited’ and some of them that do not require *ʔal-manhiyya* ‘the prohibited’. As to what requires it is your saying *ruwayda zaydan* ‘slowly, Zaid!’ and that is the name for *ʔarwid zaydan* ‘Zaid, slow down’. Of them is *hallumma zaydan* ‘This way, Zaid’. What you want is **(L. 10)** *hāti zaydan* ‘come Zaid’. Of them the saying of the Arabs *ḥayyahala ʔal-θariyda* ‘let us have the broth’. ʔabuw ʔal-xattāb claimed that some Arabs say *ḥayyahala ʔal-sʿalāt* ‘Let us have prayer’ this is a *ʔismun* ‘a name’ for *ʔi ʔti ʔal-sʿalāt* ‘have prayer’. That is *ʔi ʔtuw ʔal-θariyda wa ʔi ʔtuw ʔal-sʿalāt* ‘come with the broth and come to the prayer’. Of it is his saying (ragaz)³

Tarākihā min ʔibilin tarākihā
‘Leave the camels, leave them’

This is *ʔism* ‘a name’ for *ʔutrukḥā* ‘leave them’, and he said (ragaz)⁴: **(L. 15)**

Manā ʔihā min ʔiblin manā ʔihā
‘Defend the camels, defend them’

This is *ʔism* ‘a name’ for his saying *ʔimna ʔhā* ‘defend them’. As for the *ma ʔmuwra* ‘the commanded’ and *ʔal-manhiyya* ‘the prohibited’ do not require the *ma ʔmuwra bihi* ‘commanded’ nor *ʔal-manhiyyiy ʔanhu* ‘the prohibition is against’ is your saying *mah* ‘shut up’, hush, attentively’, *sʿah* ‘listen, *wāhin* ‘Waw’ and *ʔiyhin* ‘how painful’ and what is like that. Know that these words that are

(٤٧) بَابُ مِنَ الْفِعْلِ سُمِّيَ الْفِعْلُ فِيهِ بِأَسْمَاءٍ
لَمْ تُؤْخَذْ مِنْ أَمْثَلَةِ الْفِعْلِ الْحَادِثِ وَمَوْضِعُهَا
مِنَ الْكَلَامِ الْأَمْرُ وَالنَّهْيُ

فمنها ما يتعدى المأمور إلى مأمور به ومنها ما لا يتعدى المأمور ومنها ما يتعدى المنهي إلى منهي عنه ومنها ما لا يتعدى المنهي. أما ما يتعدى فقولك: رويدَ زيداً فإنها هو اسمُ أروذَ زيداً. ومنها هلمَّ زيداً إنسا تريد. (س) ١٠ هاتِ زيداً ومنها قول العرب: حيَّهَلْ الثريدَ. وزعم أبو الخطاب أن بعض العرب يقول: حيَّهَلْ الصَّلَاةَ فهذا اسمُ إئتِ الصلاةَ أي إئتوا الثريدَ وائتوا الصلاةَ. ومنه قوله: (رجز)

تَرَكِهَا مِنْ إِبِلٍ تَرَكِهَا

فهذا اسم لقوله أترُكُها. وقال: (رجز)

مَنَاعِهَا مِنْ إِبِلٍ مَنَاعِهَا

وهذا اسم لقوله إمنعها وأما ما لا يتعدى المأمور ولا المنهي إلى مأمور به ولا إلى منهي عنه فنحو قولك: مَهْ وَصَهْ وَآهْ وَإِيَهْ وما أشبه ذلك. واعلم أن هذه الحروف التي هي

³ The meter for ragaz is: *mustafʕilun* (six times).

⁴ The meter for ragaz is: *mustafʕilun* (six times).

ʔasmāʔ ‘names’ for action, the sign of the *mudʕmar* ‘implied’ does not appear in them, because they are *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ and they do not pattern according to what is derived from the *fīʕl ʔal-hādiθ* ‘the occurring action’, in what has passed and what is to come and on your day. But *ʔal- maʔmuwra wa ʔal-manhiyya* ‘the commanded and the prohibited’ (L. 20) are implied in the intention, and the *ʔasʕl* ‘origin’ of this is in the *ʔamr* ‘imperative’ and the *nahiy* ‘prohibition’ and they have priority with it because they can not occur except with a *fīʕl* ‘action’ and the location that can not be except a *fīʕl* ‘action’ is the more frequent and they are names for the action and they follow the course of what has the *ʔalif wa ʔal-lām* ‘ʔal-‘ like *ʔal-nagāʔa* ‘the delivery’ lest the expression of what comes after it is different from the expression of what comes after the *ʔamr* ‘imperative’ and the *nahiy* ‘prohibitive’.

أَسْمَاءٌ لِلْفِعْلِ لَا تَظْهَرُ فِيهَا عِلْمَةُ الْمُضْمَرِ وَذَلِكَ أَنَّهُمْ
أَسْمَاءٌ وَلَيْسَتْ عَلَى الْأَمْثَلَةِ الَّتِي أُخِذَتْ مِنَ الْفِعْلِ
الْحَادِثِ فِيمَا مَضَى وَفِيمَا يَسْتَقْبَلُ وَفِي يَوْمِكَ وَلَكِنَّ
الْمَأْمُورَ وَالْمَنْهِيَّ (س ٢٠) مَضْمُرَانِ فِي النِّيَّةِ. وَإِنَّمَا كَانَ
أَصْلُ هَذَا فِي الْأَمْرِ وَالنَّهْيِ وَكَانَا أَوْلَى بِهِ لِأَنَّهَا لَا
يَكُونَانِ إِلَّا بِفِعْلِ فَكَانَ الْمَوْضِعُ الَّذِي لَا يَكُونُ إِلَّا فِعْلًا
أَغْلَبَ عَلَيْهِ وَهِيَ أَسْمَاءُ الْفِعْلِ وَأُجْرِيَتْ مُجْرَى مَا فِيهِ
الْأَلْفُ وَاللَّامُ نَحْوَ النَّجَاءِ لِثَلَا يَخَالِفَ لَفْظُ مَا بَعْدَهَا
لَفْظَ مَا بَعْدَ الْأَمْرِ وَالنَّهْيِ. وَلَمْ تَصْرَفْ تَصْرُفَ الْمَصَادِرِ
لِأَنَّهَا لَيْسَتْ بِمَصَادِرٍ وَإِنَّمَا سُمِّيَ بِهَا الْأَمْرُ وَالنَّهْيُ
فَعَمِلَتْ عَمَلَهُمَا وَلَمْ تَجَاوِزْ فِيهَا تَقْوَمُ مَقَامَ فِعْلِهِمَا.

