(Ib) In the name of God, the Compassionate and Merciful:

0.1 Our master and teacher, unique in his time, alone in his era, the Sībawayhi of his day, foremost in his period and epoch, our guide to the right path and leader in the way and the truth, whose own concision makes lengthy praise fall short, Sayyid Islam and the Muslims, heir of the Lord of Messengers, Sun of the World and the Faith, Muhammad al-Katīb as-Sīrīnī (may God have mercy upon him) said:

0.2 In the name of God, the Compassionate and Merciful, to whom we pray, God bless our Lord Muhammad, his Family and his Companions, and give them peace. Praise be to God, who exalts the case of those whose object is to observe the Faith, who make inflections of compliance before those who seek the benefits of learning, and who are inflexible in their decision that only through the Lord of the Worlds is authorship and all else made easy.

0.3 I bear witness (with the witness which comes of certitude) that there is no god but God alone, who has no partner, the Only, Sole, Single and Everlasting God who bore not, nor was born. I also testify that our Lord and Prophet Muhammad is God's Servant, Messenger, Intimate and Friend, sent to smooth our path, and distinguished by his Great Intercession on the Day of Resurrection. Peace be upon his Family, his Companions, his Wives, his Seed and the People of his House for ever and ever.
Now, Muḥammad aṣ-Ṣīrbīnī al-Ḳaṭīb, needy for the mercy of his Lord who is ever near and answers every prayer, says that the Introduction of the learned and erudite Imām, the most perspicacious teacher Muḥammad Abū Abdullah ibn Dāwūd as-Ṣanhājī, better known as Ibn ʿĀjurrūm (spelt with ' followed by ä and double r, which is a Berber expression meaning Faqīr or Ṣūfī) being one of the finest abridgements of the science of grammar ever composed and, for its size, one of the most comprehensive treatises ever written, I was asked by some of my friends to devise a commentary upon it which would unravel its terminology, elaborate its examples, clarify its obscurities and lay open its inaccessibilities, including with this some of the more appropriate comments and well-defined principles (2a) that I have already set down in my Commentary on Qatār an-nadā. So I asked Almighty God for guidance, after twofold prayers at the shrine of our Imām aṣ-Ṣīfī (may Almighty God be content with him), and, my spirits rising with the knowledge that even the best ambitions have languished and fallen short at mere paraphrases, I set to work on a commentary to gladden the eyes of the student and bring the utmost joy to beginners as well as to those of middling accomplishment, through which I hope for an abundant heavenly reward and recompense, and to be helped thereby into Paradise without prior punishment.

0.5 I have called it The ʿAjurrūmiyya’s Exposition by the Light of Intuition, and I beseech the Bounteous Lord in His grace to make it pure in His sight, that with flowing zephyrs of approval it may be blessed, for He is the most bountiful of those to whom prayers are addressed, and the mightiest on whom all our hopes rest. And I pray that my work may be as useful as the original, for many scholars have taken the trouble to write commentaries on it, which is a sign of its straightforward reliability. May God receive it in Paradise in the
Highest Heaven, among the prophets, the believers, the martyrs and the virtuous, all favourered by God, and may He do likewise with us, our parents and our loved ones, Amen.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 The author of the Ajurrūmiyya (may God have mercy on him) says:

In the name of God, the Compassionate and Merciful: beginning with bi-smī llāhi r-raḥmāni r-raḥīmi 'in the name of God, the Compassionate and Merciful', thus following the example of the Noble Qurʾān and putting into practice the words of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace), "Any serious matter (i.e. matter of importance) which does not begin with bi-smī llāhi 'in the name of God' is severed (i.e. is cut off from blessing)". Speaking with the formula bi-smī llāhi 'in the name of God' and anything else connected with it, is syntactically isolated by being mentioned in a prefatory way, and we shall not discuss it further.

1.01 Now, you must know that whoever desires to immerse himself thoroughly in a science first has to discover its definition, data, aim and use, in order to pursue the study of it in full awareness. The science that we are dealing with here is defined as a science of certain principles by which the varieties of word endings both inflectional and invariable can be known. Its data are the actual words of Arabic, because it is in these that the vowels of (2b) inflection and invariability are studied. Its aim is to help in understanding the speech of Almighty God and his Prophet (God bless him and give him
peace) and to avoid mistakes of language. Its use is the recognition of correct speech from incorrect.

1.02 After the bi-smi Ilahi 'in the name of God', some writers in this field begin directly with the topic of the word, as does Ibn Hisam in certain of his books, while others begin with speech, as does Ibn Malik, because that is the purpose of words. Our author follows Ibn Malik:

1.1 Speech (which means basically, 'This is a chapter explaining the term "speech"') has two meanings, one lexical and one technical. Its lexical meaning embraces everything which conveys information, whether it be a formal utterance such as gama zaydun 'Zayd stood' or not, such as a gesture of pointing, a wink of the eye, a nod of the head or the language of situation. Its technical meaning is that which combines in itself four features:

1.11 The author begins with the first by saying that speech is (1) a formal utterance, i.e. something uttered, using lafz 'utterance' in the meaning of mafuz 'thing uttered', just as kalq 'creature' is used in the meaning of maklq 'thing created'. An utterance is a sound composed of letters of the alphabet (which begins with ' and ends with '). A sound is made of air compressed between two objects striking against each other, and in this way gesture, writing, counting on the fingers and the language of situation are excluded.

1.12 Speech is also composite, i.e. composed of two words or more, thus excluding isolated words such as zaydun 'Zayd' and the cardinal numbers such as wahidatun 'one', itnani 'two' etc.

1.13 (3) The third feature is that it is informative, i.e. denoting a meaning which, once uttered, it is correct for the speaker to be silent
at that point in such a way that the listener will expect nothing further. If it is objected that there is, therefore, no need to state that speech is composite, since anything thus informative can only be composite, the reply is that with definitions it is not enough to mention the bare essentials and, furthermore, our author wrote this Introduction for beginners only, where bare essentials would not suffice. Through this feature are excluded all those composite utterances which are not informative by themselves, such as the annexed compound (e.g. ّCabdu lāhī 'Cabdu'llah'), the mixed compound (e.g. ba'llakku 'Baalbek'), the limiting compound (e.g. al-ḥayawānu n-nātigu 'the logical animal') and the predicative compound which is dependent upon something else (e.g. 'in qāma zaydun 'if Zayd stood').

1.14 (4) Fourthly, speech is by convention; i.e. intentional, which is to say that the speaker intends to convey information to the listener. The previous objection about the composite nature of speech can also be raised here, but the answer is the same. By this feature are excluded the speech of one who is asleep, who has lost his wits or whose tongue utters what he does not intend, as well as imitation by certain birds and such like.

1.15 Note: Within this definition fall such self-evident assertions as 'the sky is above us' and 'the earth is beneath us', except that by 'informative' the author means only that which actually conveys information, hence the above are not termed speech.

1.16 The combination of these four features is illustrated by zaydun karīmun 'Zayd is generous': it is true that this is a formal utterance because it is a sound comprising z, y, d, k, r, y, m, which are letters of the alphabet, that it is composite because it is composed
of two words, the first *zaydun* 'Zayd' and the second *karīmun* 'generous', that it is informative because it conveys information the listener did not have as long as he remained ignorant of Zayd's generosity, and that it is intentional because the speaker intended to convey information to the listener by means of this utterance.

1.2 Since every compound must needs have parts of which to be composed, the author now has to deal with the 'parts of speech', which he designates figuratively as 'subdivisions', saying, and its subdivisions i.e. the 'parts of speech' insofar as speech is composed of a combination of them, thought not necessarily of all of them at once, are three in number: (by induction and rational dichotomy), viz. the noun, the verb and the particle (to which there is no fourth).

1.21 With the inductive method scholars in this field have made thorough observations of the speech of the Arabs without finding any but these three (though al-Farrā’ is reported as claiming that the word *kallā* 'nay' is not one of the three, but belongs somewhere between nouns and verbs). As for rational dichotomy, a word either denotes a meaning (3b) intrinsically or not: the latter is then a particle and the former, being either connected with one of the three times or not, is respectively a verb or a noun.

1.22 Note: The author gives priority to the noun over the other two because it can be both a subject and a predicate, and to the verb over the particle because it can be a predicate but not a subject, and puts the particle last because of its inability to be either.

1.23 Dividing speech into these three is a division of the whole into its parts (as already shown), like the division of oxymel into vinegar and honey; it is not the same as dividing the word itself into three kinds, for this is a division of the universal into its particulars,
like the division of animal into man, horse etc. The mark of the latter division is that, unlike the former, the name of the thing divided applies to every one of its subdivisions.

1.24 The noun has three subdivisions: the pronoun, e.g. 'anā 'I', the overt noun, e.g. bakrun 'Bakr' and the vague noun, e.g. hāgā 'this'.

The verb likewise has three subdivisions: the past tense, e.g. ādaba 'he struck', the imperfect, e.g. 'he strikes' and the imperative, e.g. ēdribu 'he strikes' and the imperative, e.g. ēdribu 'strike!'.

1.25 The particle has the feature that it is an element which occurs for some grammatical meaning. This excludes the letters of the alphabet when they are part of a word, e.g. the z, y, d of zaydun 'Zayd', but not absolutely, since in other forms the letters of the alphabet can be meaningful nouns, e.g. jīmu, the name of the sound j: the proof that it is a noun is that it can take noun markers, e.g. katabtī jīman 'I wrote a j', hādīhi ī jīmu 'ahsanu min jīmika 'this j is more elegant than your j', and likewise for the rest of the alphabet. The particle also has three subdivisions: the particle common to both nouns and verbs, e.g. āl 'a', the particle peculiar to nouns, e.g. ēf 'in' and the particle peculiar to verbs, e.g. īam 'not'.

1.3 The author now turns to the markers which distinguish these three parts of speech, beginning with the nouns for the reason already given:

1.31 The noun (i.e. the first in order of subdivision) is recognized (i.e. is distinguished from the other two subdivisions) by the oblique form, which is the word-final ī produced by the operator of obliqueness, whether that operator is a particle or an annexed noun. Both kinds are found together in the expression bi-smi lāhī r-raḥmānī r-raḥīmī 'in the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful':
expression *ismi* 'name' is a noun whose nominality is recognized by its oblique (4a) ending, the prefix bi 'by, in' being its operator of obliqueness; the name of the Almighty, *allāhī*, is a noun whose nominality is recognized by its oblique ending, with the annexed noun (*ismi* 'name') as its operator of obliqueness; both 'the Compassionate' and 'the Merciful' are adjectives qualifying the name of the Almighty and concord with it in their obliqueness, and are thus both nouns whose nominality is recognized by their oblique endings, and their oblique operator is the same element which has already made the name of the Almighty oblique (though some say that their operator is the concord between them and the name of the Almighty).

1.4 The noun is also recognized by the *tanwīn*¹ on the end. The *tanwīn* is defined as the normally unvowelled *n* pronounced but not written at the end of a word and not denoting emphasis.² By the feature of vowellessness he excludes the first *n* of *dayfānun* 'parasite' (one who arrives with a guest uninvited), because this *n* is vocalized in juncture;³ it is also excluded by its orthographical feature because it is permanent in writing. The vowellessness of *tanwīn* is called a normal feature so that certain individual cases of *tanwīn* should not be excluded when they happen to be vocalized in order to avoid the clash of two unvowelled consonants, as in the Qur'anic *mağūran-u-nṣur* '... restricted. See...'⁴ By the feature of word-final pronunciation, and also by the feature of lacking a written form, the *n* within such words as *inkasa* 'it broke' and *munkasirun* 'breaking' is excluded because it is not word-final and is permanent in writing. By the feature of not being emphatic is excluded the *n* suffixed to *la-nasfā* 'we shall surely drag'⁵ (assuming the *ā* here to represent an *n* in writing).

1.41 Note: There are four kinds of *tanwīn* peculiar to the noun, viz. (1) the *tanwīn* of establishment, also called the *tanwīn* of stability and the *tanwīn* of currency.¹ This is the *tanwīn* suffixed to most fully
inflected and fully declinable nouns, whether defined, e.g. zaydun 'Zayd' or undefined, e.g. rajulun 'man'.

1.42 (2) the tanwîn (4b) of indefiniteness, which is suffixed to certain invariable nouns to denote indefiniteness, showing that no specific individual is meant, which is what the grammarians mean by 'distinguishing the defined from the undefined'. It occurs regularly with the class of proper nouns ending in wayhi, and anomalously with the class of nouns of action in hi etc. You say sibawayhi 'Sībawayhi' without tanwîn if you mean a specific person named Sībawayhi, and you say 'Ihi 'go on' (spelt with i after the h, followed by y with two dots beneath it after the h, without tanwîn) if you are requesting your listener to add to a specific statement. But if you mean anyone called Sībawayhi or an addition to any statement whatever, you add tanwîn in both cases;

1.43 (3) the tanwîn of correspondence, which is suffixed to such words as muslimātun 'female Muslims' and other plurals in āt because the Arabs have made it correspond to the āna in words like muslimîna 'male Muslims' and others which form their plural in āna and ūna;

1.44 (4) the tanwîn of compensation, which is suffixed to such words as ġawāsîn 'covers' and jawârin 'girls' among the defective plurals, in compensation for the arbitrarily elided final y (i.e. its elision denotes nothing and has no grammatical reason).
This tanwin is also suffixed to 'id 'when' in such words as yawma'idin 'on that day', as in the Qur'anic yawma'idin yafrabu l-mu'minìna 'on that day the believers shall rejoice', in compensation for the sentence to which 'id is usually annexed. Ibn Hišâm mentions in the Muğniî compensation for a single word, namely the tanwin suffixed to kullun 'all' and ba'dun 'some' when they are cut off from annexation, but this has been rejected on the grounds that the tanwin of these two is simply the tanwin of establishment, which always disappears in annexation and remains in the absence of annexation. If it is claimed that the same applies to 'id in yawma'idin 'on that day', the answer is that 'annexation' here means that which requires the formal inflection of the second element; the 'id of yawma'idin and such like is not intended here because 'id 'when' is only annexed to sentences, and indeed only occurs in annexation to sentences, so that, when it is given tanwin, you will know that this is in compensation for what has been elided, which is not the case with ba'dun 'some' and kullun 'all'.

These four kinds of tanwin are peculiar (5a) to the noun, to which some grammarians have added another six that I have already dealt with in my Commentary on Qatr an-nadā and will not go into here. One writer has collected them all into the following verses:

1.45

1.441

The kinds of their tanwin are ten, and here they are for you, divided up with the best of care: (1) establishment, (2) compensation, (3) correspondence, (4) indefiniteness, (5) redundant vocative, (6) poetic trilling, (7) verbatim quotation, (8) poetic licence, (9) metrical extravagance, (10) after hamza. But to call the last six tanwin is only a figure of speech, since they are not peculiar to the noun.
The noun is also recognized by the prefixing of *al* ‘the’, (i.e. all kinds of *al* ‘the’ except the relative *al* and the interrogative *al*) on the front of the noun, e.g. *ar-rajulu* ‘the man’, *al-farasu* ‘the horse’. Equivalent to the *l* of *al* is the *m* occasionally substituted for it, as in the saying of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace), *layya min am-birri m-siyāmu fī m-safri* ‘It is no part of piety to fast during a journey’ (related by the Imam Ahmad in his *Musnad*).

The relative *al* is sometimes prefixed to imperfect tense verbs, e.g. in the verse of al-Farazdaq addressed to one of the Banī Cūdra:

\[ mā 'anta bi-l-ḥakamī t-turḍā ḥukūmatuhu \]

\[ wa-l-ʾaṣfili wa-l-ḍī r-raʾyi wa-l-jadali \]

‘You are not the arbiter whose judgement is acceptable, nor of noble origin, sound opinion or skill in argument’. Its occurrence before imperfect tense verbs is held by most to be a poetic licence, but as elective by Ibn Malik, and I have explained both points of view in my Commentary on *Qaṭr an-nādā*.

Interrogative *al* occurs before past tense verbs, e.g. ‘*al faʿalta* synonymous with *hal faʿalta* ‘have you done?’, as related by Qurṭrub.

Note: It is well known that *al* ‘the’ is not prefixed to all nouns such as pronouns, vague nouns and most proper names, do
TEXT AND TRANSLATION 1.6-1.7

What our author means is only those nouns on which it is possible for al to appear.

1.6 The noun is also recognized by the fact that statements can be made about it, i.e. it can be the subject of predication, which is to combine it with something that completes the sense, e.g. qāma zaydun 'Zayd stood', zaydun ga'imun 'Zayd is standing', where zaydun 'Zayd' is a noun because you have predicated of it the act of standing. This particular marker is abstract, and is the most useful of the noun markers because by means of it (5b) the nominality of words which do not take al 'the' or tanwīn can be deduced, such as the tu 'I' in darabtu 'I struck': tu 'I' is a noun because you have predicated of it the act of striking, and the same applies to other pronouns, e.g. darabnā 'we struck'. Moreover there is no difference as far as predication is concerned between the abstract type just mentioned and purely formal predication such as zaydun țulāţiyyun 'zaydun is triliteral', daraba fī ǧūl mādīn 'daraba is a past tense verb' and min ḥaru jarrīn 'min is a particle of obliqueness', since predicates can only be made about verbs and particles by deeming them nouns.

1.7 Finally the noun is recognized by the occurrence of the particles of obliqueness, before it, as will be explained. Note: The gist of what the author says is that the noun markers are four, two suffixes (obliqueness and tanwīn) and two prefixes (al 'the' and the particles of obliqueness). He has reversed the natural order of putting prefixes first and suffixes second because there is so much to say about the particles. And he has joined all the noun markers by 'and' denoting absolute coordination to show that some may combine with others in the sentence, e.g. obliqueness with either al 'the' or tanwīn, though in fact there are some which do not combine, e.g. al 'the' and tanwīn. He then digresses somewhat by mentioning a number of the particles of obliqueness, and these are (i.e. the particles of obliqueness) as follows:
1.701 *min* 'from', (spelt with *i* after the *m*), whose senses include the beginning of a spacial limit, e.g. *min al-masjidi* 'from the mosque', or a temporal limit, e.g. *min 'awwali s-šahri* 'from the first of the month' and others, e.g. *min sulaymāna* 'from Solomon'; *al-masjidi* 'the mosque', *'awwali* 'first' and *sulaymāna* 'Solomon' are all nouns because *min* 'from' occurs before them;

1.702 *'ilā* 'towards', whose senses include terminal destination, e.g. *sirtu* *'ilā l-kūfati* 'I travelled to Kūfa', *al-kūfati* 'Kūfa' being a noun because *'ilā* 'towards' occurs before it;

1.703 *'an* 'from', whose senses include passing beyond, e.g. *ramaytu* *'an il-qawsi* 'I shot from the bow', *al-qawsi* 'the bow' being a noun because *'an* 'from' occurs before it;

1.704 *'alā* 'on', whose senses include superiority, either perceptibly, as in the Qur'anic *kullu man 'alayhā fānin* 'all those on it will perish', or abstractly, as in the Qur'anic *faḍḍalnā baḍḍahum* *'alā baḍḍin* 'we have made some superior over others', both *hā* 'it' and *baḍḍin* 'some others' being nouns because *'alā* 'on' occurs before them;

1.705 *fī* 'in', whose senses include being contained in space (6a) or time, as in the Qur'anic *wa-'antum ṭākifūna fī l-masjidi* 'while you are secluded in the mosques', and *udkurū l-lāha fī 'ayyāmin maḍḍātin* 'remember God on certain calculated days', both *al-masjidi* 'the mosques' and *'ayyāmin* 'days' being nouns because *fī* 'in' occurs before them;

1.706 *rubba* 'how few, how many', (spelt with *u* after the *r*), whose senses include scarcity, as in the verse:
'a-lā rubba mawlūdin wa-laysa lahu 'abun
wa-gī waladin lam yaldahu 'abawānī

"How few are born and do not have a father, and how few have children
and are not born of two parents!", referring to the Lord Jesus and the
Lord Adam (prayers and peace upon them), mawlūdin 'born' being a noun
because rubba 'how few' occurs before it;

1.707 bi 'with', whose senses include assistance, since it is prefixed to the instrument of an action, e.g. katabtu
bi-l-qalami 'I wrote with the pen', al-qalami 'the pen' being a noun
because bi 'with' occurs before it;

1.708 ka 'like', whose senses include comparison, e.g. zaydun
ka-l- 'asadi 'Zayd is like a lion', al- 'asadi 'the lion' being a noun
because ka 'like' occurs before it;

1.709 li 'for', whose senses include causation, e.g. wa- 'anzalnā
'ilayka g- 'ikra li-tubayyina li-n-nāsī 'and we sent down to you this
reminder for you to make it clear for the people' (i.e. in order that
you might make clear to them), an-nāsī 'the people' being a noun
because li 'for' appears before it;

1.710 and the particles of swearing, (spelt qasam 'swearing' with a
after the undotted s, 'meaning yamīn 'oath'). The particles of swearing
belong to the particles of obliqueness because they are prefixed to
the noun by which the oath is sworn, comprising three well-known
particles, viz.

1.711 wa, which is exclusive to overt nouns, e.g. wa-llāhi 'by God!
wa-n-najmi 'by the star!';

1.712 bi, (spelt with one dot), which is prefixed both to overt nouns,
e.g. bi-llāhi 'by God!', and to pronouns, e.g. allāhu 'uqsimu bihi
"God, I swear by him!";

1.713 and ta.\(^1\) (Spelt with two dots above),\(^2\) exclusively found with the name of the Almighty, though rarely one hears ta-rabbi l-ka\(^2\)bati 'by the Lord of the Kaaba!' and ta-r-rahmāni 'by the Merciful One!'. The fundamental particle of swearing is bi, for, as already stated, it occur before both nouns and pronouns; next is wa, which occurs only before nouns, and last ta, because it is exclusive to the name of the Almighty.\(^3\)

1.8 Having finished with the noun markers\(^1\) the author now turns to the verb markers. And the verb\(^2\) (spelt fi\(^\text{c}\), with l after the f) is recognized (i.e. is distinguished from the other two subdivisions of speech),

1.8.1 by qad 'already',\(^1\) i.e. the qad with particle status. It occurs both before the past tense, e.g. qad gāma 'he had stood' and the imperfect, e.g. qad yaqūmu 'he does stand', gāma 'he stood' and yaqūmu 'he stands' (6b) being verbs because qad occurs before them. This is not the same as the nominal qad which is found only before nouns,\(^2\) synonymous with ḥasbu 'enough' and always in annexation, e.g. qad zaydin dirhamun 'a dirham is enough for Zayd', where qad 'enough' has independent status as subject with dirhamun 'a dirham' as its predicate;

1.8.2 by sa and sawfa\(^1\) which occur only before the imperfect tense, e.g. sa-yaqūmu and sawfa yaqūmu 'he will stand', yaqūmu 'he stands' being a verb because sa and sawfa occur before it;

1.8.3 and by the unvowelled feminine t. This denotes that the agent is
feminine, and is only found in the past tense; for example, from qāma 'he stood' and qa'ada 'he sat' you say qāmat hindun wa-qa'adat 'Hind stood up and sat down'. By 'unvowelled' is excluded the vowelled t which occurs with nouns, e.g. qā'imatun 'standing' (fern, sing.) and some particles, e.g. rubbata 'how few', tum mata 'then' (except that the vowel after the t in nouns is inflectional, while in the particles it is invariable). By 'denoting that the agent is feminine' are excluded such rarities as the unvowelled t of rubbat 'how few' and tummat 'then' as a particle suffix, because in this case it merely denotes that the expression itself is feminine, not that it has a feminine agent.

1.9 Having finished with the verb markers the author now turns to those by which the particle is recognized. The particle is distinguished from the other two subdivisions of speech by being

1.91 that on which the sign of the noun is improper, i.e. the noun markers already mentioned, or any others, and equally improper the sign of the verb. (That is, those already mentioned, and any others).

1.92 The absence of marker, then, is the distinctive mark of the particle, and if a word does not take any of the above mentioned markers then it is a particle, since we have only three kinds of word, as already shown inductively. Ibn Malik used similar reasoning in discussing the letters j, h and k: the marker of j is a dot below, of h a dot above and of k the entire absence of dots.

Having finished explaining the parts of speech in terms of their markers the author now deals with what happens to them when combined...
in utterances, i.e. inflection (7a), saying:

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 Chapter (i.e. this is a chapter) on inflection.¹ Lexically this term means 'making clear': the Arabs say 'aCraba r-rajulu ⁰ammā fī ḍamĪrīhī 'the man clearly expressed what was in his mind', i.e. explained clearly. Its technical meaning is stated by the author:

2.1 Inflection is the change in the state of word-endings due to the variation of operators (this last phrase being semantically connected with the word 'change', because the variation causes the change); by variation of operators he means their successive effects on speech. He goes on to say, which occur before them, i.e. the word-endings. This asserts that inflection is abstract;² in formal terms inflection is defined as an explicit or implicit word-final feature produced by the determining operator on nouns having no resemblance to particles³ and on the imperfect tense verb unsuffixed by the feminine n or the emphatic n.⁴

2.101 He then says, either explicitly or implicitly.¹ Both these are circumstantial qualifiers of the word 'change', because changes in word-endings sometimes occur explicitly (i.e. as short vowels, elision, vowellessness and their substitutes)² and sometimes are supposed or assumed, i.e. those of the above features which are taken as understood, such as the intended ū, a and i of the invariable noun al-fatā 'the boy', the ū in muslimūna 'male Muslims'³ intended as independent and the intended n in la-tublawunna 'you shall certainly be tested'.⁴
2.11 What is meant by 'operator' is the element by which the meaning necessitating the inflection is realized. It may be a formal operator, e.g. \( jā'a \) 'came', which demands an agent of the requisite independent form, \( ra'aytu \) 'I saw', which demands a direct object of the requisite dependent form, \( ka \) 'like', which demands a term of comparison of the requisite oblique form, or it may be an abstract operator, such as the equational sentence construction or the absence of operator.

2.12 By 'word-endings' is meant either that which is literally last, such as the \( d \) of \( zaydun \) 'Zayd', or figuratively, such as the \( d \) of \( yadun \) 'hand', whose original form is *yadayun.

2.13 'The occurrence of operators before words' means their presence in whatever capacity is required, e.g. as an agent etc., whether they do precede the word they operate on, e.g. \( ra'aytu zaydan \) 'I saw Zayd' or follow it, e.g. \( zaydan ra'aytu \) 'Zayd I saw'.

2.14 By 'words' here is meant the fully established nouns (7b) and the imperfect tense verb, because inflection (i.e. the change itself) occurs only on the ends of these. Their change of ending is a transition from the zero-inflected pausal form they have before being in syntactical combination, from independence to dependence in both nouns and verbs, from dependence to obliqueness in nouns and from dependence to apocope in verbs.

2.15 Since the transition from the pausal to the above mentioned forms itself constitutes inflection and, since those transitional states may only figuratively be referred to as 'types' of inflection (because our author treats inflection as abstract, whereas 'types' only applies literally if inflection is treated as formal), he explains them in the following terms:
2.2 Its subdivisions\(^1\) (i.e. nominal and verbal inflection) are four: independence, dependence, which are common to nouns and verbs.\(^2\) Examples of the independent form: *zaydun yaqūmu* 'Zayd stands', where *zaydun* 'Zayd' is independent because it initiates an equational sentence and *yaqūmu* 'he stands' is independent through the absence of operators.\(^3\) Examples of the dependent form: *‘inna zaydan lan yaqūma* 'verily Zayd will not stand', where *zaydan* 'Zayd' is made dependent by *‘inna* 'verily' and *yaqūma* 'he (will) stand' is made dependent by *lan* 'not';\(^4\) next obliqueness, which is peculiar to a semantic function of the noun,\(^5\) e.g. *marartu bi-zaydin* 'I passed by Zayd', where *zaydin* 'Zayd' is a noun made oblique by *bi* 'by'; and apocopation. This is peculiar to a semantic function of the verb,\(^6\) e.g. *lam yaqum* 'he did not stand', where *yaqum* 'he stand' is apocopated by *lam* 'not'. So much for the summary presentation: the details follow.

2.3 Of these the nouns have (i.e. of the above four subdivisions):\(^1\)

2.3.1 independence, either explicitly, e.g. *jā'a zaydun* 'Zayd came' or implicitly, either because realization is impossible,\(^1\) as in *jā'a l-fatā* 'the boy came' or due to phonetic inconvenience, as in *jā'a l-qādī* 'the judge came'. Here *zaydun* 'Zayd' is an agent with independent form and an explicit final *u*\(^2\) *al-fatā* 'the boy' is likewise an agent, but ends in an implicit *u* whose appearance is prevented by impossibility of realization;\(^3\) *al-qādī* 'the judge' is also an agent, and ends in an implicit *u* whose appearance is prevented by phonetic inconvenience;\(^4\)

2.3.2 dependence, either explicitly, as in *ra'aytu zaydan* 'I saw Zayd' or implicitly, as in *ra'aytu l-fatā* 'I saw the boy'. Here *zaydan*
'Zayd' has dependent form with an explicit final a and al-fatā 'the boy' has an implicit final a whose appearance is prevented by impossibility of realization;¹

2.33 and obliqueness, either explicitly, as in marartu bi-zaydīn 'I passed by Zayd' (8a) or implicitly, as in marartu bi-l-fatā wa-l-qādī 'I passed by the boy and the judge'. Here zaydīn 'Zayd' has oblique form with an explicit final i; al-fatā 'the boy' likewise has oblique form but ends in an implicit i whose appearance is prevented by impossibility of realization; al-qādī 'the judge' also has oblique form but ends in an implicit i whose appearance is prevented by phonetic inconvenience;¹

2.34 but they have no apocopation. That is, the nouns have none because it is found only in verbs.¹

2.4 Verbs¹(i.e. those which are fully inflected) have of these (i.e. of the above-mentioned subdivisions):

2.41 independence, either explicitly, as in yaqūmu 'he stands' or implicitly, as in yaqšā 'he fears'. Here yaqūmu 'he stands' has independent form with an explicit final u and yaqšā 'he fears' likewise has independent form but the u is implicit because its appearance is prevented by impossibility of realization;²

2.42 dependence, either explicitly, as in lan yaqūma 'he will not stand' or implicitly, as in lan yaqšā 'he will not fear'.¹ Here yaqūma 'he (may) stand' has dependent form with an explicit final a and yaqšā 'he (may) fear' also has dependent form but ends in an implicit a;

2.43 and apocopation,¹ shown by vowellessness if the final consonant is sound (such as yaḍribu 'he strikes'), or by elision of the defective consonant,² namely 之中, ā or ǐ, when the defective consonant is final
2.44 but they have no obliqueness.¹ That is, the verbs have none because it is found only in nouns.

2.45 To sum up, these four subdivisions reduce to two groups, one common and one peculiar, the common comprising two, viz. independence and dependence, and the peculiar likewise two, viz. obliqueness and apocopation.¹ What this means is that independence and dependence are common to both nouns and verbs while obliqueness is peculiar to nouns and apocopation to verbs. All this is inferred from what our author says, because he repeats independence and dependence under nouns and verbs so that we know they are common to both, and he restricts obliqueness particularly to nouns (denying them apocopation) (8b) and apocopation particularly to verbs (denying them obliqueness).