Chapter 48. This is a chapter on *mutas'arraḥ* 'inflection' of *ruwayda* 'slowly'

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.123-126, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 103-105,
Haruwn vol.1. p. 243-248)

(I. P. 103. L. 1) You say *ruwayda zaydan* 'slowly, Zaid' for what you want is *ḥarwid zaydan* 'go slow Zaid'. ḥal-huḍaliyy said: (t'awiyl)⁵

Ruwayda ḥaliyyan gudda mā ʿadyu ḥummihim
ḥilaynā wa lākin buyd'uhum mutamā ḥinu

'Go slow, Ali, there is a cut off from their mother's breast
To us, but their hatred for us is a pretense'

We have heard from Arabs some who say *wa-ḥal-lāhi law ḥaradta ḥal-darāhima la-ḥa ḥtaytuka ruwayda mā ḥal-ḥi ḥra* 'by god, if you had wanted, I would have given you the money. What is it with poetry?'. He wants *ḥarwid* (L. 5) *ḥal-ḥi ḥra* 'go slow with the poetry'. It is like the saying of the one who says *law ḥaradta ḥal-darāhima la-ḥa ḥtaytuka fada ḥ ḥal-ḥi ḥra* 'if you had wanted the dirhams I would have given them to you, so let go of the poetry'. This shows you that *ruwayda* 'slowly' is in the location of the *ḥi ḥl* 'action'. *Ruwayda* is also a *s'ifah* 'descriptive' as in your saying *sāruw sayran ruwaydan* 'they walked a slow walk'. They also say *sāruw ruwaydan* 'they walked slowly'. They delete *ḥal-sayr* 'the walking' and they make a *ḥāl* 'circumstance' by which he described his speech referring partially to what is at the beginning of his discourse from his saying *sāruw* 'they walked' with mentioning *ḥal-sayr* 'the walking. Of that is the saying of the Arabs *d'a ḥhu ruwaydan* 'place it slowly/gently' that is *wad' ḥan ruwaydan* 'a slow/gentle placing'. Of those is your saying to a man you see dealing with a thing *ruwaydan* 'slowly', but you want *ḥilāgan ruwaydan* 'a slow cure'. This is the surface of the *ḥāl* 'circumstance' (L. 10) except that the *maws'uwf* 'the thing described' appears and it is in the *ḥāl* 'the circumstance' or other than the *ḥāl* 'circumstance'. Know that *ruwayda* is followed by *kāf* [k] and is in the location of *ḥifḥal* and that is your saying *ruwaydaka zaydan* 'go slow with Zaid' and *ruwaydakum zaydan* 'go-pl slow with Zaid'. This *kāf* [k] that followed it followed to show the *ḥal-muxāt'ab ḥal-maxs'uws'* 'the specific addressee' because *ruwayda* occurs in the singular, the plural, the masculine and the feminine. The *kāf* [k] was introduced when he feared confusing

(٤٨) هذا بابٌ مُتَصَرِّفٌ رُوَيْدَ

تقول رُوَيْدَ زَيْدًا وَإِنَّمَا تَرِيدُ أَرْوِدُ زَيْدًا قَالَ الْهَذَلِيُّ:
(طويل)

رُوَيْدَ عَلِيًّا جَدًّا مَا تَدِي أُمَّهُمْ

إِلَيْنَا وَلَكِنْ بَعْضُهُمْ مُمْتَائِنٌ

وسمعنا من العرب من يقول والله لو أردت الدرهم
لأعطيتك رُوَيْدًا ما الشعر يريد أَرُوِدُ (س ٥) الشعر
كقول القائل لو أردت الدرهم لأعطيتك فدع الشعر
فقد تبين لك أن رُوَيْدَ في موضع الفعل ويكون رُوَيْدَ
أيضاً صفة كقولك ساروا سَيْرًا رُوَيْدًا ويقولون أيضاً
ساروا رُوَيْدًا فيحذفون السير ويجعلونه حالاً به وصف
كلامه اجتزاءً بها في صدر حديثه من قوله ساروا عن
ذكر السير ومن ذلك قول العرب صَعَهُ رُوَيْدًا أي
وَصَعًا رُوَيْدًا ومن ذلك قولك للرجل تراه يعالج شيئاً
رُوَيْدًا إنما تريد علاجاً رُوَيْدًا فهذا على وجه الحال (س
١٠) إلا أن يظهر الموصوف فيكون على الحال وعلى
غير الحال واعلم أن رُوَيْدًا تلحقها الكاف وهي في
موضع إفعال وذلك كقولك رُوَيْدَكَ زَيْدًا ورُوَيْدَكُم
زَيْدًا وهذه الكاف التي لحقت رويداً إنما لحقت لتبين
المخاطبَ المخصوص لأن رُوَيْدَ تقع للواحد والجميع
والذكر والأنثى فإنها أدخل الكاف حين خاف التباس

⁵ The meter for t'awiyl is: *fa ḥuwlun mafā ḥiyulun* (four times).

whom he meant and whom he did not mean. He deleted it in the first presuming knowledge of *ʔal-muxātʔab* ‘the addressee’ that he means no other than him/it’. So, the attachment of the *kāf* [k] is like your saying *yā fulānu* ‘Hey, so and so!’ to the man (L. 15) until he comes to you and leaving it out is as your saying to a man *ʔanta tafʔalu* ‘you do’ if he were coming to you, facing you and listening to you, so you left out *yā fulānu* ‘Hey so and so!’ when you said *ʔanta tafʔalu* ‘you are doing’, being satisfied with his coming towards you. And you may also say *ruwaydaka* ‘take it easy’ to the man, as a confirmation, who does not fear he will be confused with another, just as you say to the one coming towards you and listening to you *ʔanta tafʔalu dāka* *yā fulān* ‘you do that, you so and so’ as a confirmation, and *ḏā* ‘that’ has the status of the saying of the Arabs *hāʔa*, *hāʔak*, *hāʔ*, *hāʔak*, ‘behold this, you behold this’, and it has the status of their saying *ḥayyahala* ‘Come this way’ and *ḥayyahalaka* ‘You come this way’ and like their saying *ʔal-nagāʔaka* ‘save yourself’. This *kāf* [k] does not occur as a personal/proper name (L. 20) for those who are commanded or prohibited that are implied. If it were a proper name for the implied it would be a mistake because the implied here are the *fāʔiluw* ‘the actors’ and the mark of the implied actors is the *wāw* [w], like in your saying *ʔifʔaluw* ‘you-pl do’. Rather this *kāf* [k] came *tawkiydan* ‘by way of confirmation’ and *taxsʔiysʔan* ‘by way of specification’. Where it to be an *ʔism* ‘a name’ *ʔal-nagāʔaka* ‘save your self’ it would be impossible. Because the *ʔism* ‘name’ that has (P. 104) the *ʔalif wa ʔal-lām* ‘ʔal-’ is not annexed. It is incumbent on the one who claimed that they are *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ that he also claim that the *kāf* [k] of *ḏālika* ‘that one’ is *ʔism* ‘a name’. It he were to say that then he has no choice but to claim that it is *magruwrah* ‘pulled with an [i]’ or *mansʔuwbah* ‘erected with an [a]’. And if it were *mansʔuwbah* it is incumbent on him to say *ḏāka nafsaka zaydun* ‘that one, yourself, is Zaid’ if he wanted the *kāf* [k]. Similarly it is incumbent on him to say, if it were *magruwrah* ‘pulled with an [i]’ *ḏāka nafsika zaydun* ‘that one yourself is Zaid’. It is incumbent on him to say that the *tāʔ* [t] of *ʔanta* ‘you-s’ is an *ʔism* ‘name’, but the *tāʔ* [t] of *ʔanta* ‘you’ has the status of *kāf* [k]. What proves to you that it is not (L. 5) *ʔism* ‘a name’ is the saying of the Arabs. *ʔa-raʔaytaka fulānan mā ḥāluhu* ‘did you see so and so what is his circumstance’. The *tāʔ* [t] is the mark of *ʔal-mudʔmar*, *ʔal-muxātab ʔal-marfuwʔ* ‘the implied, raised addressee’. If you do not attach the *kāf* [k] you would be dispensing with it as your dispensing with it when

مَنْ يَعْنِي مَنْ لَا يَعْنِي وَإِنَّمَا حَذَفَهَا فِي الْأَوَّلِ اسْتِغْنَاءً
بِعِلْمِ الْمُخَاطَبِ أَنَّهُ لَا يَعْنِي غَيْرَهُ فَالْحَاقُ الْكَافَ كَقَوْلِكَ
يَا فُلَانُ لِلرَّجُلِ (س ١٥) حَتَّى يُقْبَلَ عَلَيْكَ وَتَرْكُهَا
كَقَوْلِكَ لِلرَّجُلِ أَنْتَ تَفْعَلُ إِذَا كَانَ مُقْبِلًا عَلَيْكَ بِوَجْهِهِ
مُنْصِتًا لَكَ فَتَرَكْتَ يَا فُلَانُ حِينَ قُلْتَ أَنْتَ تَفْعَلُ
اسْتِغْنَاءً بِإِقْبَالِهِ عَلَيْكَ وَقَدْ تَقُولُ أَيْضًا زُوَيْدَكَ لِمَنْ لَا
يَخَافُ أَنْ يَلْتَبَسَ بِسِوَاهُ تَوْكِيدًا كَمَا تَقُولُ لِلْمُقْبِلِ عَلَيْكَ
الْمُنْصِتِ لَكَ أَنْتَ تَفْعَلُ ذَاكَ يَا فُلَانُ تَوْكِيدًا وَذَا بِمَنْزِلَةِ
قَوْلِ الْعَرَبِ هَاءٌ وَهَاءُكَ وَهَاءٌ وَهَأُكَ وَبِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِكَ
حَيْهَلْ وَحَيْهَلْكَ وَكَقَوْلِهِمُ النَّجَّاءُ فَهَذِهِ الْكَافُ لَمْ
تُجِئْ عَلَمًا (س ٢٠) لِلْمَأْمُورِينَ وَالْمُنْهَيَّيْنَ الْمُضْمَرِينَ
وَلَوْ كَانَتْ عَلَمًا لِلْمُضْمَرِينَ لَكَانَ خَطَأً لِأَنَّ الْمُضْمَرِينَ
هَاهُنَا فَاعِلُونَ وَعَلَامَةُ الْمُضْمَرِينَ الْفَاعِلِينَ الْوَاوُ
كَقَوْلِكَ افْعَلُوا وَإِنَّمَا جَاءَتْ هَذِهِ الْكَافُ تَوْكِيدًا
وَتَخْصِيصًا وَلَوْ كَانَتْ اسْمًا لَكَانَ النَّجَّاءُ مُجْهَلًا لِأَنَّهُ لَا
يُضَافُ الْاسْمُ الَّذِي فِيهِ (ص ١٠٤) الْأَلْفُ وَاللَّامُ
وَيَنْبَغِي لِمَنْ زَعَمَ أَنَّهُمْ أَسْمَاءٌ أَنْ يَزْعُمَ أَنَّ كَافَ ذَاكَ اسْمٌ
فَإِذَا قَالَ ذَلِكَ لَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ بَدٌّ مِنْ أَنْ يَزْعُمَ أَنَّهَا مَجْرُورَةٌ أَوْ
مَنْصُوبَةٌ فَإِنْ كَانَتْ مَنْصُوبَةً انْبَغَى لَهُ أَنْ يَقُولَ ذَاكَ
نَفْسَكَ زَيْدٌ إِذَا أَرَادَ الْكَافُ وَيَنْبَغِي لَهُ أَنْ يَقُولَ إِنْ
كَانَتْ مَجْرُورَةٌ ذَاكَ نَفْسِكَ زَيْدٌ وَيَنْبَغِي لَهُ أَنْ يَقُولَ إِنْ
تَاءَ أَنْتَ اسْمٌ وَإِنَّمَا تَاءَ أَنْتَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ الْكَافِ وَمِمَّا يَدُلُّكَ
عَلَى أَنَّهُ لَيْسَ (س ٥) بِاسْمٍ قَوْلُ الْعَرَبِ أَرَأَيْتَكَ فُلَانًا مَا
حَالُهُ فَالتَاءُ عِلْمَةٌ الْمُضْمَرِ الْمُخَاطَبِ الْمَرْفُوعِ وَلَوْ لَمْ تُلْحَقِ الْكَافُ
كَانَتْ مُسْتِغْنِيًا كَمَا اسْتِغْنَاكَ حِينَ

the *muxāt'ab* 'the addressee' is coming towards you in response to your saying *yā zaydu* 'Hey, Zaid' and the attachment of the *kāf* [k] is as in your saying *yā zaydu* 'Hey, Zaid', to whom, were you not to say to him *yā zaydu* 'Hey, Zaid', you would have dispensed with it. The *kāf* [k] came in *ʔa-raʔayta* 'did you see' and the *nidāʔ* 'vocative' in this location are a confirmation and whatever comes in speech as a confirmation, if it were to be dropped, it would be dispensed with a great deal. Someone informed us, whom we do not accuse that he heard from the Arabs someone who says *ruwayda* (L. 10) *nafsihi* 'slowly, towards himself'. He made a *mas'dar* 'source' like his saying *fa-d'arba ʔal-riḡāba* 'strike the necks' (Sūrah XXXVII: 4) and as your saying *ʕaḍiyra ʔal-ḥayyiy* 'apologist of the compound'. An equivalent of the *kāf* [k] in *ruwayda* in meaning not in expression is *laka* 'to you' that comes after *halumma* 'let us go!' in your saying *halumma laka* 'you, let us go'. The *kāf* [k] here is *ʔism magruwr* 'a pulled name' with the *lām* [l] and the meaning is in *ʔal-tawkiyd wa ʔal-ʔixtis'ās* 'the confirmation and the specification' with the status of the *kāf* [k] that is in *ruwayda* and what is like it. It is as though he said *halumma* 'come on' then he said *ʔirādati bi-ḥāḍā laka* 'is my wish in this for you'. It has the status of *saḡyan laka* 'drinking for you'. If you so wished, you said *halumma liy* 'come, towards me' with the status of *ḥāti li* 'come to me/bring to me' and *halumma ḍāka laka* 'take, that is for you' in the status of *ʔadni ḍāka laka* 'bring that close to you'. You say of what is conjoined to an implied name in the intention (L. 15) and what is a *s'ifah* 'descriptive' for it in intention just as you say in the expressed. As to the conjoined is your saying *ruwaydakum ʔantum wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'take it easy, you and Abdulah'. It is as though you said *ʔifʕaluw ʔantum wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'Do, you and Abdulah' because the implied in the intention is *marfuwʕ* 'raised' and it follows the course of the implied whose marker you dualized in the *fi ʕl* 'action'. If you were to say *ruwaydakum fa-ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'take it easy and Abdulah' it is also raised but there is *ḡubḥun* 'unacceptability' in it, because if you were to say *ʔiḍḥab wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'go with Abdulah' there would be *ḡubḥun* 'unacceptability' in it. If you were to say *ʔiḍḥab ʔanta wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'you go and Abdulah' it is acceptable. There is an example of that in the *gurʔān fa-ʔiḍḥab ʔanta wa rabbuka fa-ḡātilā* (Sūrah V: 244) 'go you and your Lord, and you two fight' *wa ʔuskun ʔanta wa zawḡuka ʔal-gannata* (Sūrah II: 33 & VII: 19) 'you and your wife dwell in the garden'. And you say (L. 20) *ruwaydakum ʔantum ʔanfusuum* 'take it easy, you yourselves'.