2.5 Note: The inflection of ā and ī described above applies only when ā or ī are actually present¹ if ā has already been elided,² as in the case of jā’a ōtān ‘a boy came’, ra’aytu ōtān ‘I saw a boy’, marartu bi-ōtān ‘I passed by a boy’, you must say of the independent form that

(such as yakṣā ‘he fears’, yağzū ‘he raids’, yarmī ‘he throws’). Thus you say lam yādrib ‘he did not strike’, lam yakṣa ‘he did not fear’, lam yağzu ‘he did not raid’, lam yarmi ‘he did not throw’, in which yadrib ‘he (might) strike’ has apocopated form ending in vowellessness and the remainder are also apocopated but with elision of the defective consonant instead of vowellessness;
its independence marker is an implicit u on the َā which has previously been elided to prevent the clash of two unvowelled consonants\(^3\) (in this instance َā and the َn of َtamwil), the original form having been *fatayun, with َayu changing to َā which is in turn elided to prevent the resulting clash of two unvowelled consonants. Similarly you must say of the dependent form that its dependence marker is an implicit a on the َā which has been elided to prevent the clash of two unvowelled consonants, and of the oblique form that its obliqueness marker is an implicit i on the َā which has been elided to prevent the clash of two unvowelled consonants.

2.6 In the case of elided َī as in jā'ā qādin 'a judge came', marartu bi-qādin 'I passed by a judge', you say of the independent form that its independence marker is an implicit u on the َī which has previously been elided to prevent the clash of two unvowelled consonants,\(^1\) and of the oblique form you say that its obliqueness marker is an implicit i for the same reason. Use these examples as an analogy for all similar cases.\(^2\)

2.7 Where the inflected noun ends in a sound or quasi-sound consonant\(^1\) (i.e. w and y) immediately preceded by an unvowelled consonant, e.g. dalwun 'bucket', َzabyun 'gazelle', all the inflection is explicit.\(^2\) Where the noun ends in َā, e.g. al-фatā 'the boy' or in َī, e.g. al-qādı 'the judge', the inflection is implicit, except that with َā the inflection has to be implicit due to impossibility of realization (since َā cannot be followed by a vowel), while with َī it has to be implicit because of phonetic inconvenience (since َī can be followed by a vowel but is awkward to pronounce). By َā here is meant that which is
pronounced a irrespective of whether it is spelt with a y as, for example, in yakša 'he fears', al-fatā 'the boy'.

2.8 Now, independence, dependence, obliqueness and apocopation all have basic markers and secondary markers which replace them, and it is necessary to find out about them. Our author has dealt with them (9a) in a separate chapter, entitled:

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 Chapter on (i.e. explaining) the recognition of the markers of the various kinds of inflection. The basic markers are four: u for independence, a for dependence, i for obliqueness and elision of the short vowel for apocopation. These are the basic markers; the secondary markers which replace them are ten, three replacing u, viz. ū, ā and n; four replacing a, viz. ā, ā and i; and elision of n, two replacing i, viz. a and ā; and one replacing elision of the short vowel, viz. elision of the defective consonant or of n. Once you have grasped this we may proceed.

3.1 Independence (as such) has four markers, one the basic marker, namely u, and three secondary markers, namely ū, ā and n; (replacing u). The author puts u first because it is the basic form, secondly ū because it derives from u by prolongation, so that ū is the offspring of u, thirdly ā because it is closely related to ū in being a long semi-vowel and lastly n because it faintly resembles the defective
3.2-3.23

consonants in being nasalized when vowelless. None of this arrangement, however, is determined by the nature of $u$.$^3$ Each of the four markers has its own particular functions.$^4$

3.2 $u$ is the marker of independence in four places,

3.21 (1) on the singular noun,$^1$ whether masculine or feminine, e.g. $qäma$ $zaydun$ $wa-l-fätā$ $wa-l-gäḏī$ $wa-'ahmadu$ $wa-rajulun$ $wa-farasun$ 'Zayd, the boy, the judge, Ahmad, a man and a horse stood up', and $qämat$ hindun $wa-ḥūblā' Hind and a pregnant woman stood up'. Here $qäma$ 'stood' is a past tense verb, $zaydun$ 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by $qäma$ 'stood', and what follows is coordinated with $zaydun$ and shares in its independence through $qäma$.

3.22 (2) (9b) on the broken plural,$^1$ whether of masculines or feminines, e.g. $jä'a$ $r-rijālun$ $wa-l-'asārā$ $wa-l-hunūdu$ $wa-l-'agārīf$ 'the men, the prisoners, the Hinds and the virgins came'.

3.221 This kind of plural is called the 'broken plural'$^4$ because 'breaking' lexically means 'changing'. It is brought about by lengthening the singular with no change of pattern,$^2$ e.g. $ṣīnun$ 'male relative', $ṣīnawānun$ 'male relatives', or by changing the pattern without lengthening or shortening, e.g. $'asādun$ 'lion', $'usudun$ 'lions', or by shortening the singular together with a change of pattern, e.g. $rasūlun$ 'messenger', $rusulun$ 'messengers', or by shortening the singular without a change of pattern, e.g. $tukamatun$ 'indigestion', $tukamun$ 'indigestions', or by simultaneously lengthening, shortening and changing the pattern, e.g. $gūlām$ 'boy', $gilām$ 'boys', or by lengthening the singular together with a change of pattern, e.g. $rajulun$ 'man', $rijālun$ 'men'. All these have $u$ in the independent form.$^3$

3.23 (3) on the sound feminine plural,$^1$ which is formed by suffixing $āt$,
e.g. *jâ’at il-hindätu* 'the Hinds came', where *jâ’a* 'came' is a past tense verb, the *t* is the feminine marker and *al-hindätu* 'the Hinds' is an agent made independent by *jâ’a* 'came' with *u* as its independence marker.

3.231 This kind of plural is called 'feminine' because its singular is feminine, and 'sound' because its singular is free from any change of pattern. To qualify it as sound and feminine is only a generalization as it is, in fact, also found with masculines, e.g. *ištablätun* 'stables', plural of *ištablun* 'stable', and with broken plurals, e.g. *hublä* 'pregnant*.

3.24 (4) on the imperfect tense verb without personal suffixes as in *yağribu* 'he strikes', *yağšä* 'he fears', *yağzü* 'he raids', *yarmi* 'he throws'. Each of these is an imperfect tense verb made independent by freedom from the operators of dependence and apocopation; the independence marker is an explicit *u* in *yağribu* 'he strikes' and implicitly in the others because they are all imperfect tense verbs without personal suffixes.

3.241 Should any suffix be found on these verbs it will either be the feminine *na*, e.g. *an-niswatu* *yağribna* 'the women strike' (in which case the end of the verb is invariable and vowelless because of the suffixed feminine *na*), or it will be the emphatic *anna*, e.g. *hal yağribanna* 'will he indeed strike?' (in which case the end of (10a) the verb is invariable because of the suffixed emphatic *anna*). Or else it will be a dual pronoun, viz. *ā* as in *yağribānī* 'they two (masc.) strike', a plural pronoun, viz. *ū* as in *yağribūna* 'they (masc. plur.) strike' and *tağribūna* 'you (masc. plur.) strike', or a second person feminine singular pronoun, viz. *ū* as in *tağribīna* 'you (fem. sing.) strike', the verb here being not invariable but inflected: all are independent through the absence of operator, with retention of *n* as their independence marker instead of *u*, while the *ā*, *ū* and *ū* are agents with independent status through their preceding verb.
3.3 It might be asked, what is the difference between the marker and the case it denotes (as, for example, when one says 'with \( u \) in inde­
pendence' etc.)? The answer is that the markers consist of the short
vowels and vowellessness used in constructing words, namely \( u, a, i \)
and \( \emptyset \), while the cases denoted by the markers consist of the vowels of
inflection and apocopation, namely independence, dependence, oblique­
ness and apocopation. The two are different even if they appear on the surface to be identical, just as the definition differs from the thing defined: in short, the marker and the case it denotes are identical in essence but different in reference, just as the vowel \( i \) differs from the occurrence of an \( i \).

3.4 Having finished with \( u \), which is the basic independence marker, the author now turns to its replacements: \( \ddot{u} \) is the marker of independ­
ence in two places:

3.41 (1) in the sound masculine plural, e.g. \( j\ddot{a}'a \ z-zayd\ddot{u}n\a \ 'the Zayds came' among nouns and \( j\ddot{a}'a \ i-muslim\ddot{u}n\a \ 'the Muslims (came)' among adjectives. Here \( j\ddot{a}'a \ 'came' is a past tense verb and \( az-zayd\ddot{u}n\a \ 'the Zayds' and \( al-muslim\ddot{u}n\a \ 'the Muslims' are agents made independent by \( j\ddot{a}'a \ 'came', with \( \ddot{u} \) as their independence marker instead of \( u \).

3.411 This kind of plural is called 'sound' because its singular remains unaltered except for the suffixing of \( \ddot{u}n\a \) and \( Ina \). Everything, whether noun or adjective, which takes this kind of plural must fulfil three conditions: (a) there should be no feminine \( t \), for such nouns do not form this kind of plural, cf. \( \ddot{t}al\dot{h}at\u 'Talha', nor do adjective­
ives, cf. \( \ddot{a}ll\dot{a}matun 'very learned (man)', lest (10b) they should con­
tain the masculine and feminine markers simultaneously; (b) that it should refer to a male, for such feminine proper names as \( za\dot{n}abu \)
'Zenobia' do not form this kind of plural, nor do feminine adjectives such as ha’idun 'menstruating', lest the masculine and feminine plural become confused, and (c) it must denote a rational being, for names of dogs such as wāsigun 'Darter' do not form this kind of plural, nor do adjectives such as sābiqun 'Racer' when applied to horses. There is one final condition regarding their being separate words, and that is that they must not be compound proper names, neither predicative nor mixed compounds. The predicative compound proper name, such as baraqa nahrhu 'His chest gleamed' does not form this kind of plural, nor does the mixed compound proper name, such as ma’dī karibu 'Ma’dīkarib'. Adjectives which take the feminine t, e.g. qā’imun 'standing' (masc.) from which you can say qā’imaturi 'standing' (fem.), or those which do not take the feminine t but denote a superior quality, e.g. afdalu 'most virtuous', have the plural qā’imun 'standing' (masc.), afdalūna 'most virtuous' (masc.). But this kind of plural is not formed by such words as jarīhun 'wounded' in the meaning of majrūhun 'wounded', sabūrun 'very patient' in the meaning of sabirun 'patient', sakrānu 'intoxicated' and aḥmaru 'red' because they do not take the feminine t nor do they denote any superiority.

3.412 Note: They have treated as sound masculine plurals four other kinds of word which, even though they are inflected with long vowels, are not sound plurals, viz.

(a) certain plural nouns such as ‘ulū 'possessors of' in the meaning of the plural noun ‘asbābu 'owners of', Cālamūna 'worlds' (plural of Cālamun 'world', in both cases spelt with a after the l), and ıšrūna 'twenty' (and other words in this category up to tisqūna 'ninety');
(b) certain broken plurals, namely banūna 'sons', plural of ibnun 'son' (whose regular sound plural should be *îbnûna), 'aharrûna 'stony places' (spelt with a after the ' and h, and double r) plural of harratun 'stony place', 'aradûna 'lands' (spelt with a after the r) plural of 'arďun 'land' (spelt with unvowelled r), sinûna 'years' (spelt with i after the s) plural of sanatun 'year' (spelt with a after the s), and other words of the same category and behaviour such as idatun 'piece', plural Cîdûna 'pieces';

c(c) the genuine sound plurals which do not fulfil the above conditions for nouns and adjectives, e.g. 'ahlûna 'peoples', plural of 'ahlun 'people', and wâbiluna 'pouring rains', plural of wâbilun 'pouring rain', for neither 'ahlun nor wâbilun are proper names, nor are they adjectives;

d(d) those which are used as singular proper names in this plural form or have become attached to this category, such as zaydûna 'Zaydûn' (lila) and 'illiyyûna 'Illiyyûn', which are inflected with long vowels and are thus allowed to behave as they did before they came to be used as names.

3.42 (2) in the five nouns, i.e. the defective nouns, when in annexation, viz. abûka 'your father', aḵûka 'your brother', hamûka 'your father-in-law', fûka 'your mouth' and dû mâlin 'possessor of wealth'. Thus in jâ'a 'abûka 'your father came' jâ'a 'came' is a past tense verb and 'abûka 'your father' is an agent made independent by jâ'a 'came', with ū as its independence marker instead of u. The same rule applies to all the others, and the ka 'your' in all five is made oblique by annexation.

3.421 Note: It is a condition for the inflection of these five nouns
that they should be singular, non-diminutive and annexed. If separated from annexation they are then inflected with short vowels, e.g. wa-lahu 'ağun 'and he has a brother' in the independent form, 'inna lahu 'aban 'verily he has a father' in the dependent form and wa-banâtu l-'akī 'and the daughters of the brother' in the oblique form. It is also a condition for these nouns that they should not be annexed to I 'my', otherwise they are inflected with implicit short vowels, e.g. hâdâ 'ağī 'this is my brother', ra'aytu 'ağī 'I saw my brother', marartu bi-'akī 'I passed by my brother'. The author dispenses with mentioning these conditions by the way he has listed the nouns above. He has left out the noun al-hanu 'the thing' because it is best treated as an incomplete noun and inflected with the short vowels, e.g. hâgâ hanuka 'this is your thing', ra'aytu hanaka 'I saw your thing', naṣartu 'ilâ hanika 'I looked at your thing', with u, a and i respectively. But it may also be inflected with long vowels, in which case you say hâgâ hanūka 'this is your thing', ra'aytu hanâka 'I saw your thing', naṣartu 'ilâ hanīka 'I looked at your thing'.

3.422 Axiom: There are no inflected nouns ending in ü other than the six nouns in the independent state.

3.43 â is the marker of independence especially in the dual of nouns, e.g. qâla rajulâni 'two men said', where qâla 'said' is a past tense verb and rajulâni 'two men' is an agent made independent by qâla with â as its independence marker instead of u.

3.44 n1 is the marker of independence in the imperfect tense verb when suffixed with the dual pronoun (which is â), as in yaḍribâni 'they two (masc.) strike' (spelt y, with two dots below), taḍribâni 'you two (masc. & fem.) strike, they two (fem.) strike' (spelt t, with two dots above), or the plural pronoun (namely â for the masculine plural, as
in yāḍribūna 'they strike' (spelt y, with two dots below) and tāḍribūna 'you strike' (spelt t, with two dots above), or the pronoun of the second person feminine singular. This is f (spelt y, with two dots below), as in tāḍribūna 'you strike'.

3.45 These are known as 'the five patterns',\(^1\) (11b) being so called because they are not in themselves verbs (as 'the six nouns' are in themselves nouns), but are simply patterns used to allude to all verbs of the same status,\(^2\) e.g. yāḥhabānī 'they two (masc.) go'. Ibn Hīšām said in his Commentary on the Lumḥa that 'they are called five by subsuming the second person feminine dual under the second person masculine dual, but it would be better to count them as six'.\(^3\) The verbs here are all independent, their independence marker being the retention of their final n instead of u because they are free from any operator of dependence or apocopation.\(^4\) Having finished with the independence markers the author next turns to the markers of dependence.