كان المخاطبُ مقبلاً عليك عن قولك يا زيدٌ ولحاقُ الكاف كقولك يا زيدٌ لمن لو لم تقل له يا زيدٌ استغنيتَ فإنها جاءت الكاف في رأيَت والنداءُ في هذا الموضع توكيداً وما يجيء في الكلام توكيداً لو طُرِحَ كان مستغنىً عنه كثيراً وحدثنا من لا ننتهم أنه سمع من العرب من يقول رُويدَ (س ١٠) نفسه جعله مصدراً كقوله فَضْرَبَ الرَّقَابِ وكقولك عَذِيرَ الْحَيِّ ونظيرُ الكاف في رُويدَ في المعنى لا في اللفظ لك التي تجيء بعد هَلُمَّ في قولك هَلُمَّ لك فالكاف ههنا اسمٌ مجرور باللام والمعنى في التوكيد والاختصاص بمنزلة الكاف التي في رُويدَ وما أشبهها كأنه قال هَلُمَّ ثم قال إرادتي بهذا لك فهو بمنزلة سَقِيًا لك وإن شئت قلت هَلُمَّ لي بمنزلة هَاتِ لي وهَلُمَّ ذاك لك بمنزلة أذِن ذاك لك وتقول فيما يكون معطوفاً على الاسم المضمَر في النيَّة (س ١٥) وما يكون صفة له في النيَّة كما تقول في المظهر أمَّا المعطوف فكقولك رُويدَكم أنتم وعبُد الله كأنك قلت إفعلوا أنتم وعبُد الله لأن المضمَر في النيَّة مرفوع فهو يجري مجرى المضمَر الذي تُنبت علامته في الفعل فإن قلت رُويدَكم وعبُد الله فهو أيضاً رفعٌ وفيه قُبْحٌ لأنك لو قلت إذهب وعبُد الله كان فيه قُبْحٌ فإذا قلت إذهب أنت وعبُد الله حَسَنٌ ومثل ذلك في القرآن فَادْهَبْ أَنْتَ وَرَبُّكَ فَقَاتِلَا وَأَسْكُنْ أَنْتَ وَرَوْجُكَ الْجَنَّةَ وتقول (س ٢٠) رُويدَكم أنتم أنفُسكم

Here speech is acceptable. It is as though you said *ʔifʕaluw ʔantum ʔanfusukusm* ‘act, you yourselves’. If you were to say *ruwaydakum ʔanfusukusm* ‘take it easy yourselves’ *rafʕta* ‘you raised’ and there is *cubhun* ‘unacceptability’ in it. Since you saying *ʔifʕaluw ʔanfusukusm* ‘you do yourselves’ has in it *cubhun* ‘unacceptability’. If you were to say *ʔantum ʔanfusukusm* ‘you yourselves’, speech becomes acceptable (P. 104).

You say *ruwaydakum ʔagma ʕuwn* ‘Take it easy, all of you’ and *ruwaydakum ʔantum ʔagma ʕuwn* ‘you take it easy, all together’ it is all acceptable, because it is acceptable when the implied has a marker (in the *fi ʕl* ‘action’). Don’t you see that you say *ʕuwmuw ʔagma ʕuwn* ‘get up, all together’ and *ʕuwmuw ʔantum ʔagma ʕuwn* ‘you, get up, altogether’. Similarly, *ruwayda* ‘slowly’, if you were not to attach a *kāf* [k] to it, it follows this course’. And similarly, the *ħuruwf* ‘words’ that are *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ for action. All of them follow this course, whether the *kāf* [k] is attached to them or not, except that *halumma* ‘let us go’ if *laka* ‘to you’ follows it, if you were so to wish you related (L. 5) *ʔagma ʕiyn* ‘all’ and *nafsaka* ‘yourself’ to the *kāf* [k] that is *magruwrah* ‘pulled’, and you say *halumma lakum ʔagma ʕiyn* ‘let all of you come’, and *halumma lakum ʔanfusikum* ‘let you, yourselves, come’. It is not permitted that you conjoin to the *kāf* [k] whose *ʔism* ‘name’ is *magruwr* ‘pulled’, because you don’t conjoin the *muḏʕhar* ‘expressed’ to the *muḏʕmar* ‘implied’ that is *magruwr* ‘pulled’. Don’t you see that it is permitted for you to say *hāḏā laka nafsika* ‘this is for you, yourself’ and *lakum ʔagma ʕiyn* ‘to you all’, but it is not permitted for you to say *hāḏā laka wa ʔaxiyka* ‘this is for you and your brother’. If you so wished, you made the *sʕifah* ‘descriptive’ and the *ma ʕuwf* ‘conjoined’ related to the *ʔal-muḏʕmar ʔal-marfuwʕ* ‘the raised that is implied’ in the *niyyah* ‘intention’. So you say *halumma laka ʔanta wa ʔaxuwka* ‘come this way, you and your brother’. And *halumma lakum ʔagma ʕuwn* ‘come, all of you, altogether’. It is as though you said *ta ʕālaw ʔantum ʔagma ʕuwn* ‘come, all of you altogether’ and *ta ʕāla ʔanta wa ʔaxuwka* ‘come, you and your brother’. If you were not to attach *laka* ‘to you’, it would follow the course of *ruwayda*. ‘slowly’.

فيحسن الكلام كأنك قلت إفعلوا أنتم أنفسكم فإن قلت رويدكم أنفسكم رفعت وفيها قُبْحٌ لأن قولك إفعلوا أنفسكم فيها قُبْحٌ فإذا قلت أنتم أنفسكم حسن الكلام (ص ١٠٥).

وتقول رويدكم أجمعون ورويدكم أنتم أجمعون كلُّ حسنٌ لأنه يحسن في المضمر الذي له علامة ألا ترى أنك تقول قوموا أجمعون وقوموا أنتم أجمعون وكذلك رويد إذا لم تلحق فيها الكاف تجري هذا المجرى وكذلك الحروف التي هي أسماءٌ للفعل جميعاً تجري هذا المجرى لحقتها الكاف أو لم تلحقها إلا أن هلمَّ إذا لحقتها لك فإن شئت حملت (س ٥) أجمعين ونفسك على الكاف المجرورة فتقول هلمَّ لكم أجمعين وهلمَّ لكم أنفسكم ولا يجوز أن تعطف على الكاف المجرورة الاسم لأنك لا تعطف المظهر على المضمر المجرور ألا ترى أنه يجوز لك أن تقول هذا لك نفسك ولكم أجمعين ولا يجوز أن تقول هذا لك وأخيك وإن شئت جعلت الصفة والمعطوف على المضمر المرفوع في النية فتقول هلمَّ لك أنت وأخوك وهلمَّ لكم أجمعون كأنك قلت تعالوا أنتم أجمعون وتعال أنت وأخوك فإن لم تلحق لك جرت مجرى رويد.

Chapter 49. This is a chapter on the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ in which the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ was named with *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ that are *mudʿāfatīn* ‘annexed’ and are not taken from examples of the *ʔal-fi ʔl ʔal-hādiʔ* ‘the occurring action’

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.126-128, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 105-107, Haruwn vol.1. p. 248-253)