3.5 There are five markers of dependence:\(^1\) (1) a, which is the basic one and for that reason placed first, (2) ā\(_\text{t}^\prime\), which he puts before the next because it derives from a, (3) i, which he puts before the next because it is related to a in being a short vowel, (4) ī\(_\text{x}^\prime\)ay,\(^2\) which he puts before n because it is related to i, and (5) elision of n. This he puts last because it least resembles the others.\(^3\) Each of these has its own particular functions and the author begins with a because it is the basic marker (as has already been pointed out):

3.51 a is the marker of dependence in three places: (1) on the singular noun, e.g. raʾaytu zaydān waʾ-ʾahmāda wa-l-fātā wa-ʾabdallāhi 'I saw Zayd, Āhmād, the boy and Abūdallāh',\(^1\) where raʾaytu 'I saw' is a verb
and agent, tu 'I' (which is the agent) is a noun because the action is predicated of it, and zaydan 'Zayd' is a direct object with 'ahmada 'Ahmad' etc. coordinated with zaydan and sharing in its dependence;²

3.52 (2) on the broken plural,¹ e.g. 'akramtu r-rijāla wa-l-hunūda wa-l-āsāra wa-l-Cadāriya 'I honoured the men, the Hinds, the prisoners and the virgins',² where 'akramtu 'I honoured' is a verb with an agent made independent by 'akrama 'to honour',³ tu 'I' is a noun because the action is predicated of it, and ar-rijāla 'the men' is a direct object made dependent by the verb, the nouns following being coordinated with ar-rijāla;

3.53 (3) on the imperfect tense verb when preceded by an operator of dependence (12a) and without suffixes,² (such as the feminine plural na, the emphatic anna, or the pronouns in the case of the 'five verbs').³
An example of the unsuffixed imperfect tense verb is lan yabraha zaydun 'Zayd will not go forth', where lan 'not' is a particle of negation and dependence.³ By the way, lan is in origin a simple word: it is not the negative là 'not' with a change of ā to n, nor does it originate from là 'an 'not that' with elision of ' for ease of pronunciation and consequent elision of ā to prevent the clash of two unvowelled consonants. Moreover lan does not make the negation necessarily perpetual, since this would entail a contradiction in mentioning the word al-yawma 'today' in the Qur'anic fa-lan 'ukallima l-yawma 'insiyyan 'I shall not speak to anyone today',⁴ and also tautology in mentioning 'abadan 'ever' in the Qur'anic wa-lan yatamannahu 'abadan 'and they shall not desire it ever'.⁵ The alleged perpetual negation in the
Qur'anic \textit{yakluqū} 
\begin{flushleft}
\textit{gubāban} \ 'they shall not create a fly' according to the opinion of az-Zamakhšarī\textsuperscript{6} (because of his allegiance to that vain school of thought which denies that we shall see God in the afterlife), which he appeals to in his exegesis of the Qur'anic \textit{tan tarānī} 'you shall not see me'\textsuperscript{7}, is due to some external factor and is not necessarily implied by \textit{tan}. To resume: \textit{yabraha} 'he (may) go forth' is an imperfect tense verb made dependent by \textit{tan} 'not' with \textit{a} as its dependence marker and \textit{zaydun} 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by \textit{yabraha} with \textit{u} as its independence marker. Having dealt with \textit{a}, which is the basic dependence marker, the author now turns to what replaces it:
\textbf{3.61} \textit{ā} is the marker of dependence in the 'five nouns',\textsuperscript{1} mentioned above under the independence markers, e.g. \textit{ra’aytu ‘abāka wa-ağāka} 'I saw your father and your brother', (where \textit{ra’aytu} 'I saw' is a verb and agent, \textit{‘abāka} 'your father' and \textit{ağāka} 'your brother' are both made dependent by \textit{ra’ā} 'to see'\textsuperscript{2} with \textit{ā} as their dependence marker instead of \textit{a}, and \textit{ka} 'your' is made oblique by annexation), and the like, such as \textit{ra’aytu ḥamāka wa-fâka wa-dā mālin} 'I saw your father-in-law, your mouth and the possessor of wealth';
\textbf{3.62} \textit{i} is the marker of dependence in the sound feminine plural,\textsuperscript{1} instead of \textit{a}, e.g. \textit{kalaqa lāhu s-samāwātī} 'God created the heavens',\textsuperscript{2} where \textit{kalaqa lāhu} 'God created' is a verb and agent made independent by the verb \textit{kalaqa} 'to create' and \textit{s-samāwātī} 'the heavens' is a direct object (some say, however, that it is an absolute object),\textsuperscript{3} made dependent in either case by \textit{kalaqa}, with \textit{i} as its dependence marker instead of \textit{a}.
3.63 **ay** is the marker of dependence in the dual,\(^1\) i.e. the form which conventionally denotes two things and makes it unnecessary (12b) to coordinate one with the other: 'conventionally denotes' is a generic expression,\(^2\) 'two things' is a primary differentiation which excludes those words that conventionally denote less than two, e.g. *rajāl* 'a man on foot' or more than two, e.g. *ṣīnāwun* 'male relatives', and 'makes it unnecessary to coordinate one with the other' is a secondary differentiation which excludes such words as *kilā* 'both' (masc.), *kīlā* 'both' (fem.),\(^3\) *ṣarq* 'pair' and *zawjun* 'couple'.

3.64 In this category belong the dual of the masculine singular, whether noun or adjective, e.g. *ra'aytu z-zaydayni l-muslimayni* 'I saw the two Muslim Zayds',\(^1\) of the feminine singular, e.g. *ra'aytu l-hindayni l-muslimatayni* 'I saw the two Muslim Hinds', of the broken plural, e.g. *al-jimālayni* 'the two herds of camels', of the collective noun,\(^2\) e.g. *ar-rakbayni* 'the two parties of riders', and of the generic noun, e.g. *al-ğanamayni* 'the two flocks of sheep'. Here *az-zaydayni* 'the two Zayds' and everything coordinated with it are made dependent by *ra'ā* 'to see' and their-dependence marker is **ay** (spelt with a before the *y* and i after it)\(^3\) because they are all dual.

3.65 Note: Most hold that there are eight conditions for dualizing:\(^1\)

1. The word must be singular;\(^2\) duals are not made from other duals, from sound plurals, nor from those patterns which are unique to the plural, such as *masājīdu* 'mosques', *maṣābīḥu* 'lamps'.

2. The word must be inflected; duals are not made from invariable words. As far as *gānī* 'these two' (masc.), *tānī* 'these two' (fem.), *allāḏānī* 'who' (masc. dual) and *allātānī* 'who' (fem. dual) are concerned, they are forms which conventionally denote the dual but are not themselves true duals, at least according to the soundest view, which is held by the majority of Baṣrāns.\(^3\)

3. The word must not be compound;\(^4\) according to the soundest view, duals are not made from words which also happen to be predicative or...
mixed compounds. As far as annexed compounds are concerned, dualizing the annexed noun renders dualizing the noun to which it is annexed superfluous.

(4) The word must be undefined; proper names are not dualized by leaving them in their proper name status, but are first made undefined and then dualized.

(5) The stem-form must remain the same; 'abawānī 'two fathers', i.e. both parents, father and mother, is simply a case of usage predominating.

(6) The meaning must remain the same; duals are not made from equivocal words, nor of the literal with the metaphorical: al-qalamu 'aḥadu l-lisānaynī 'the pen is one of the two tongues' is a rare exception.

(7) There should not already be an alternative dual form which renders dualizing unnecessary; sawāʿun 'like, else, other etc.' does not have a dual because the dual of siyyun 'like etc.' makes it unnecessary, and people say siyyānī 'two like etc.' instead of sawāʿānī.

(8) There should be a second in existence; there is no dual of aš-šamsu 'the sun' or al-qamaru 'the moon'. The expression al-qamarānī lit. 'the two moons', meaning the sun and moon together is a case of usage predominating. I have explained the manner of this predominance in my Commentary on Qatr an-nadā, and whoever (13a) wishes may look it up there, where I have said more or less all there is to say on it.

3.71 ٦ is a marker of dependence in the plural, i.e. the sound masculine plural, e.g. 'akramtu z-zaydānā 'I honoured the Zayds', where
'akramtu 'I honoured' is a verb and agent made independent by 'akrama 'to honour' and az-zaydīna is a direct object made dependent by 'akrama 'to honour', with I (spelt with i before the y and a after it)\(^2\) as its dependence marker instead of a.

3.72 Note: He only uses the unqualified term 'plural' while meaning the sound masculine plural (as I specified in my gloss)\(^1\) because it follows the same principles as the dual.\(^2\) Thus when the plural is mentioned alongside the dual it is taken to refer to the sound masculine plural because it is related\(^3\) to the dual in that both are inflected with long vowels.

3.73 and elision of n is the marker of dependence in the verbs which retain it in their independent form.\(^1\) This means the 'five verbs'. It has already been said\(^2\) that every imperfect tense verb with pronoun suffixes (whether the dual ā, the plural ū\(^3\) or the feminine ī, as in yadrībāni 'they two (masc.) strike', taḍribāni 'you two (masc. & fem.) strike, they two (fem.) strike', yadrībūna 'they (masc.) strike, taḍribūna 'you (fem. sing.) strike') has its n elided when preceded by an operator of dependence, so that you say lan yadrībā 'they two (masc.) will not strike', lan taḍribā 'they two (fem.) will not strike, you two (masc. & fem.) will not strike', lan yadrībū 'they (masc.) will not strike, lan taḍribū 'you (masc. plur.) will not strike, lan taḍribī 'you (fem. sing.) will not strike'. These five verbs are made dependent by lan 'not',\(^4\) with elision of n as their dependence marker instead of a. The ā, ū and ī are agents with independent status\(^5\) through their verbs, and are nouns because the action is predicated of them.

Having acquainted us with the markers of dependence, the author now turns to the markers of obliqueness.
3.8 Obliqueness has three markers, (1) $i$, which is the basic one and for that reason he puts it first, (2) $I/\text{ay}$, which he puts before the next because it is closely related to $i$, and (3) $a$. This is put last because it is distantly related to $i$ in being a short vowel. Each of these three markers has its own particular functions.

3.81 $i$ is the marker of obliqueness in three places: (1) in the fully declinable singular noun, i.e. the fully established and stable noun, e.g. marartu $bi$-bakrin 'I passed by Bakr'. (It is called 'fully declinable' because it bears the tanw\text{In} of currency, also known as the tanw\text{In} of establishment);

3.82 (2) in the fully declinable broken plural, e.g. marartu $bi$-rijālin $wa$-hun\text{dīn} 'I passed by men and Hinds'. It will later emerge that the semi-declinable nouns have a when oblique.

3.83 (3) in the sound feminine plural. This is always fully declinable, hence the author does not specify it as such. It applies equally to nouns, e.g. marartu (13b) $bi$-l-hindātī 'I passed by the Hinds' and to adjectives, e.g. marartu $bi$-l-muslimātī 'I passed by the female Muslims', but only when they are not proper names (otherwise they may be fully or semi-declinable).

3.84 And $I/\text{ay}1$ is the marker of obliqueness in three places: (1) in the 'five nouns', e.g. marartu $bi$-‘abīka $wa$-‘ağīka $wa$-ẖamīka $wa$-fīka $wa$-ḏī mālin 'I passed by your father, your brother, your father-in-law, your mouth and the possessor of wealth'. Here marartu 'I passed' is a verb and agent made independent by its verb, $bi$-‘abīka 'by your father' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element, and what follows is coordinated with it and shares in its obliqueness through $bi$ 'by', the
obliqueness marker in all five being ı instead of i.\(^4\) The ka 'your' in all five is made oblique by what is annexed to it.

3.85 (2) *in the dual*,\(^1\) whether masculine, as in *marartu bi-z-zaydayni* 'I passed by the two Zayds' or feminine, as in *marartu bi-l-hindayni* 'I passed by the two Hinds', where *az-zaydayni* 'the two Zayds' and *al-hindayni* 'the two Hinds' are made oblique by *bi* 'by' (spelt with one dot below), their obliqueness marker being *ay* (spelt with *a* before the *y*) instead of *ı*;

3.86 (3) *in the plural*.\(^1\） He does not specify this as the sound masculine plural for the reason already given.\(^2\) Example: *marartu bi-z-zaydīna* 'I passed by the Zayds', where *az-zaydīna* 'the Zayds' is made oblique by *bi* 'by' (spelt with one dot below), with *I* (spelt with *ı* before the *y*) as its obliqueness marker instead of *ı*.

3.87 And *a* is the marker of obliqueness in the semi-declinable noun.\(^1\) Full declinability refers to the four kinds of *tanwīn* which are peculiar to the noun (as Ibn Mālik\(^2\) says), because if a noun resembles a particle it is invariable and termed 'not fully established', while if it does not resemble a particle it is inflected: then, if the inflected noun resembles a verb, it is prevented from full declinability and is termed 'not fully stable', while if it does not resemble a verb, it is fully declined and termed 'stable'.\(^3\)

3.88 The factors preventing full declinability are nine, and have been collected by Ibn an-Nabhās into one line of verse:\(^2\)
Verbal measure, (2) compound, (3) foreign, (4) defined, (5) anomalous, (6) epithet, (7) plural, (8) augmented, (9) feminine'.

Another grammarian put it as follows:

ijma wa-zin ādilan 'annit bi-ma rifatin rakkib wa-zid ujmatan fa-1-wasfu qad kamala

'(1) plural, (2) verbal measure, (3) anomalous, (4) feminine, (5) defined, (6) compound, (7) augmented, (8) foreign, (9) epithet, and that is all'.

3.89 The gist of all this is that in the following cases:

(1) the most extreme plural pattern, e.g. marartu bi-masājidha wa-mašābīha 'I passed by mosques and lamps',

(2) the long feminine ā ending, e.g. sahṛā'u 'desert' or the short feminine ā ending, e.g. ḥublā 'pregnant',

(3) the combination of proper name and compound, e.g. maḏī karibu 'MaḏīKarib',

(4) the combination of proper name (14a) and feminine, e.g. zaynabu 'Zenobia', faṭimatu faṭima',

(5) the combination of proper name and foreign word, e.g. 'ibḥā кредi 'Abraham' (all the names of the prophets are foreign except four, viz. muḥammadun 'Muhammad', saḥīḥun 'Ṣīḥ', šu'Caybul šu'Cayb' and hūdun 'Hūd', may God bless them all and give them peace),

(6) the combination of proper name and verbal measure, e.g. 'ahmadu 'Ahmad', yazīду 'Yazīd',

وَقَالَ فِيهِ وَرَن عُمَرُ عَذرةَ وَرَن عُمَرُ قَالَ عَذرةَ قَالَ عَذرةَ وَرَن عُمَرُ قَالَ عَذرةَ قَالَ عَذرةَ وَرَن عُمَرُ قَالَ عَذرةَ قَالَ عَذرةَ وَرَن عُمَرُ قَالَ عَذرةَ
TEXT AND TRANSLATION 3.9-3.91

(7) the combination of proper name and the augment ān, e.g. ġūtnānu 'Ġūtān',

(8) the combination of proper name and anomaly, e.g. ġumāru 'Ġumar',

(9) the combination of epithet and anomaly, e.g. mağnā 'in twos', tulātu 'in threes', rubā'cū 'in fours',

(10) the combination of adjective and verbal measure, e.g. ʾāfḍalū 'most virtuous',

(11) the combination of adjective and the augment ān, e.g. sakrānu 'intoxicated' (though for this there are certain conditions which I have mentioned in my Commentary on Qatr an-nadā and will not go into here),

all have a in the oblique form instead of i, providing that they are not annexed to another word or prefixed by al 'the', in which case they have the regular i in the oblique form, e.g. marartu bi-ʾafḍalikum 'I passed by the most virtuous of you', marartu bi-l-ʾafḍalī 'I passed by the most virtuous'.

3.9 Apocopation has two markers, vowellessness, which is the elision of the short vowel, and elision. This is the dropping of the defective consonant (i.e. ā, ū and ī) and of the n of the 'five verbs', as will be shown. Both vowellessness and elision have their own particular functions; as vowellessness is the basic form, the author treats it first.