(I. Chapter 49. P. 105. L. 11) Rather they have the status of singular names that were related to the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ like *ruwayda* ‘slowly’ and *hayyahala* ‘come hither’ and their course is one and their location in speech is *ʔal-ʔamru wa ʔal-naḥyu* ‘the imperative and the prohibitive’ if they are aimed at the *ʔal-muxātʿab ʔal-maʔmuwr* ‘the commanded addressee’ and *ʔal-manḥiyy* ‘the prohibited’. They and *ruwayda* and what is like *ruwayda* have become equivalent just as the singular and the annexed have become equivalent, if they are two names like *ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi wa zaydin* ‘Abdulah and Zaid’. (L. 15) Their courses in Arabic are equivalent. Of them requires *ʔal-maʔmuwra* ‘the commanded’ and *ʔal-maʔmuwra bihi* ‘what is commanded’ and of them requires *ʔal-manḥiyya* ‘the prohibited’ and *ʔal-manḥiyya ʕanhu* ‘what is prohibited’ and some of them require neither *ʔal-maʔmuwra wa lā ʔal-manḥiyya* ‘the commanded nor the prohibited’. As to the one which requires *ʔal-maʔmuwra* ‘the commanded’ and *ʔal-maʔmuwra bihi* ‘what is commanded’ is your saying *ʕalayka zaydan* ‘take care of Zaid’, *duwnaka zaydan* ‘Zaid is beneath you’ and *ʕindaka zaydan* ‘keep Zaid with you’. You command him to do it. ʔabu ʔal-xattāb told us about this. As to what requires *ʔal-manḥiyya* ‘the prohibited’ and *ʔal-manḥiyya ʕanhu* ‘what is prohibited’ is like your saying *ḥaḍaraka zaydan* ‘be on guard against Zaid’ and *ḥaḍarika zaydan* ‘beware of Zaid’. We heard them from the Arabs. As for what transitivizes neither *ʔal-maʔmuwra wa lā ʔal-manḥiyya* ‘the commanded nor the prohibited’ is your saying *makānaka wa ba ʕdaka* ‘your place and behind you’, if (L. 20) you were to say *taʔaxxar* ‘be delayed’ or *ḥaḍḍartahu ʕayʔan xalfahu* ‘you warned him of something behind him’. Similarly, *ʕindaka* ‘with you’ if you were warning him that something was present to him or you were commanding him that he come forward. Similarly, *faraʕaka* ‘don’t be wasteful’, if you were warning him that something was present to him or you were commanding him that he come forward and like it is *ʔamāmaka* ‘in front of you’ if you were warning him or showing him something.

(٤٩) هذا بابٌ من الفعلِ سُمِّيَ الفعلُ
فيه بأسماءٍ مُضافةٍ ليست
من أمثلةِ الفعلِ الحادثِ

(م ١ ب ٤٩ . ص ١٠٤ . س ١١) ولكنها بمنزلة
الأسماء المفردة التي كانت للفعل نحو رُوَيْدَ وَحَيْهَلْ
ومجرهِنَّ واحد وموضعُهُنَّ من الكلام الأَمْرُ والنهْيُ
إذا كانت للمخاطب المأمور والمنهْيِ وإنما استوت هي
وَرُوَيْدَ وما أَشَبَهُ رُوَيْدَ كما استوى المفردُ والمُضَافُ إذا
كانا اسمَيْنِ نحو عبدِ اللهِ وزيدِ (س ١٥) مجرهما في
العربيَّةِ سواءً ومنها ما يتعدى المأمورَ إلى مأمور به
ومنها ما يتعدى المنهْيِ إلى المنهْيِ عنه ومنها ما لا
يتعدى المأمورَ ولا المنهْيِ أمَّا ما يتعدى المأمورَ إلى
مأمورٍ به فهو قولك عَلَيكَ زيداً ودُونَكَ زيداً وَعِنْدَكَ
زيداً تَأْمُرُهُ به حَدَّثْنَا بذلك أبو الخطَّابِ وأمَّا ما تعدى
المنهْيِ إلى منهْيٍ عنه فقولك حَدَرَكَ زيداً وَحَدَّارِكَ
زيداً سمعناهما من العرب وأمَّا ما لا يتعدى المأمورَ
ولا المنهْيِ فقولك مكانك وبعْدَكَ إذا (س ٢٠) قلت
تَأَخَّرَ أو حَدَّرْتَهُ شيئاً خَلْفَهُ كذلك عِنْدَكَ إذا كنت
تُحَدِّرُهُ من بين يديه شيئاً أو تَأْمُرُهُ أن يتقدَّم وكذلك
فَرَطَكَ إذا كنت تحدِّرُهُ من بين يديه شيئاً أو تَأْمُرُهُ أن
يتقدَّم ومثلها أمامك إذا كنت تحدِّرُهُ أو تبصِّرُهُ شيئاً

And *ʔilayka* ‘for you’ if you were to say *tanahħha* ‘step aside’, *warāʔaka* ‘behind you!’ if you meant *ʔuftʔun limā xalfaka* ‘be alert to what is behind you’. *ʔabuw ʔal-xattāb* informed us that he heard from the Arabs whom is spoken to *ʔilayka* ‘to/for you’ (P. 106), he says *ʔilayya* ‘to me’. It is as though it was said to him *tanahħha* ‘step aside’ and he said *ʔatanahħha* ‘I will step aside’. *Duwniy* ‘to me’ and *ʔalayya* ‘to me’ are not said’ but we heard it in this word only and it does not have power of the *fi ʔil* ‘action’ to pattern on. Know that these annexed *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ have the status of singular names in *ʔatʔf* ‘conjunction’ and *sʔifāt* ‘descriptives’ and what is unacceptable and acceptable of them is because *ʔal-fā ʔil ʔal-maʔmuwr wa ʔal-fā ʔil ʔal-manhiyy* ‘the commanded operator and the prohibited operator’ in this chapter/case *mudʔmirān* ‘are both implied’ in the intention. And it is not permitted that you say *ruwaydahu zaydan* ‘slow him down Zaid’, and *duwnahu ʔamran* ‘take him, Amr’. He intends with it (L. 5) other than the *muxātʔab* ‘addressee’ because it is not a *fi ʔil* ‘action’ nor does it inflect with its inflections. Someone who heard it told me that some of them said *ʔalayhi ragulan laysaniy* ‘a man against him, it is not me’. This is rare. They likened it to *fi ʔil* ‘an action’. It is permitted that you say *ʔalaykum ʔanfusiikum* ‘take care of yourselves’ and *ʔagma ʔiyn* ‘mind yourselves’. You relate it to the implied that is *magruwr* ‘pulled with an [i]’ which you mentioned for *muxātʔabah* ‘addressing’, just as you related it to *laka* ‘for you’ when you mentioned it after *halumma* ‘come, let us!’ and you do not relate it to the implied *fā ʔil* ‘operator’ in the intention. That is permitted. It proves to you that if you were to say *ʔalayka* ‘to you’ you have implied *fā ʔil* ‘an operator’ in the intention and that the *kāf* [k] is for *muxātʔabah* ‘addressing’ in your saying *ʔalayya zaydan* ‘Zaid is your responsibility’ But (L. 10) you introduced the *yāʔ* [y] like your saying to *ʔal-maʔmuwr* ‘the commanded’ *ʔawliny zaydan* ‘give me Zaid’. If you were to say *ʔanta nafsuka* ‘you yourself’, it cannot be but *rafʔan* ‘raise with [u]’. If he were to say *ʔanā nafsiy* ‘I myself’, it cannot be except *garran* ‘pull with [i]’. Don’t you see that the *yāʔ* [y] and the *kāf* [k] come to separate between *ʔal-maʔmuwr wa ʔal-ʔamr* ‘what is the commanded and the command’ in *muxātʔabah* ‘addressing’. If he were to say *ʔalayka zaydan* ‘Zaid is your’ it is as though he said to him *ʔiʔti zaydan* ‘bring Zaid’. Don’t you see that *ʔal-maʔmuwr* ‘the commanded’ has two names, one name for *muxātʔabah* ‘addressing’ that is *magruwr* ‘pulled with [i]’

وإليك إذا قلت تَنَحَّ ووراءك إذا قلت أَفْطُنُ لما خَلْفَكَ وحدثنا أبو الخطاب أنه سمع من العرب من يقال له إِيْلِكَ (ص ١٠٦) فيقول إِيْلَى كأنه قيل له تَنَحَّ فقال أَتَنَحَّى ولا يُقال دوني ولا على هذا إنما سمعناه في هذا الحرف وحده وليس لها قوَّة الفعل فيُقاسَ واعلم أن هذه الأسماء المضافة بمنزلة الأسماء المفردة في العطف والصفات وفيما قَبِحَ فيها وحسُنَ لأنَّ الفاعل المأمور والفاعل المنهي في هذا الباب مضميران في النيَّة ولا يجوز أن تقول رُوَيْدُهُ زَيْدًا ودُوْنُهُ عَمْرًا وأنت تريد (س ٥) به غيرِ المخاطَب لأنه ليس بفعل ولا يتصرَّف تصرُّفَهُ. وحدثني من سمعه أن بعضهم قال عليه رجلاً لِيَسْنِي وهذا قليل شَبَّهه بالفعل وقد يجوز أن تقول عليكم أَنْفُسِكُمْ وأجمعين فتحمله على المضمير المجرور الذي ذكرته للمخاطبة كما حملته على لك حين ذكرتها بعد هَلُمَّ ولم تحمّل على المضمير الفاعل في النيَّة فجاز لك ويدلُّك على أنك إذا قلت عَلَيَّكَ فقد أضمرت فاعلاً في النيَّة وإنما الكافُ للمخاطبة قولك عَلَيَّ زَيْدًا وإنما (س ١٠) أدخلت الياء على مثل قولك للمأمور أُولَيْني زَيْدًا فلو قلت أنت نفسك لم يكن إلَّا رفعاً ولو قال أنا نفسي لم يكن إلَّا جراً ألا ترى أن الياء والكاف إنما جاءتا لتفصلاً بين المأمور والأمر في المخاطبة وإذا قال عليك زَيْدًا فكأنه قال له إِيْتِ زَيْدًا ألا ترى أن للمأمور اسمين اسماً للمخاطبة مجروراً

and its *ʔismahu ʔal-fāʔil* ‘its name is the actor’ that is implied in the intention, just as it was that there is a name as an actor implied in the intention when he said *ʔalayya* ‘to me’. If you were to say *ʔalayka* ‘to you’ it has two names a *magruwr* ‘pulled with [i]’ and a *marfuwʔ* ‘raised with [u]’ and it is not acceptable that you say (L. 15) *ʔalayka wa ʔaxiyka* ‘to you and your brother’, just as it is not acceptable to say *halumma* ‘let us go’ to you and your brother’. Similarly, *ħaḏaraka* ‘warning’ it proves to you that *ħaḏaraka* ‘warning’ has the status of *ʔalayka* ‘to you’. Your saying *taħḏiyriy zaydan* ‘warning me against Zaid’. If you wanted *ħaḏḏirniy zaydan* ‘warn me against Zaid’. The *masʔdar* ‘origin’ and others in this chapter/case are equivalent. Whoever makes *ruwaydan* ‘slowly!’ *masʔdaran* ‘origin’ he said *ruwaydaka nafsika* ‘slowing down yourself’ if he wishes to relate *nafsaka* ‘yourself’ to the *kāf* [k], just as he said *ʔalayka nafsika* ‘keep to yourself’ when he related the *kalām* ‘speech’ to the *kāf* [k]. If you were to relate *nafsaka* ‘yourself’ (L. 20) to the *kāf* [k], *gararta* ‘you pulled with [i]’, and if you relate it to the implied in the intention you raised with [u]. Similarly, *ruwaydakum* ‘you-p slow down’ if you intend the *kāf* [k], you said *ruwaydakum ʔagma ʔiyina* ‘take it easy, all of you’. As for the saying of the Arabs *ruwaydaka nafsaka* ‘slow down, yourself’, they give *ʔal-nafs* ‘the self’ the status of *ʔabdi ʔal-lāhi*, if you were to command him with it. It is as though you said *ruwaydaka ʔabda ʔal-lāhi* ‘slow down, Abdulah’ if you wanted *ʔarwid ʔabda ʔal-lāhi* ‘slow down Abdulah’. As to *ħayyahalaka* and *hāʔaka* and their sisters, they include nothing except what we have mentioned because they were not made *masʔādir* ‘origins’. Know that people among the Arabs give *halumma* ‘Come, let us’ the status of the examples that were derived from the *fi ʔil* ‘action’. They say (L. 25) *halummiy* ‘come you-fs, *halummā* ‘come you-d,’ *halummuw* ‘come-you-pl’. Know that you do not say *duwniy* ‘I take’, like you said *ʔalayya* ‘to me’ because not every *fi ʔil* ‘action’ (P. 107) has the status of *ʔawlīny* ‘give me’. It may require *mafʔuwlayn* ‘two acted-upons’. As to *ʔalayya* ‘to me’ has the status of *ʔawlīny*, and *duwnaka* has the status of *xuḏ* ‘take!’ You do not say *ʔaxiḏniy dirhaman* ‘censure me a dirham’ nor *xuḏniy dirhaman* ‘take me a dirham’.

واسمه الفاعل المضمر في النية كما كان اسم فاعل
مضمر في النية حين قلت على فإذا قلت عليك فله
اسمان مجرور ومرفوع ولا يحسن أن تقول (س ١٥)
عليك وأخيك كما لا يحسن أن تقول هلم لك وأخيك
وكذلك حذرك يدل على أن حذرك بمنزلة عليك
قولك تحذيري زيدا إذا أردت حذري زيدا بالمصدر
وغيره في هذا الباب سواء ومن جعل زويداً مصدراً
قال زويدك نفسك إذا أراد أن يحمل نفسك على الكاف
كما قال عليك نفسك حين حمل الكلام على الكاف
وهي مثل حذرك سواء إذا جعلت مصدراً لأن الحذر
مصدر وهو مضاف إلى الكاف فإن حملت نفسك (س
٢٠) على الكاف جررت وإن حملته على المضمر في النية
رفعت وكذلك زويدكم إذا أردت الكاف تقول
زويدكم أجمعين وأما قول العرب زويدك نفسك فإنهم
يجعلون النفس بمنزلة عبد الله إذا أمرته به كأنك قلت
زويدك عبد الله إذا أردت أروذ عبد الله وأما حيهلك
وهاءك وأخواتها فليس فيها إلا ما ذكرنا لأنهن لم
يُجعلن مصادراً واعلم أن ناساً من العرب يجعلون هلم
بمنزلة الأمثلة التي أخذت من الفعل يقولون (س
٢٥) هلمى وهلموا وهلموا واعلم أنك لا تقول دوني
كما قلت على لأنه ليس كل فعل يجيء (ص ١٠٧)
بمنزلة أولني قد تعدى إلى مفعولين فإنما على بمنزلة
أولني ودونك بمنزلة حذ لا تقول آخذني درهماً ولا
خذي درهماً

Know that it is not permitted for you to say *ṣalayhi zaydan* ‘against him, Zaid’ when you want by it the *ʔamr* ‘imperative’, just as you wanted that from the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ when you said *li-yad^srib zaydan* ‘let him hit Zaid’ because *ṣalayhi* ‘to him’ is not from the *fi ʔl* ‘action’. Similarly, *ḥaḍarahu zaydan* ‘he warned him Zaid’ is *gabiḥatun* ‘unacceptable’ because it is not of the examples of the *fi ʔl* ‘action’. My warning of Zaid occurred (L. 5) because the *mas^sdar* ‘origin’ is inflected with the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ and becomes *ḥaḍaraka* ‘he warned you’ in location of *ʔiḥḍar* ‘warning!’ and *taḥḍiryi* ‘my warning’ is in the location of *ḥaḍḍirniy* ‘warn me’. The *mas^sdar* ‘origin’ is always in the location of its *fi ʔl* ‘action’. *Duwnaka* ‘take’ does not derived from the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ nor does *ʔindaka* ‘with you’, but it ends with it where the Arabs ended it. Know that it is unacceptable *zaydan ṣalayka* ‘Zaid is to you’ and *zaydan ḥaḍaraka* ‘Zaid warned against you’ because they are not the examples of the *fi ʔl* ‘action’. So it is unacceptable that what is not of the examples to follow its course except that you say *zaydan* ‘Zaid’ so you erect with [a] due to your implication of the *fi ʔl* ‘action’, then you mention *ṣalayka* ‘to you’ after that. This does not have the strength of the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ because it is not a *fi ʔl* ‘action’ (L. 10) nor does it inflect with the inflection of the *fā ʔil* ‘actor’ that has the meaning of *yafṣalu* ‘he acts’.