3.91 Vowellessness is the marker of apocopation in the imperfect tense verb of sound ending, (i.e. which does not end in ā, ū or ī) e.g. lam
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3.92 Elision is the marker of apocopation in two places: (1) in the imperfect tense verb of weak ending, i.e. which ends in one of the above-mentioned defective consonants, e.g. lam yadCů 'he did not call', lam yAKšA 'he did not fear', lam yARMî 'he did not throw', where yadCů 'he (might) call', yAKšA 'he (might) fear' and yARMî 'he (might) throw' are all apocopated by lam 'not', with elision of their defective final consonant as their apocopation marker instead of vowellessness.\(^1\) From yadCů it is w which is elided and the preceding u remains as an indication, from yAKšA it is y which is elided, with the preceding a remaining as an indication, and from yARMî it is y which is elided, indicated by the preceding i;\(^2\) (14b)

\(^1\) This means every imperfect tense verb suffixed with the dual, masculine plural and feminine singular pronouns: you say lam yansurů 'they two (masc.) did not aid', lam yansurū 'they (masc.) did not aid', lam tansurô 'you (fem. sing.) did not aid', and these 'five verbs' are all apocopated by lam 'not', with elision of n as their apocopation marker instead of vowellessness. The â, ĕ and ţ are agents with independent status through the 'five verbs'.

3.94 Note: Under the independence markers the author stated that the 'five verbs', when independent through the absence of operator, have retention of n as their independence marker instead of u, and under
dependence markers he stated that the 'five verbs', when made dependent
by one of the operators of dependence, have elision of n as their
dependence marker instead of a. He now states that the 'five verbs',
when apocopated by an operator of apocopation, also have elision of n
as their apocopation marker instead of vowellessness, for which
examples have already been given. 2

3.95 An illustration of operators of apocopation and dependence
together is found in the Qur'anic fa-'in lam taf°alü wa-lan taf°alü
'and if you did not do it, and you will not do it,' where lam 'not' is
a particle of negation and apocopation,2 taf°alü 'you (might) do' is an
imperfect tense verb apocopated by lam with elision of n as its apocpa-
on marker instead of vowellessness (and the ü is an agent with
independent status3 through the verb), lan 'not' is a particle of nega-
tion and dependence and taf°alü 'you (may) do' is an imperfect tense
verb made dependent by lan with elision of n as its dependence marker
instead of a (the ü being an agent with independent status through the
verb).

3.96 Note: If to this n is further suffixed the 'preserving n',1 the
former may be elided for ease of pronunciation, or it may be assimila-
ted to the preserving n, or both may be pronounced separately: the
Qur'anic ta'murünf 'you (masc. plur.) command me'2 is read in all three
ways. Occasionally n is elided even when there is no operator of
dependence or apocopation, as in the verse
'
abītu 'abkf wa-tabṭīf tadhlu1f
wajhaki bi-l-ū'anbari wa-l-miski ǧ-ṣakīf
'I pass the night weeping, but you spend your night rubbing your face
with amber and pure musk',3 where n has been elided from tabtīf 'you
4.0-4.11

(15a) بَعْبَعَ بِالحَرِكَاتِ الثَّلاَثَ عَلَى الأَلْفِ وَهُنَاكَ الْفَتْحَةُ وَالْفُتُوحَةُ أوَّلَ الْحَرِكَةِ، وَقَبْلَهَا أَوْ بِالْحَرِكَاتِ الثَّلَاثَ عَلَى الأَلْفِ وَهُنَاكَ الْفَتْحَةُ وَالْفُتُوحَةُ أَوَّلَ الْحَرِكَةِ، وَقَبْلَهَا، وَقَبْلَ وَالْحَرِكَاتِ الثَّلَاثَ عَلَى الأَلْفِ وَهُنَاكَ الْفَتْحَةُ وَالْفُتُوحَةُ أَوَّلَ الْحَرِكَةِ، وَقَبْلَهَا. كَذَلِكَ يَعْبِرَ بِالْحَرِكَاتِ الثَّلَاثَ عَلَى الأَلْفِ وَهُنَاكَ الْفَتْحَةُ وَالْفُتُوحَةُ أَوَّلَ الْحَرِكَةِ، وَقَبْلَهَا، وَقَبْلَ وَالْحَرِكَاتِ الثَّلَاثَ عَلَى الأَلْفِ وَهُنَاكَ الْفَتْحَةُ وَالْفُتُوحَةُ أَوَّلَ الْحَرِكَةِ، وَقَبْلَهَا، وَقَبْلَ وَالْحَرِكَاتِ الثَّلَاثَ عَلَى الأَلْفِ وَهُنَاكَ الْفَتْحَةُ وَالْفُتُوحَةُ أَوَّلَ الْحَرِكَةِ، وَقَبْلَهَا.

Having finished his detailed introduction to the markers of inflection, the author now sums them up in a specially entitled section as practice for the beginner.4

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 Section: Inflected words4 are of two kinds, i.e. everything so far mentioned in the preceding chapter on inflection is of two kinds:

4.01 (1) one (15a) inflected with the short vowels,4 the three of them, which is the regular way. The vowels are u, a, and i, and inflection may also be shown by vowellessness;

4.02 (2) and one inflected with consonants.4 There are four of these, replacing the short vowels, contrary to the regular way, viz. w, ū, y and n, and inflection may also be shown by elision. The author begins next with those inflected with the short vowels because that is the regular way.

4.1 Those inflected with the short vowels (to sum up) are of four types, three of nouns and one of verbs.4 The three noun types are:

4.11 (1) the singular noun,4 whether masculine, as in jā'a zaydun 'Zayd came', ra'aytu zaydan 'I saw Zayd', marartu bi-zaydin 'I passed by

(fem. sing.) pass the night'.
4.12 (2) the broken plural,\(^1\) whether masculine, as in jā'a z-zuyūdu 'the Zayds came', ra'aytu z-zuyūda 'I saw the Zayds', marartu bi-z-zuyūdi 'I passed by the Zayds', or feminine, as in jā'at il-hunūdu 'the Hinds came', ra'aytu l-hunūda 'I saw the Hinds', marartu bi-l-hunūdi 'I passed by the Hinds'.\(^2\) In the first example az-zuyūdu 'the Zayds' and al-hunūdu 'the Hinds' are agents made independent by jā'a 'to come' and their independence marker is an explicit final u; in the second they are direct objects made dependent by ra'ā 'to see' and their dependence marker is i instead of a; in the third they are made oblique by bi 'by' and their obliqueness marker is i.\(^3\)

4.13 (3) the sound feminine plural,\(^1\) as in jā'at il-hindātu 'the Hinds came', ra'aytu l-hindāti 'I saw the Hinds', marartu bi-l-hindāti 'I passed by the Hinds'.\(^2\) In the first example al-hindātu 'the Hinds' is an agent made independent by jā'a 'to come' and its independence marker is an explicit final u (the t being a feminine gender marker);\(^3\) in the second it is a direct object made dependent by ra'ā 'to see' and its dependence marker is i instead of a; in the third it is made oblique by bi 'by' and its obliqueness marker is i. The author now turns
4.14 (4) the imperfect tense verb without suffixes.  

(That is, those suffixes which would impose invariability, namely the feminine na and the emphatic anna).  

Examples: yadribu 'he strikes', lan yadriba 'he will not strike'.

4.2 All these (i.e. the four types collectively, not each and every one of them (15b) because some of the rules do not apply in certain cases) have u when independent,  
hence you say in the singular noun jā'a zaydun wa-hindun 'Zayd and Hind came', in the broken plural jā'a z-zuyûdu 'the Zayds came', in the sound feminine plural jā'at il-hindätu 'the Hinds came' and in the verb yadribu 'he strikes'; a when dependent, hence you say in the singular noun ra'aytu zaydan wa-hindan 'I saw Zayd and Hind', in the broken plural ra'aytu zuyûdan 'I saw Zayds' and in the verb lan yadriba 'he will not strike'; i when oblique, hence you say in the singular noun marartu bi-zaydin wa-hindin 'I passed by Zayd and Hind', in the broken plural marartu bi-z-zuyûdi 'I passed by the Zayds' and in the sound feminine plural marartu bi-l-mu'minätu 'I passed by the (fem.) believers'; and vowellessness when apocopated. Example: lam yadrhib 'he did not strike'. The above inflection is the regular way.

4.3 Excluded from this regular way are three things:

4.31 (1) the sound feminine plural,  

which has i when dependent, e.g. ra'aytu l-hindati 'I saw the Hinds', where ra'aytu 'I saw' is a verb and agent and al-hindati 'the Hinds' is a direct object made dependent by ra'a 'to see', but its dependence marker is i instead of a, contrary to the regular way, since according to the regular way its dependence marker should be a;

4.32 (2) the semi-declinable noun,  

which has a when oblique, e.g. marartu bi-'ahmada wa-masâjida 'I passed by Ahmad and some mosques',
where both words are oblique but end in a, contrary to the regular way, since the obliqueness marker ought to have been i;\(^2\)

4.33 (3) and the imperfect tense verb of weak ending elides this ending in apocope.\(^1\) Examples: \textit{lam yag\u00fatz} 'he did not raid', \textit{lam ya\u00fag\u00e6a} 'he did not fear', \textit{lam yarmi} 'he did not throw', contrary to the regular way, since the apocope marker ought to have been vowellessness.

Having finished with the four types inflected with short vowels in the regular way, the author now turns to the four types which are inflected irregularly with consonants.

4.4 Words inflected with consonants are of four types: three of nouns and one of verbs, analogous to the above.\(^1\) The three types of nouns are (1) the dual,\(^2\) e.g. \textit{ja\acute{a} z-zayd\u00e3ni} 'the two Zayds came', (2) the sound masculine plural,\(^3\) e.g. \textit{ja\acute{a} z-zayd\u00e3n\u00eaa} 'the Zayds came', (3) the (16a) 'five nouns', already mentioned,\(^4\) viz. \textit{\u014d\u00f6\u0131ka} 'your father', \textit{\u014d\u00f6\u0151\u00f6ka} 'your brother', \textit{\u0151m\u00f6\u0131ka} 'your father-in-law', \textit{\u00e7u\u014d\u00f6ka} 'your mouth' and \textit{\u00e7u\u014d\u00f6\u0131\u00f6\u0142m\u0131n\u00e6} 'possessor of wealth'. The verbal type is (4) the 'five verbs',\(^5\) viz. \textit{ya\u0151f\u00e6l\u00e4n\u00e6} 'they two (masc.) do' (spelt y with two dots below), \textit{ta\u0151fl\u00e4n\u00e6} 'you two do, they two (fem.) do' (spelt t with two dots below), \textit{ya\u0151f\u00e6l\u00e4n\u00e6} 'they (masc.) do' (spelt y with two dots below), \textit{ta\u0151fl\u00e4n\u00e6} 'you (masc. plur.) do' (spelt t with two dots above), and \textit{ta\u0151fl\u00e4n\u00e6} 'you (fem. sing.) do' (spelt only with t with two dots above).

4.5 The dual\(^1\) (using the term \textit{ta\u0151ni\u00e6a} 'dualization' in the meaning of \textit{mu\u0142ann\u00e6} 'thing made dual', thereby giving the verbal noun the status of
the patient noun)\(^2\) has \(g\) when independent, e.g. \(q\)ā\(ma\) z\(-\)zay\(d\)ā\(n\)ī 'the two Zayds stood', where az\(-\)zay\(d\)ā\(n\)ī 'the two Zayds' is an agent made independent by \(q\)ā\(ma\) 'to stand', with \(a\) as its independence marker instead of \(u\), and has \(a\) when dependent and oblique. An example of the dependent form in \(a\) is ra\(\'\)aytu z\(-\)zay\(d\)ā\(y\)nī 'I saw the two Zayds', where az\(-\)zay\(d\)ā\(y\)nī 'the two Zayds' is a direct object made dependent by ra\(\'\)ā 'to see', with \(a\) (spelt with \(a\) before the \(y\) and \(i\) after) as its dependence marker instead of \(a\). An example of the oblique form in \(a\) is marartu bi\(z\)-zay\(d\)ā\(y\)nī 'I passed by the two Zayds', where az\(-\)zay\(d\)ā\(y\)nī 'the two Zayds' is made oblique by bi 'by', with \(a\) (spelt with \(a\) before the \(y\) and \(i\) after)\(^3\) as its obliqueness marker instead of \(i\).

4.6 The sound masculine plural\(^1\) has \(u\) when independent, e.g. \(q\)ā\(ma\) z\(-\)zay\(d\)ū\(n\)a 'the Zayds stood', where az\(-\)zay\(d\)ū\(n\)a 'the Zayds' is an agent made independent by \(q\)ā\(ma\) 'to stand', with \(u\) as its independence marker instead of \(u\), and has \(I\) when dependent and oblique. (Namely with \(i\) before the \(y\) and \(a\) after).\(^2\) An example of the dependent form in \(I\) is ra\(\'\)aytu z\(-\)zay\(d\)ū\(n\)a 'I saw the Zayds', where az\(-\)zay\(d\)ū\(n\)a 'the Zayds' is a direct object made dependent by ra\(\'\)ā 'to see', with \(I\) (spelt with \(I\) before the \(y\) and \(a\) after) as its dependence marker instead of \(a\). An example of the oblique form in \(I\) is marartu bi\(z\)-zay\(d\)ū\(n\)a 'I passed by the Zayds', where az\(-\)zay\(d\)ū\(n\)a 'the Zayds' is made oblique by bi 'by', with \(I\) (spelt with \(I\) before the \(y\) and \(a\) after) as its obliqueness marker instead of \(i\).

4.7.1 The 'five nouns'\(^1\) have \(u\) when independent, e.g. jā\(a\) 'abū\(k\)a wa\(-\)a\(k\)ū\(k\)a wa\(-\)ham\(b\)ā\(k\)a wa\(-\)fū\(k\)a wa\(-\)gū\(m\)ālin 'your father, your brother, your father-in-law, your mouth and the possessor of wealth came', where 'abū\(k\)a 'your father' is an agent made independent by jā\(a\) 'to come, the nouns following are coordinated with it and share in its independence, and the independence marker in each is \(u\) instead of \(u\). The ka 'your'
on the first four is made oblique by what is annexed to it.

4.72 They have ā when dependent, e.g. raʾaytu ʿabāka waʾaḥāka wa-ḥamāka wa-fāka wa-dā mālin 'I saw your father, your brother, your father-in-law, your mouth and the possessor of wealth', where ʿabāka 'your father' is a direct object made dependent by raʾā to see (which makes its own agent independent), the nouns following are coordinated with it and share in its dependence through raʾā, and the dependence marker of each is ā instead of a. The ka 'your' on the first four is made oblique by what is annexed to it; 2

4.73 and they have ʾī when oblique. Examples: marartu biʾ-ʿabīka waʾaḥīka wa-ḥamīka wa-fīka wa-dī mālin 'I passed by your father, your brother, your father-in-law, your mouth and the possessor of wealth', where ʿabīka 'your father' is made oblique by biʾ by (spelt with one dot below), the nouns following are coordinated with it and share in its obliqueness through biʾ, and the obliqueness marker of each is ī instead of i. The ka 'your' on the first four has oblique status 1 through what is annexed to it. Attention has already been drawn to the conditions under which the 'five nouns' are inflected with consonants.

4.81 The 'five verbs' mentioned above have n when independent, e.g. yaddribānī 'they two (masc.) strike', taddribānī 'you two (masc. & fem.) strike', yaddribūna 'they (masc.) strike', taddribūna 'you (masc. plur.) strike', taddribūnā 'you (fem. sing.) strike'. 2 These 'five verbs' are made independent by the absence of operator, with retention of n as their independence marker instead of u. The pronouns in the 'five verbs', viz. ā, ā and ī are agents made independent by the 'five verbs'.
They elide the \( n \) when dependent or apocopated. Examples of the dependent form with elision of \( n \) are \( \text{Ian yadrib}ā \) 'they two (masc.) will not strike', \( \text{Ian tadrib}ā \) 'you two (masc. & fem.) will not strike, they two (fem.) will not strike', \( \text{Ian yaqrib}ū \) 'they (masc.) will not strike', \( \text{Ian tadrib}ū \) 'you (masc. plur.) will not strike', \( \text{Ian taqribī} \) 'you (fern, sing.) will not strike'. These 'five verbs' are made dependent by \( \text{Ian} \) 'not', with elision of \( n \) as their dependence marker instead of \( a \). The dual \( ā \), masculine plural \( ā \) and second person feminine \( ī \) are agents made independent by the 'five verbs'. Examples of the apocopated form with elision of \( n \) are \( \text{lam yadrib}ā \) 'they two (masc.) did not strike', \( \text{lam tadrib}ā \) 'you two (masc. & fem.) did not strike, they two (fem.) did not strike', \( \text{lam yaqribū} \) 'they (masc.) did not strike', \( \text{lam tadribū} \) 'you (masc. plur.) did not strike', \( \text{lam tadribī} \) 'you (fern, sing.) did not strike'. These 'five verbs' are apocopated by \( \text{lam} \) 'not' with elision of \( n \) as their apocopation marker instead of vowellessness. The three pronouns, namely \( ū \), \( ā \) and \( ī \), are agents with independent status through the 'five verbs'. All these are imperfect tense verbs suffixed with either the dual, masculine plural or second person feminine singular pronoun, as in the examples provided, and anyone who wishes a more extensive treatment of this than we give here may refer to my *Commentary on Qatr an-nadā* or other such lengthy works.

**4.9 Supplementary Note:** The total number of inflection markers is ten, viz. the three short vowels, \((17a)\) vowellessness, the three consonants, their elision by the apocopating operator, \( n \) and its elision by the operators of dependence and apocopation.

Having finished with the inflection markers of the various kinds of inflected words (including the imperfect tense verb), the discussion now turns to inflected and invariable verbs, to which the author assigns a special chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 Chapter on verbs:¹ (in the technical sense). Verbs (plural of fi² 'verb, action') are of three kinds, and there is no fourth:

5.01 (1) past tense,¹ i.e. that which conventionally denotes an event and an elapsed time. It is distinguished from the other two kinds by the unvowelled feminine t suffix denoting that its agent is feminine: thus, with qāma 'to stand', qaṣada 'to sit', karaja 'to go out', you say qāmat hindun wa-qaṣadat wa-karajat 'Hind stood, sat, went out'. By 'unvowelled' he excludes the vowelled t which occurs on nouns,² e.g. qā'imatun 'standing' (fem. sing.) and on particles, e.g. rubbat 'how few', tummatat 'then', except that the vowel of this t in nouns is inflectional, while that of the particles is invariable (though the invariable vowel is sometimes found on nouns, e.g. lā ḥawla wa-lā quwwata 'no power and no might').³ By 'denoting that its agent is feminine' he excludes such rarities as the unvowelled t on particles like rubbat 'how few', tummatat 'then', because on these it merely denotes that the expression itself is feminine, not that it has a feminine agent (as already partly made clear above; my aim in this commentary, however, is to clarify the terminology even at the cost of repetition, so that beginners may benefit from it, and others too, if Almighty God so wills);⁴

5.02 (2) imperfect tense, (i.e. 'similar' to the noun),¹ defined as that which conventionally denotes an event and an unelapsed time, whether
present or future. It is called mudārīṣ 'resembling' from the word mudāraṣṣatun 'resemblance', meaning similarity to the noun. The best explanation of the point of similarity is that in syntactical combination both nouns and verbs acquire a variety of meanings, some of which result in identical forms of inflection. The noun, however, needs inflection more than the imperfect tense verb because the meanings of the imperfect (unlike those of the noun) can be distinguished by means other than inflection, hence inflection is (17b) fundamental in nouns and only secondary in imperfect tense verbs. The imperfect is distinguished from the other two kinds of verb by the fact that it may be preceded by lam 'not', as in the Qur’anic lam yalid wa-lam yūld 'he bore not, nor was he born'.

5.03 (3) imperative. This is always future, since its aim is the occurrence of what has not yet happened. It is distinguished from the other two kinds by intrinsically denoting a demand, e.g. qum 'stand!'. Excluded, for example, is lā tadrib 'do not strike!', even if this is understood to denote a demand, it is only through the intermediary of a particle of prohibition, i.e. it is a demand to desist. Being a verb, the imperative must be able to take the second person singular I (which Sibawayhi regarded as a pronominal i), as in the Qur’anic fa-kuli wa-sabl wa-qarrī aynan 'so eat, drink and delight your eye'. It must also be able to take the emphatic anna, as in 'agbilanna 'approach!!'. If a word denotes a demand but cannot take the feminine I or the emphatic anna, e.g. šah 'ssh!' meaning uskut 'be quiet!', it is not an imperative verb but a noun of action. Similarly, if it does take the second person feminine singular i but does not denote a demand, e.g. 'anti taqumīna wa-tagūdīna 'you (fem. sing.) are standing up and sitting down', it is not an imperative but an imperfect tense verb. Those are the facts of the three kinds of verbs: their grammatical rules are as follows.

5.1 The past tense always ends in a, whether triliteral, e.g. daraba 'to strike', quadrilateral, e.g. dabraja 'to overturn', quinquiliteral,
5.11 Among the past tense verbs are included ničma 'how good he is', bi'sa 'how bad he is', casā 'he might' and laysa 'he is not', since they can all take the above-mentioned feminine t, e.g. ničmat 'how good she is', bi'sat 'how bad she is', casat 'she might' and laysat 'she is not'.

5.2 The imperative is always apocopated, or rather, it is invariable, according to the best view held by the majority of Başrans. Its invariable form is the same as the apocopated form of its imperfect tense: if the verb is of sound ending it is unvowelled, e.g. iqrib 'strike!', intalīq 'depart!', istakrij 'extract!', whose apocopated imperfect tense is unvowelled, viz. lam yaqrib 'he did not strike', lam yantalīq 'he did not depart', lam yastakrij 'he did not extract'. If the verb is (18a) defective, i.e. ends in ū, ā or ī, it is made invariable by eliding the defective consonant, e.g. uţzu 'raid!';
5.21 Among the imperative verbs are hātī 'bring!' (with i after the t providing no masculine plural pronoun is suffixed, in which case u occurs), and taqāla 'come!' (always with a after the i), because they both denote a demand and may also take the feminine singular i. Thus when used to command a male they are invariably with elision of the defective consonant, viz. hātī 'bring!', taqāla 'come!', like irmī 'throw!' and iğša 'fear!', and when used to command a female they are invariably with elision of n, viz. hātī 'bring!', taqālay 'come!', like irmī 'throw!' and iğšay 'fear!'.

5.3 The imperfect tense begins with one of the four augments known as the 'consonants of the imperfect tense', viz. , n, y (spelt with two dots below) and t (spelt with two dots above), which are combined in the letters making up the word 'anaytu, meaning 'I reached' (alternatively na'a'ytu, meaning 'I was distant'). The conditions are that ' denotes the speaker by himself, n the speaker and whoever is with him,
or a single person in self-magnification (even if only by pretension), $y$ denotes the absent male absolutely and the plural of absent females, and $t$ denotes the person addressed absolutely, the single absent female and the dual absent female, e.g. 'aqūmu 'I stand', naqūmu 'we stand', yaqūmu 'he stands', taqūmu 'you (masc. sing.) stand, she stands'. If it is objected that these consonants also appear on past tense verbs, as in 'akramtu zaydan 'I honoured Zayd', taqallantu l-mas'ila 'I learnt the problem', narjastu d-dawa'a 'I put narcissus (narjis) in the medicine', yarna'tu š-Šayba 'I put red dye (yarna', i.e. henna) in the white hair', the answer is that if you define them as above this is clearly not intended.

5.31 Note: There are two rules for the form of the imperfect tense verb, one for its beginning and one for its end. The rule for the beginning is that its first letter (i.e. the one which actually begins the word) is always followed by $u$ if the corresponding past tense (18b) is quadriliteral, e.g. yudahriju 'he overturns' (past tense dahraja 'he overturned'), but otherwise is followed by $a$, whether the verb is triliteral, as in yaqribu 'he strikes' (past tense daraba 'he strikes'), quinquiliteral, e.g. yanṭaliqu 'he departs' (past tense intalaqa 'he departed') or six-lettered, e.g. yastakriju 'he extracts' (past tense istakraja 'he extracted').

5.32 The rule for the end is that it is unwovelled with the feminine plural $na$ (strictly speaking it is invariably when this is suffixed), as in the Qur'anic wa-l-muṭallaqātu yatarbābsna 'and the divorced women wait', and it has a when directly suffixed with the emphatic $anna$, whether the heavy form, as in the Qur'anic la-yusjananna 'he shall surely be imprisoned!', or the light form, as in the Qur'anic wa-l-yakūnan min aṣ-ṣāgīrina 'he shall surely be among the humbled'.

5.33 Apart from this the imperfect tense is inflected, as the author indicates by saying, and it is always independent (that is, in the
absence of operators of dependence or apocopeation), e.g. *yaqūmu zaydun* 'Zayd stands', *yakšā zaydun* 'Zayd fears', *yağū zaydun* 'Zayd raids', *yarmī zaydun* 'Zayd throws'; these four verbs are made independent by the absence of operators and their independence marker is *u*, likewise *yadribāni* 'they two (masc.) strike', *tadribānī* 'you two (masc. & fem.) strike', they two (fem.) strike', *yadribūnā* 'they (masc.) strike', *tadribūnā* 'you (masc. plur.) strike', *tadribūna* 'you (fem. sing.) strike', these 'five verbs' being made independent by the absence of operators,\(^2\) with retention of *n* as their independence marker instead of *u*.

5.34 They remain independent until preceded by an operator of dependence (which therefore makes them dependent) or an operator of apocopeation. (This apocopates them).\(^1\) Having finished with the independence of the imperfect tense verb through the absence of operators, he now turns to its dependence caused by dependence operators:

5.4 The operators of dependence\(^1\) on the imperfect tense (including both those accepted unanimously and those in dispute) are ten in number: as presented here, of which only four are unanimously accepted, the remaining six being held to make the imperfect tense dependent only by means of a suppressed *'an 'that'*\(^2\), but the author attributes dependence directly to them to make it easier for the beginner. He then indicates the four unanimously accepted: they are,

5.41 (1) *'an 'that'*\(^1\) (spelt with a after the *' and unvowelled *n*). This is a relative particle\(^2\) which fuses with its dependent verb to form the
equivalent of a verbal noun,\(^3\) for which reason it is called 'the verbal noun 'an'. It occurs in two positions:\(^4\) (a) as the initial element of an equational sentence, with independent function as subject, as in the Qur'anic \(\text{wa-'an tasūmū kayrun lakum} \) 'and that you should fast is best for you',\(^5\) and (b) after an expression denoting a sense of uncertainty; here it may have independent function as agent, as in the Qur'anic \(\text{a-lam ya'ni li-lladîna 'an} \) 'has it not occurred to those who believe that their hearts should be humble'?\(^6\), or it may have dependent function as object, as in the Qur'anic \(\text{aradtu 'an 'a} \) 'I wanted to blame it',\(^7\) or oblique function, as in the Qur'anic \(\text{min qabli 'an ya'tiya yawmūn} \) 'before a certain day comes'.\(^8\)

The author puts 'an first because it is the fundamental particle and parent\(^9\) of the whole category.

5.411 It makes dependent either when overt or suppressed: an example of the former is the Qur'anic \(\text{wa-lladi 'atma }\) 'and who I desire that he should forgive me my sin',\(^1\) and the latter is illustrated in the verse

\[
\text{wa-lubsu 'aba'ātin wa-tagarra }\text{Caynī}
\]\n
'and wearing a rough cloak and my eye relax is dearer to me than wearing the finest cloth',\(^2\) where \(\text{tagarra 'may relax'}\) is made dependent by a suppressed 'an 'that', which, combined with its verb, is a paraphrase of an independent verbal noun coordinated with \(\text{lubsu 'the wearing'}\). Thus the implicit meaning is \(\text{lubsu }\) \(\text{Gabā'atîn wa-qurratu }\text{Caynī 'the wearing of a rough cloak and the relaxation of my eye'}\).\(^3\)

5.412 The term 'verbal noun 'an' excludes the 'explanatory 'an',\(^1\) viz. the one preceded by a sentence containing a synonym of \(\text{gāla 'to say'}\) but not its actual letters,\(^2\) because this 'an merely has the status of \(\text{ay 'i.e.'}, \) as in the Qur'anic \(\text{fa-'awhaynā 'ilayhi 'an isnā il-fulka 'so we inspired him, (that) 'build the ark!'}\)',\(^3\) i.e. we said 'build!'.

5.413 Also excluded is the 'redundant 'an'\(^1\) that sometimes follows the
temporal lammā 'when',² as in the Qur’anic fa-lammā 'an jā’a l-bašīru 'and when the bearer of good tidings came'.³ Various other matters are also excluded, which I have mentioned in my Commentary on Qatır an-nadā¹ and which are not suitable for such a short work as this.

5.42 (2) lan 'not',¹ a particle which negates the future, e.g. lan nabraha 'we shall not go forth', where lan 'not' is a particle of negation and dependence and nabraha 'we (may) go forth' is an imperfect tense verb made dependent by lan, with an explicit a as its dependence marker. I have dealt above with problems concerning lan.²

5.43 (3) 'idän 'therefore',¹ which, according to Sibawayhi and his followers, is a particle of response and requital.² The best view is that it is a simple word and not a compound of 'iḏ 'since' and 'an 'that', and that it makes dependent by itself and not through a suppressed following 'an. What is meant by its being a particle of response is that it occurs in sentences which are responses to other sentences (expressed or implied), irrespective of whether 'idän 'therefore' occurs at the beginning, in the middle or at the end. By its being used for requital is meant that the content of the sentence in which it occurs is a requital of the content of some other sentence.

5.431 Note: 'idän 'therefore' only makes the imperfect tense verb dependent under three conditions:

(1) that the imperfect tense verb following it should have future meaning.¹ If the verb is merely a circumstantial qualifier it remains
independent, as, for instance, when someone says 'ubhibbuka 'I love you', and you reply 'idan uşaddiğuka 'that being the case I always believe you';

(2) that 'idan should have first place in the sentence, e.g. when someone says 'âtîka gadan 'I am coming to you tomorrow', and you reply 'idan ukrıma 'in that case I shall honour you'. If 'idan does not have first place it will have intervened between two elements, e.g. (19b) zaydun 'idan yukrimuka 'Zayd, therefore, will honour you', and it is then inoperative;

(3) that nothing should separate 'idan from its verb, e.g. 'idan 'ukrimaka 'therefore I shall honour you', for if it is separated, as in 'idan anâ 'ukrimuka 'I, therefore, will honour you', 'idan is inoperative. Nevertheless, when the intervening element is an oath, as in 'idan wa-llâhi 'ukrimaka 'therefore, by God, I will honour you', this has no effect.

5.432 These three conditions are fulfilled, for example, when someone says 'azûrûka gadan 'I shall visit you tomorrow', and you reply 'idan 'ukrimaka 'therefore I shall honour you', where 'idan 'therefore' is a particle of response and dependence, 'ukrima 'I (may) honour' is an imperfect tense verb made dependent by 'idan 'therefore', with a as its dependence marker; the agent is concealed in the verb as an implicit anâ 'I' with independent status through the verb 'ukrima 'I (may) honour', and ka 'you' is a direct object with dependent status through the imperfect tense verb.