واعلم أنه لا يجوز لك أن تقول عَلَيْهِ زيداً تريد به الأمر كما أردت ذلك في الفعل حين قلت لِيَضْرِبُ زيداً لأن عَلَيْهِ ليس من الفعل وكذلك حَذَرُهُ زيداً قبيحةٌ لأنها ليست من أمثلة الفعل فإنما جاء تحذيري زيداً (س ٥) لأن المصدر يتصرف مع الفعل فيصيرُ حَذَرَكَ في موضعٍ إِحْذَرُ وتحذيري في موضعٍ حَذَرْنِي فالمصدرُ أبداً في موضعٍ فَعَلِهِ ودُونَكَ لم يُؤْخَذْ من فعلٍ ولا عِنْدَكَ فإنما تَنْتَهِي فيها حيث انتهت العربُ واعلم أنه يقبح زيداً عَلَيْهِ زيداً حَذَرَكَ لأنه ليس من أمثلة الفعل فقَبَحَ أن يجري ما ليس من الأمثلة مجراها إلا أن تقول زيداً فتَنْصِبُ بإضمارك الفعلَ ثم تَذَكَّرُ عليك بعد ذلك فليس يَقْوَى هذا قوَّةَ الفعل لأنه ليس بفعل (س ١٠) ولا يَتَصَرَّفُ تصرَّفَ الفاعل الذي في معنى يَفْعَلُ.

Chapter 50. This is a chapter in which the *ʔamr* ‘imperative’ and the *nahyiy* ‘prohibitive’ affect the application of the expressed *fi ʔl* ‘action’ if you were to know that the person can dispense with your expression of the *fi ʔl*

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.128-129, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 107-109, Haruwn vol.1. p. 253-256)

(I. P. 107. L. 11) And that is in your saying *zayd-an wa ʔamr-an wa raʔsahu* ‘Zaid, Amr and his head’. That is because you saw a man *yad^ʔribu* ‘striking’ or *yaʔtim* ‘insulting’ or *yactulu* ‘killing’ and you were content with what he was doing in his action that you express to him his action, so you said (L. 15) *Zayd-an* ‘Zaid’ that *ʔawci ʔamalaka bi-zaydin* ‘execute your action on Zaid’; or you saw a man saying *ʔad^ʔribu ʔarra ʔal-nāsi* ‘I strike the evil of people’ so you say *zayd-an* ‘Zaid’; or you saw *ragulan yuhaddi ʔu hadiy ʔ-an* ‘a man recounting an account’ then he interrupted it, so you said *ʔadiy ʔaka* ‘your account’; or a man having returned from a trip so you said *ʔadiy ʔaka* ‘your account’. You dispensed with the *fi ʔl* ‘action’ with his knowing that he was asked to report. On account of this, this and its likes are permissible. As for the *nahyu* ‘prohibition’, it is *ʔal-tah^ʔḏ^ʔiy^ʔ* ‘the warning’, as in your saying *ʔal-ʔasada ʔal-ʔasada* ‘the lion, the lion’ and *ʔal-gidāra ʔal-gidāra* ‘the wall, the wall’ and *ʔal-s^ʔabiyya ʔal-s^ʔabiyya* ‘the little boy, the little boy’. You have forbidden him from approaching the leaning, threatenig wall or coming near the lion or stepping on the boy. If he so wished, he expressed in these things (L. 20) what he implied by the action and he would say *ʔid^ʔrib zaydan* ‘hit Zaid’ and *ʔuʔtum ʔamran* ‘cuss Amr’ and *lā taw^ʔi ʔal-s^ʔabiyya* ‘don’t step on the boy’ and *ʔih^ʔdir ʔal-gidāra* ‘beware of the wall’ and *lā taʔrab ʔal-ʔasada* ‘don’t come near the lion’. Of it also is his saying *ʔal-t^ʔariyca ʔal-t^ʔariyca* ‘the road, the road’. If he so wished, he said *xalli ʔal-t^ʔariyca* ‘abandon the road’ or *tanah^ʔha ʔani ʔal-tariyca* ‘get off the road’. Gariyr said: (basiyt^ʔ)⁶

*Xalli ʔal-t^ʔariyca li-man yabniy ʔal-manāra bi-hi
Wa- ʔubruz bi-barzata hay ʔu ʔid^ʔt^ʔarraka ʔal-gadar*

‘Get off the road for the one who builds a landmark on it
And stand out where fate obliges you’

(٥٠) هذا بابٌ ما جرى من الأمر والنهي
على إضمار الفعل المستعمل إظهاره إذا
علمت أن الرجل مُستغنٍ عن لفظك بالفعل

(م ١. ب ٥٠. ص ١٠٧. س ١١) وذلك قولك: زيداً
وعمرأ ورأسه وذلك أنك رأيت رجلاً يضرب أو
يشتيم أو يقتل فاكتفيت بما هو فيه من عمله أن تلفظه له
بعمله فقلت (س ١٥) زيداً أي أوقع عملك بزيداً أو
رأيت رجلاً يقول أضرب شر الناس فقلت زيداً أو
رأيت رجلاً يحدث حديثاً فقطعه فقلت حديثك أو قدم
رجلٌ من سفرٍ فقلت حديثك استغنيت عن الفعل
بعلمه أنه مستخبرٌ فعلى هذا يجوز هذا وما أشبهه وأما
النهي فإنه التحذير كقولك الأسد الأسد والجدار
الجدار والصبي الصبي فإنما نهيتَه أن يقرب الجدار
المخوف المائل أو يقرب الأسد أو يوطئ الصبي وإن
شاء أظهرَ في هذه الأشياء (س ٢٠) ما أضمر من
الفعل فقال اضرب زيداً واشتم عمرأ ولا توطئ
الصبي وأحذر الجدار ولا تقرب الأسد ومنه أيضاً
قوله الطريق الطريق إن شاء قال خل الطريق أو تنح
عن الطريق قال جرير (بسيط):

خَلَّ الطريقَ لمن يبني المنارَ به

وابرُزُ ببرزة حيث اضطرَّك القدرُ

⁶ The meter for basiyt^ʔ is: *mustaf ʔilun fā ʔilun mustaf ʔilun fa ʔilun* (twice).