5.44 (4) kay 'that', called the 'verbal noun kay'. This particle has li 'for' prefixed to it either explicitly, as in the Qur'anic li-kay-lâ ta'saw 'so that you may not grieve', or implicitly, as in ji'tuka kay...
tukrimanî 'I have come to you so that you may honour me', where the implicit original form is li-kay 'so that', but you have elided the li 'for' because the intention to utter it enables you to dispense with it.\(^3\) In the Qur'anic example li 'for' is a particle of causation and obliqueness, kay 'so that' is a verbal noun particle of dependence, lā 'not' is a particle of negation and ta'saw 'you (may) grieve' (masc. plur.) is in imperfect tense verb made dependent by kay with elision of n as its dependence marker. If kay is not taken as having an explicit or implicit li before it, then kay itself becomes regarded as causative and the following imperfect tense verb is made dependent by a compulsorily suppressed 'an 'that'.\(^4\)

5.5 Having finished with the four unanimously accepted operators of dependence,\(^1\) the author now turns to the disputed six; as already pointed out, the best view is that the actual operator of dependence with these is a following suppressed 'an 'that'.

5.51 (1) the li 'for' of kay 'so that', i.e. the 'causative li'.\(^1\) This li has been annexed to kay here because li can take the place\(^2\) of kay in conveying causality, as in the Qur'anic li-yakūna r-rasūlu šahīdan Calaykum 'in order that the Prophet may be a witness against you',\(^3\) where yakūna 'he may be' is an imperfect tense verb made dependent by an implicit 'an 'that' after 'the li of kay' 'so that', with a as its dependence marker; ar-rasūlu 'the Prophet' is the subject-noun of yakūna 'he may be', which makes it independent, šahīdan 'a witness' is the predicate of yakūna, which makes it dependent,\(^4\) and Calaykum 'against you' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connect-ed with šahīdan 'a witness'. This li 'for' is also called the 'causative li'.

5.52 (2) the li of denial,\(^1\) i.e. of negation. This is the redundant li
for' which occurs in the predicate of kāna 'to be' when that verb is negated by mā 'not' or lam 'not'. An example of the former is the Qur'anic mā kāna llāhu li-yaā ara l-mu'minlna 'God is not one to abandon the faithful'. The latter is illustrated by the Qur'anic lam yakun illā hu li-yagfira lahum 'God was not the one to forgive them'; in both these examples yadara 'he may abandon' and yagfira 'he may forgive' are imperfect tense verbs made dependent by an implicit 'an 'that' after the 'li of denial', with a as their marker of dependence. This li is called the 'li of denial' because it is preceded by a negated entity, denial being another name for negation.

5.53 (3) hattā 'until', i.e. the operator of obliqueness which conveys the sense of an ultimate limit, as in the Qur'anic ḥattā ya'tiya wa'du llāhi 'until the threat of God comes', where ya'tiya '(it) may come' is an imperfect tense verb made dependent by a compulsorily suppressed 'an 'that', with a as its dependence marker, wa'du 'threat' is an agent made independent by ya'tiya '(it) may come', and allāhi 'of God' is made oblique by having wa'du 'threat' annexed to it.

5.54 (4) response with fa 'and then', conveying cause, and (5) wa 'and', conveying accompaniment. These two occur in the response to a pure demand or a pure negation: an example of the latter is the Qur'anic lā yuqd ās alayhim fa-yamūtū (or wa-yamūtū) 'it shall not be decreed upon them that they should die'.

5.55 The pure demand comprises various types, in seven matters, which are as follows:
(a) the imperative, e.g. *zurnī fa-'ukrimaka* or *wa-'ukrimaka* 'visit me and I shall honour you';

(b) prohibition, e.g. the Qur'anic *lä taṭgaw fī fa-yahilla *Galaykum *gādābi* 'do not go to extremes in it so that my anger may descend upon you' (or *wa-yahilla* 'and so it may descend', outside the Qur'ān);

(c) invocation, as in the verse

\[ \text{rabbi waffiqni fa-lā 'a cdila (or wa-lā 'acdila) cān sanani s-sā'cina fī kāyri sananin} \]

'O my Lord, give me success, and then I will not swerve from the path of the strivers in the best of paths';

(d) interrogation, as in the verse

\[ \text{hal ta'rifūna lubānātī fa-'arjuwa 'an} \]
\[ \text{tuqād fa-yartadda (or wa-yartadda) ba'cdū r-rūḥi li-l-jasādī 'do you understand my cares, so that I may hope they will be ended, and some soul may return to my body?'}; \]

(e) proposing, as in the verse

\[ \text{yā bna l-kirāmī 'a-lā tadnū fa-tubsīra (or wa-tubsīra) mā qad hadādāka fa-mā rā'īn ka-man samī'c} \]

'O son of nobles, will you not come near, and then you will see what they have told you about, for one who sees is not like one who hears';

(f) incitement, as in the Qur'anic *lawlā 'äkkartānī 'ilā 'ajalin qarībin fa-'assaddaqa* 'would you not grant me a postponement for a short term, and then I may give alms' (or *wa-'assaddaqa* 'and then I may give alms' outside the Qur'ān);

(g) hoping, as in the Qur'anic *yā laytanī kuntu mā'ahum fa-'afūza* 'Oh,
if only I were with them and then I might gain'.

The response after the fa and wa in all these examples is made dependent by a compulsorily suppressed 'an 'that'.

5.551 Note: If the author had said 'fa and wa in response' it would have been clearer, because the response does not make anything dependent, but is itself made dependent.

5.552 By 'pure negation' is excluded negation voided by 'illā 'except', e.g. mā 'anta 'illā ta'tīnā fa-tuhaddītanā 'you do nothing except come and talk to us', and by 'imperative' is excluded the agent noun, as in nazālī fa-nukrimuka 'dismount and we will honour you'. In both of these cases there is nothing but the independent form.

5.56 (6) 'aw 'or', the conjunction, whenever 'ilā 'until' or 'illā 'except' can properly occur in its place. The former is illustrated by la-'alzimannaka (20b) 'aw taqdiyani haqqī 'I shall surely stick close to you or you will give me my due', i.e. 'ilā 'an taqdiyani 'until you give me', cf. the verse

la-'astashilanna s-sa'ba 'aw 'udrika 1-munā
fa-mā ngādat il-'āmālu 'illā li-ṣābirin
'I shall surely face all difficulties lightly, or I shall achieve my desire, for hopes submit only to the steadfast', i.e. 'ilā 'an 'udrika 'until I achieve'. An example of the latter is la-'aqṭulanna l-kāfira 'aw yuslima 'I shall surely kill the unbeliever or he will become a Muslim', i.e. 'illā 'an yuslima 'except he become a Muslim'. The verbs
5.6 Note:¹ The gist of the above is that there is a suppressed 'an 'that' after three of the particles of obliqueness, viz. li 'for', the causative kay 'so that', ḥattā 'until', and after three of the particles of coordination, viz. fa 'and then', wa 'and', 'aw 'or'. Having finished with the operators which make the imperfect tense verb dependent, the author now turns to the operators which apocopate it:

5.7 The operators of apocopation are eighteen in number;¹ they are divided into two kinds, those which apocopate a single verb, and those which apocopate two verbs.² The author begins with the first kind, of which there are six, the first being,

5.71 (1) lam 'not',¹ a particle of negation and apocopation which negates the imperfect tense and converts its meaning to the past,² as in the Qur'anic lam yalid wa-lam yūlad wa-lam yakun lahu kufuwan 'ahadun 'he did not bear, nor was he born, nor has there been anyone his equal',³ where lam 'not' is a particle of negation and apocopation and yalid 'he (might) bear', yūlad 'he (might) be born' and yakun 'he (might) be' are all imperfect tense verbs apocopated by lam, with vowellessness as their marker of apocopation.

5.72 (2) lammā 'not yet',¹ i.e. the negative lammā, a particle of apocopation which negates the imperfect tense and converts its meaning to the past, as in the Qur'anic lammā yaqdi mā 'amarahu 'he has not yet performed what he commanded him',² where yaqdi 'he (might) perform' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by lammā 'not yet', with elision of the defective consonant as its apocopation marker instead of vowellessness.

5.721 lammā 'not yet' has the following in common with lam 'not':¹ it is a particle, specific to the imperfect tense, it negates, apocopates, converts the meaning to the past, and may be prefixed with the inter-
rogative 'a '?'. But lam 'not' differs from lammā 'not yet' in various ways that I have mentioned in my Commentary on Qatr an-nadā and which are not suitable for this short work.

5.722 Additional Note: The 'verbal noun 'an' 'that' and lam 'not' sometimes overlap, so that 'an apocopates and lam makes dependent.1 There is a rare Reading of the Qur'anic 'a-lam našrah 'did we not expand?' as našraḥa 'we (may) expand' in the dependent form. Occasionally lam 'not' is made inoperative by treating it as là 'not', so that the following verb remains independent, as in the verse fragment lam yūfūna bi-1-jārī 'they have not kept their word to their neighbour'.

5.73 (3) 'a-lam 'not...?',1 as in the Qur'anic 'a-lam našrah laka sadraka 'did we not expand for you your breast?',2 where 'a-lam 'not...?' is a particle of affirmation and apocopation, našrah 'we (may) expand' is apocopated by 'a-lam with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, and its agent is concealed3 in it (21a) with the implicit meaning of nahnu 'we' and has independent status; laka 'for you' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with našrah 'we (may) expand', sadraka 'you breast' is a direct object made dependent by našrah with a as its dependence marker, and ka 'your' has oblique function by having sadra 'heart' annexed to it.

5.74 (4) 'a-lammā 'not yet...?',1 which is closely related2 to 'a-lam 'not...?', e.g. 'a-lammā 'ūḥsin 'ilayka 'have I not yet been good to you?'. Here 'a-lammā 'not yet...?' is a particle of affirmation and apocopation,3 'ūḥsin 'I (might) be good' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by 'a-lammā with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, and its agent is a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of 'anā 'I' and has independent status, and 'ilayka 'towards you' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with 'ūḥsin 'I (might) be good'.
5.741 Note: ‘a-lam 'not...?' and 'a-lammā 'not yet...?' are simply lam and lamma repeated by the author with the interrogative prefix 'a '?' to make it easier for the beginner.

5.75 (5) the imperative li,'as in the Qur’anic li-yunfiq ǧū sa‘atīhi 'let the man of means spend from his means'. Here li is the 'imperative li', yunfiq 'he (might) spend' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by the imperative li with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, ǧū 'possessor of' is its agent made independent by it with ū as its independence marker instead of u (because it is one of the 'five nouns'), sa‘atī 'means' has ǧū 'possessor of' annexed to it and this makes it oblique, and min sa‘atīhi 'from his means' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with yunfiq 'he (might) spend'.

5.751 and the li of request,'which is really an imperative li but is called the 'li of request' out of politeness, as in the Qur’anic li-yaqdi ǧalāyīnā rabbuka 'let your Lord judge us'. Here li is the 'li of request', yaqdi 'he (might) judge' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by the li of request with elision of the defective consonant as its apocopation marker instead of vowellessness; ǧalāyīnā 'over us' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with yaqdi 'he (might) judge', rabbu 'lord' is the agent of yaqdi and is made independent by it with u as its independence marker, and ka 'your' has rabbu 'lord' annexed to it, which makes it oblique.

5.752 Note: The difference between the 'imperative li' and the 'li of request' is that commands are only given to inferiors, while requests are made of superiors. If you ask something from an equal it is called 'solicitation'.

5.76 (6) *lā 'not'* used in prohibition,\(^1\) e.g. *lā tādrib* 'do not strike', where *lā 'not'* is a particle of prohibition and apocopeation, *tādrib* 'you (might) strike' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by the *lā of prohibition* with vowellessness as its apocopeation marker, and its agent is a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of *anta 'you'* (masc. sing.) and independent status through the verb.

5.761 and also the *lā 'not'* used in request, which is really the *lā of prohibition*, but (2lb) is called the *lā of request* out of politeness,\(^1\) e.g. *lā tu'ākīnā* 'do not blame us',\(^2\) where *lā 'not'* is a particle of request and apocopeation, *tu'ākīnā* 'you (might) blame us' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by the *lā of request* with vowellessness as its apocopeation marker, its agent is a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of *anta 'you'* (masc. sing.) and independent status through the verb, and *nā 'us'* is a direct object with dependent status through *tu'ākīd* 'you (might) blame'.

5.8 Having finished with the operators which apocopeate a single verb, the author now turns to those which apocopeate two verbs,\(^1\) of which there are twelve, the first being:

5.81 (1) *'in 'if'*\(^1\), i.e. the *'conditional 'in'* spelt with *i* after the *' and unwovelled *n*.\(^2\) This is a particle which apocopates the imperfect tense formally and the past tense verb in status,\(^3\) and changes the meaning of the past tense to the future (the opposite of *lam 'not'*), as
in the Qur’anic _wa-‘in tu’minū wa-tattaqū yu’tikum ‘ujūrakum ‘and if you believe in and fear God he will bring you your rewards_. 4 Here _‘if’ is a particle of condition and apocopeation, tu’minū ‘you (might) believe’ (masc. plur.) is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by _‘in_ with elision of _n_ as its apocopation marker instead of vowellessness (because it is one of the ‘five verbs’), and tattaqū ‘you (might) fear’ (masc. plur.) is coordinated with _tu’minū_ and shares in its apocopeation by _‘in_, and its apockpation marker is also elision of _n_ instead of vowellessness. 5 In both verbs the _ū_ is an agent with independent status through them. The verb _yu’tī ‘he (might) bring_ is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by _‘in ‘if_ with elision of the defective consonant as its apocopeation marker instead of vowellessness, and its agent is a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of _huwa ‘he_; _kum ‘you_ (masc. plur.) is a direct object with dependent status through the verb, _‘ujūrakum ‘your rewards_ is a second direct object made dependent by the verb, and _kum ‘your_ (masc. plur.) has _‘ujūra ‘rewards_ annexed to it, which makes it oblique.

5.811 The first verb, namely _tu’minū ‘you (might) believe_ is called the ‘verb of the condition’ and the second, namely _yu’tī ‘he (might) bring_ is called the ‘response to the condition’, because it follows from the condition just as an answer follows from the question. It is also called the ‘requital’, because its contents are a requital of the contents of the condition. 1

5.82 (2) _mā ‘whatever_ , i.e. the ‘conditional _mā_, as in the Qur’anic
mā nansāk min 'āyatin 'aw nunsīhā naʾti bi-kayrin minhā 'aw mitlihā
'whatever we cancel of a verse or cause it to be forgotten, we shall bring one better than it or like it'.

Here mā 'whatever' is a noun of condition and apocopation, nansāk 'we (might) cancel' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by the 'conditional mā' with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of naḥnu 'we' and independent status through the verb; min 'āyatin 'of a verse' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with nansāk 'we (might) cancel', 'aw nunsīhā 'or we (might) cause it to be forgotten' is coordinated (22a) by 'aw 'or' with nansāk 'we (might) cancel' and shares in its apocopation by the conditional mā, and the hā 'it' is a direct object with dependent status through nunsī 'we (might) cause to forget'; the agent of nunsī is a concealed pronoun made independent by it with the implicit meaning of naḥnu 'we' (so that the latter is a noun by virtue of having the verb predicated of it); naʾti 'we (might) bring' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by the conditional mā with elision of the defective consonant as its apocopation marker instead of vowellessness, and its agent is a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of naḥnu 'we'. Here nansāk 'we (might) cancel' is the verb of the condition and naʾti 'we (might) come' is the response to the condition; bi-kayrin 'with a better one' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with naʾti, minhā 'than it' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with kayrin 'a better one', mitlihā 'like it' is coordinated by 'aw 'or' with kayrin and shares in its obliqueness, and hā 'it' is made oblique by the annexation of migli 'like' to it.