(P. 108) It is not permitted to imply *tanahha sani pal-tariyg* 'leave off from the road' because the *gārr* 'what pulls with [i]' does not include implication and that is because the *magruwr* 'the thing pulled with [i]' is integral to *gārr* 'what pulls' not separable from it, so it becomes as though a piece of the *ḥism* 'name' because it follows the *tanwiyn* 'nutation'. But if *ḥad'marta* 'you were to imply', you implied what is of its meaning of what is connected with other than the particle of *annexion* as you did before. Know that you are not permitted to say *zayd-un* 'Zaid' and you wanted to say *li-yud^ḥrab zayd-un* 'that Zaid be struck' or *li-yad^ḥrib zayd-un* 'let Zaid strike' if it is *fā ḥil* 'actor' and not *zayd-an* 'Zaid' (L. 5) and when you want *li-yad^ḥrib ḥamrun zayd-an* 'let Amr strike Zaid'. And *zayd-un ḥamr-an* 'Zaid, Amr' is not permitted if you are not addressing Zaid. If you were to want *li-yad^ḥrib zayd-un ḥamr-an* 'that Zaid strike Amr' and you are addressing me. When you want that I inform him about you that you have commanded him to strike Amr, with Zaid and Amr being absent. It is not possible that you imply the *fi ḥil* 'action' of the one absent (3rd person). Nor is *zayd-an* permissible when you want me that I inform him about you that he *ḥan yad^ḥriba zaydan* 'strike Zaid' for if you were to imply the *fi ḥil* 'action' of the *ḡā ḥib* 'one absent' that the *sāmi ḥ ṣāhid* 'hearer observer' if you were to say *zayd-an* 'Zaid' you are commanding him concerning Zaid. They disliked the confusion here like their disliking it in what is not (L. 10) derived from the *fi ḥil* 'action' like *ḥalayka* 'to you' that they say *ḥalayhi zayd-an* 'Zaid to him' lest it be likened to what is not derived from the likes of the *fi ḥil* 'action', with the *fi ḥil* 'action'. They disliked this about the confusion and it became weak when you do not address the *ma ḥmuwra* 'person commanded' just as they disliked that and is rendered weak that *ḥalayka* and *ruwayda* are likened to the *fi ḥil* 'action'. These are arguments that have been heard from the Arabs and from those who are trusted claiming thereby that he heard them from the Arabs.

And of those is the saying of the Arabs, in one of their proverbs, *ḥal-lāhumma d^ḥabu ḥ-an wa ḥi ḥb-an* 'Please God a hyena and a wolf', if he were to call that on the sheep of a man. If you were to ask them what they meant, they would say *ḥal-lāhumma ḥigma ḥ ḥaw ḥig ḥal fiyhā* (L. 15) *d^ḥabu ḥ-an wa ḥi ḥb-an* 'Please God, bring together or make come about a hyena and a wolf with them'. All of them explain what it means. Its explanation was easy for them,

(ص ١٠٨) ولا يجوز أن تُضمَر تَنَحَّ عن الطريق لأنَّ الجارَّ لا يُضمَرُ وذلك أنَّ المجرورَ داخلٌ في الجارِّ غيرُ مُنفصلٍ فصار كأنه شيء من الاسم لأنه معاقبٌ للتونين ولكنك إن أضمرت أضمرت ما هو في معناه ممَّا يصلُّ بغير حرفٍ إضافةٍ كما فعلتَ فيما مضى واعلم أنَّه لا يجوز أن تقول زيدٌ وأنت تريد أن تقول ليضرب زيدٌ أو ليضرب زيدٌ إذا كان فاعلاً ولا زيداً (س ٥) وأنت تريد ليضرب عمرو زيداً ولا يجوز زيداً عمراً إذا كنتَ لا تُخاطبُ زيداً إذا أردتَ ليضربَ زيداً عمراً وأنت تُخاطبُني فإتِّمَّ تريد أن أبلغه أنا عنك أنك قد أمرته أن يضربَ عمرو زيداً وعمرو غائبان فلا يكون أن تُضمَرَ فعلُ الغائبِ وكذلك لا يجوز زيداً وأنت تريد أن أبلغه أنا عنك أن يضربَ زيداً لأنك إذا أضمرت فعل الغائب ظنَّ السامعُ الشاهد إذا قلتَ زيداً أنك تأمره هو بزيد فكرهوا الالتباس هنا ككراهيتهم فيما لم (س ١٠) يُؤخذ من الفعل نحو عَلَيْكَ أن يقولوا عليه زيداً لئلا يشبه ما لم يُؤخذ من أمثلة الفعل بالفعل وكرهوا هذا في الالتباس وضعفَ حيث لم تُخاطب المأمور كما كرهه وضعف أن يشبه عَلَيْكَ ورؤيدَ بالفعل وهذه حُججٌ سمعت من العرب ومَن يوثق به يزعم أنه سمعها من العرب.

من ذلك قول العرب في مثلٍ من أمثالهم اللَّهُمَّ ضَبْعاً وَذَبْأً إذا كان يدعو بذلك على غنم رجل وإذا سألتهم ما يعنون قالوا اللَّهُمَّ اجْمَعْ أو اجْعَلْ فيها (س ١٥) ضَبْعاً وَذَبْأً وكلهم يفسر ما ينوي وإنما سهل تفسيره

عندهم

because the *mudʿmar* ‘implied’ may be used in this location by means of expression. *ʔabuw ʔal-xattāb* told us that he heard some of the Arabs and it was said to him *lima ʔafsadtum makānakum hādā* ‘why did you spoil your place’. And he said *ʔal-sʿibyāna bi-ʔabiy* ‘the boys, by my father’. It is as though he was cautious not to be blamed so he said *lumi ʔal-sʿibyāna* ‘blame the boys’. One who is trusted told us what some of the Arabs had said to them *ʔa-mā bi-makāni kaḏā wa kaḏā wagḏun* ‘is not there in such and such a place a water hole’ which is a place that holds water. So he said *balā wigāḏan* ‘yes water holes’; that is to say ‘I know of them as wigāḏan. Of that is the saying of the poet and he is *ʔal-miskiyn*: (tʿawiyl)⁷

ʔaxāka ʔaxāka ʔinna man lā ʔaxā lahu
Ka-sā ʕin ʔilā ʔal-haygā bi-ʔayri silāhi

‘Your brother your brother whoever has no brother’
Is like the one who goes into battle without a weapon’

It is as though he wants *ʔilzam ʔaxāka* ‘hold on to your brother’. Of that is your saying *zayd-an wa ʕamr-an* ‘Zaid and Amr’ as though (P. 109) you said strike *zayd-an wa ʕamr-an* and just as you said *ra ʔaytu zayd-an wa ʕamr-an* ‘I saw Zaid and Amr’. And of it is the saying of the Arabs *ʔamra mubkiyātika lā ʔamra mudʿhikātika* ‘it is a matter that brings you tears and not the matter that brings you laughter’ and *ʔal-ḏʿibā ʔu ʕalā ʔal-bacri* ‘the gazells on the cows’; he says *ʕalayka ʔamra mubkiyātika* ‘take heed of the matter of what makes you cry *wa xalli ʔal-ḏʿibā ʔa ʕalā ʔal-bacari* ‘and let go the gazelles against the cows’.

لأنّ المضمَر قد استعمل في هذا الموضع بإظهارٍ.
حدّثنا أبو الخطاب أنّه سمع بعض العرب وقيل له لم
أفسدتم مكانكم هذا فقال الصبيان بأبي كأنه حذر أن
يُلام فقال لم الصبيان وحدّثنا من يوثق به أن بعض
العرب قيل له أما بمكان كذا وكذا وجذّ وهو موضعٌ
يُمسك الماء فقال بلى بها وجاذاً أي فأعرف بها وجاذاً
ومن ذلك قول الشاعر وهو المسكين: (طويل)

(س ٢٠) أخاك أخاك إن من لا أخ له

كساع إلى الهيجا بغير سلاح

كأنه يريد الزم أخاك ومن ذلك قولك زيدا وعمراً
كأنك قلت إضرب زيدا وعمراً كما (س ١٠٩) قلت
زيداً وعمراً رأيت ومنه قول العرب أمر مبيكاتك لا
أمر مضحكاتك و الطباء على البقر يقول عليك أمر
مبيكاتك و خلّ الطباء على البقر.

⁷ The meter for tʿawiyl is: mafʿuwlun mafāʕilun (four times).