5.83 (3) man 'whoever', i.e. the 'conditional man', as in the Qur’anic man yaʾmal sūʾan yujza bihi 'whoever does evil will be required for it'. Here man 'whoever' is a noun of condition and apocopation, yaʾmal
'he (might) do' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by man 'whoever' (and is the verb of the condition), with vowellessness as its apocopeation marker, its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of huwa 'he' and independent status through the verb; sū'ān 'evil' is a direct object made dependent by yaqmal 'he (might) do' with a as its dependence marker: yujza 'he (might) be requited' is an imperfect tense verb constructed with its object as agent and apocopated by man 'whoever' (and is the response to the condition), with elision of the final defective consonant as its apocopeation marker instead of vowellessness, and containing a concealed pronoun with the implicit meaning of huwa 'he' and independent status through the verb because it replaces the original agent; bihi 'for it' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with yujza 'he (might) be requited', and the pronoun in yujza refers to man 'whoever' (this referring is a sign that man is a noun, because pronouns can only refer to nouns).

5.84 (4) mahmā 'whatever',1 as in the Qur’anic mahmā ta’tina bihi min ‘āyatin li-tasharanā bihā fa-mā nāḥnu laka bi-mu’minīna 'whatever you bring in the way of verses to bewitch us with, we shall not believe in you'.2 Here mahmā 'whatever' is a noun of condition and apocopeation, ta’tina 'you (might) come to us' (masc. sing.) is the verb of the condition, apocopated by mahmā with elision of the final ḍ as its apocopeation marker; bihi 'with it' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with ta’tina 'you (might) come to us' and min ‘āyatin 'of a verse' is explanatory to mahmā 'whatever' with dependent function as a circumstantial qualifier of the hi ‘it’ in bihi ‘with it’, and li-tasharanā 'that you (masc. sing.) may bewitch us' is an imperfect tense verb dependent by the ‘an ‘that’ optionally suppressed after the ‘li of kay’ ‘so that’, with its agent compulsorily concealed in it and nā ‘us’ being its direct object. In fa-mā ‘and not’, the fa ‘and’ is a link for the response and mā ‘not’ is the negative particle, with nāḥnu ‘we’ as its subject-noun (if it is understood as a ‘Hijāzi mā’);3 laka ‘in you’ (22b) is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element connected with mu’minīna ‘believing’ (masc. plur.), and bi-mu’minīna ‘believing’ has dependent function as the predicate of mā ‘not’. The
sentence *fa-mā nahnu laka bi-mu'minîna* 'then we will not believe in you' has apocopated function as the response to the condition.

5.85 (5) *'idmā* 'whenever',¹ e.g. *'idmā taqum 'aqum ma caka* 'whenever you stand I shall stand with you'. Here *'idmā* 'whenever' is (according to the best view) a genuine particle, namely a particle of condition and apocopeation, and *taqum* 'you (might) stand' (masc. sing.) is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by *'idmā* 'whenever', with vowellessness as its apocopeation marker, and is termed the 'verb of the condition', its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of *'anta* 'you' (masc. sing.) and independent status through the verb; *'aqum* 'I (might) stand' is an imperfect tense verb also apocopated by *'idmā* 'whenever', with vowellessness as its apocopeation marker, and is termed the 'response to the condition', its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of *'anā* 'I' and independent status through the verb, and *ma caka* 'with you' is a space/time qualifier connected with *'aqum* 'I (might) stand'.

5.86 (6) *'ayyun* 'who(ever)',¹ as in the Qur'anic *'ayyan mā tad'ū fa-lahu l-*'asmā'u l-ḥusnā* 'whoever you pray to, His are the finest names'.² Here *'ayyan* 'whoever' is an apocopating noun of condition made depend­ent by *tad'ū* 'you (might) pray to' (masc. plur.), *mā* is a relative and *tad'ū* 'you (might) pray to' is the verb of the condition apocopated by *'ayyan* 'whoever', with elision of the final *n* as its apocopeation mark­er; in *fa-lahu* 'and to him' the *fa* 'and' is a link³ for the response and *lahu* 'to him' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element forming a preposed predicate,⁴ *al-*'asmā'u* 'the names' is a delayed
subject and al-ḥusnā 'the finest' is an epithet of al-ʿasmāʿu 'the names'. The sentence fa-lahu l-ʿasmāʿu l-ḥusnā 'and His are the finest names' has apocopated function as the response to the condition.

5.861 Additional Note:¹ The meaning of 'ayyun 'whoever' depends on what it is annexed to: in 'ayyun yaqum 'aqum 'whoever stands I will stand'² it is equivalent to man 'whoever'; in 'ayya d-dawabbi tarkab 'arkab 'whichever of the beasts you ride I shall ride' it is equivalent to mā 'whatever'; in 'ayya waqtin tasum 'asum 'whatever time you fast I shall fast' it is equivalent to matā 'whenever',³ and in 'ayya makānin tajlis 'ajlis 'whatever place you sit I shall sit' it is equivalent to 'ayna 'wherever'.⁴

5.87 (7) matā 'when(ever)',¹ as in matā taqum 'aqum 'whenever you stand I shall stand'. Here matā 'whenever'² is an apocopating noun of condition, taqum 'you (might) stand' (masc. sing.) is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by matā 'whenever', with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being concealed in it and made independent by it with the implicit meaning of 'anta 'you' (masc. sing.); 'aqum 'I (might) stand' is an imperfect tense verb also apocopated by matā 'whenever', with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being concealed in it with the implicit meaning of 'anā 'I': taqum 'you (might) stand' is the verb of the condition and 'aqum 'I (might) stand' is the response to the condition.

5.88 (8) 'ayyāna 'whenever'¹ (spelt with a after the ') , as in the verse

fa-'ayyāna mā taḍīl bihi r-rīḥu tanzili
'and then whenever the wind turns aside she stops',² where 'ayyāna 'whenever' is an apocopating noun of condition, mā 'ever' is redundant,³ taḍīl 'she (might) turn aside' is the verb of the condition, with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, and tanzili 'she (might) stop' is the response to the condition, with final vowellessness as its apocopation marker (the final i is purely accidental, as it is the vowel of the rhyming consonant).⁴
5.89 (9) 'aynamā 'wherever',¹ as in 'aynamā tajlis (23a) 'ajlis 'wherever you sit I shall sit', where 'ayna 'where' is an apocopating noun of condition, mā '-ever' is a relative,² tajlis 'you (might) sit' (masc. sing.) is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by 'ayna 'where', with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of 'anta 'you' (masc. sing.), and 'ajlis 'I (might) sit' is an imperfect tense verb also apocopated by 'ayna 'where', with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of 'anā 'I'.

5.90 (10) 'annā 'wherever',¹ (spelt with a after the ', and double n), as in 'annā tajlis 'ajlis 'wherever you sit I shall sit', where 'annā 'wherever' is an apocopating noun of condition, tajlis 'you (might) sit' (masc. sing.) is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by 'annā 'wherever' as the verb of the condition, with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of 'anta 'you' (masc. sing.); 'ajlis 'I (might) sit' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by 'annā 'wherever' as the response to the condition,² with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being concealed in it and made independent by it with the implicit meaning of 'anā 'I'.

5.91 haytumā 'wherever',¹ as in haytumā tagum 'agum 'wherever you stand I shall stand, with the same parsing as the preceding example.²
5.92 (12) kayfāmā 'however'¹ as in kayfāmā tāṣnāc 'āṣnāc 'however you act I shall act', where kayfāmā 'however'² is an apocopating noun of condition, tāṣnāc 'you (might) act' (masc. sing.) is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by kayfāmā 'however' as the verb of the condition, with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of 'anta 'you' (masc. sing.); 'āṣnāc 'I (might) act' is an imperfect tense verb apocopated by kayfāmā 'however' as the response to the condition, with vowellessness as its apocopation marker, its agent being a pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of 'anā 'I' and independent status through 'āṣnāc 'I (might) act'.

5.93 Additional Note:¹ The verb of the condition and its response have four states:² (a) both may be past tense verbs, as in wa-'in ġudtum ġudnā 'and if you (masc. plur.) returned we would return',³ or (b) both may be imperfect tense verbs, as in 'in tubūdū mā ff 'an fusikum 'aw tuḡfūhā yuḥāsibkum bihi llāhu 'if you (masc. plur.) reveal what is in your souls or hide it, God will assess you by it',⁴ or (c) the first verb may be past tense and the second imperfect tense, as in man kūrūdū ḥarṭa 1-ḡākirātī nazid lāhu ff ḥārṭihī 'whoever was wanting to cultivate the afterlife, we shall increase for him his cultivation',⁵ or (d) the first verb may be imperfect tense and the second past tense, as in the verse man yākidnī bi-sayyi‘in kunta minhu

ka-š-Sajā bayna ḥalqīhī wa-l-warīdī

'whoever might trick me into some evil, you would become towards him like the bone stuck between his windpipe and his jugular vein',⁶ but in the best opinion this last is forbidden, since it does not occur in prose.⁷
5.94 In some copies we also find: and 'īdā 'when', but only in poetry. This is in addition to the eighteen already listed. There is an example in the verse of the poet:

wa-'īdā tuṣibka ǧaṣṣatun fa-tajammal

'and when some privation afflicts you, be patient', where 'īdā 'when' is a conditional noun and tuṣibka 'it (fem. sing.) (might) afflict you' is the verb of the condition, with vowellessness as its apocopation marker; tajammal 'be patient!' (masc. sing.) is an imperative verb whose agent (23b) is compulsorily concealed in it. This verb and its agent make a verbal sentence with apocopated function as the response to the condition, and is connected by fa 'and so' because it is a verb of demand. Although 'īdā 'when' does not normally apocopate verbs when used as a conditional, it can operate in this way by being treated like matā 'when', just as matā can be made inoperative by treating it like 'īdā, as in the saying of ī'sā (may God be pleased with her), 'inna 'abā bakrīn rajulun 'asifūn wa-'innahu matā yaghūmu maqāma la yusmu'u n-nāsa 'Verily Abū Bakr is a soft-hearted man, and if he takes your place he will not make the people hear him', as transmitted by Ibn al-Jawzī in his Jāmi' al-masānīd, according to Ibn Mālik.
6.0 Chapter on the independent forms of nouns: (i.e. of nouns in particular). The independent forms of nouns are seven, viz.

6.1 (1) the agent, e.g. qāma zaydun 'Zayd stood';

6.2 (2) the object of an unnamed agent, e.g. duriba 'Amrun 'Amr was struck' (spelt with u after the d and i after the r);

6.3 (3) the subject and (4) the predicate, e.g. zaydun qā'imun 'Zayd is standing';

6.4 (5) the subject-noun of kāna 'to be', e.g. kāna zaydun qā'imun 'Zayd was standing', and of its related verbs, e.g. 'amsā zaydun dāhikan 'in the evening Zayd was laughing';

6.5 (6) the predicate of 'inna 'verily', e.g. 'inna zaydun qā'imun 'verily Zayd is standing', and of its related particles, e.g. layta 'amran mūsirun 'would that 'Amr were well off';

6.6 (7) the concordant of an independent noun, which comprises (i.e. the concordant) four items: (a) the adjective, e.g. qāma zaydun il-īl-cāqilu 'Zayd the intelligent stood', (b) the coordinate, e.g. qāma zaydun wa 'amrun 'Zayd and 'Amr stood', (c) the corroborative, e.g. qāma zaydun nafsu hu 'Zayd himself stood', and (d) the substitute, e.g. qāma zaydun 'akūka 'Zayd, your brother, stood'.

This is a summary presentation: in the detailed account the author has treated each one in a separate chapter arranged in the same sequence, starting with the first:
CHAPTER SEVEN

7.0 Chapter on the agent.1 The author gives the agent priority over the subject of the equational sentence,2 an arrangement based on the question of whether the subject or the agent is the original independent form. The case for the former is that the subject is the first element of an utterance and remains the subject even in inversion, while the agent ceases to be an agent when inverted.3 Furthermore, the subject operates on other elements, while the agent is without exception operated upon by something else.4 The case for the latter is that the operator of the agent is formal and therefore stronger5 than the abstract operator of the subject.

7.01 Lexically the agent1 is the person who brings the action into existence, but its technical meaning is 'the plain noun (or paraphrase)2 of which is predicated a syntactically complete verb (or paraphrase); this verb must precede the agent, be devoid of personal endings, and occur in its normal status and form'.3 (24a)

7.02 An example of the plain noun preceded by a verb is tabāraka ills ḥu 'God be blessed';1 by a verbal paraphrase, muktalifun 'alwānuhu 'its colours varying'2 (i.e. sinfun muktalifun 'alwānuhu 'a type varying in colours'); an example of a nominal paraphrase is 'a-wa-lam yakfihim 'annā 'anzailnā 'and has it not sufficed them that we sent down...?3 (i.e. 'inzālunā 'our sending down').

7.03 The feature of syntactic completeness excludes such verbs as kāna 'to be';1 'preceding the agent' excludes the subject of the equational sentence;2 'devoid of personal endings' excludes expressions of the type
The author now explains the agent in terms of some of its special characteristics to make it easier for the beginner. The agent is the independent noun (made so by its verb) which is preceded by its verb, e.g. qāma zaydun 'Zayd stood', where qāma 'stood' is a past tense verb and zaydun 'Zayd' is its agent made independent by it, with u as its independence marker: zaydun must be an agent because it is true of it that it is an independent noun preceded by the verb which makes it independent. We understand from the word 'noun' that the agent can only be a noun, not a verb or particle, and from the word 'independent' that the agent can only be independent, not oblique or dependent.

This is the norm, but the agent can be made formally oblique by having a verbal noun annexed to it, as in lawlā daf'ū l-lāḥi n-nāṣa 'if it were not for God's holding back the people', or by redundant min 'from' or bi 'by', as in the Qur'anic 'an taqūlū mī bi-jā'anā min bāšīrin 'that you should say, "No bringer of good tidings has come to us"', i.e. mā jā'anā bāširun 'no bringer of good tidings came to us', and also the Qur'anic kafā bi-l-lāḥi Šāhidan 'God is sufficient as a witness', i.e. kafā l-lāḥu 'God suffices'. Rarely, if the meaning is clear, the agent may be dependent: some Arabs have been heard to say kāraqa t-tawbu l-mīsmār 'the garment tore the nail', kasara z-zujāju l-hajara 'the glass broke the stone', 5 with independent and dependent forms respectively in both. Some are prepared to accept this in the Reading of  Ābdullâh of the Qur'anic fa-talaggā 'ādamu min rabbihī
7.12-7.23

**TEXT AND TRANSLATION**

9. kalimātin 'and Adam encountered words from his Lord',\(^7\) which he reads with the dependent form 'ādama 'Adam' and the independent form kalimātun 'words'.

7.12 We understand from the author's words 'preceded by its verb' that the agent does not precede its verb.\(^1\) Whenever an overt noun does precede its verb, that overt noun is a subject and the agent of the verb is a pronoun referring to the subject, as in zaydun (24b) qāma 'Zayd, he stood', az-zaydāni qāmā 'the two Zayds, they both stood', and az-zaydūna qāmū 'the Zayds, they stood': the agent in all these examples is a pronoun referring to the subject.

7.2 Having finished with the definition of the agent, the author now turns to its subdivisions: and it (i.e. the agent) is of two kinds, one overt and one pronominalized. The overt is further divided into various kinds, of which the author gives ten examples:

7.21 (1) The overt masculine singular is exemplified by qāma zaydun 'Zayd stood' and yaqūmu zaydun 'Zayd stands', where he gives the agent as singular, it being an agent of independent form with \(u\) as its marker of independence. Two kinds of verb are given which make the agent independent, viz. the past tense (namely qāma 'stood') and the imperfect tense (namely yaqūmu 'stands').\(^1\)

7.22 (2) The masculine dual, as in qāma z-zaydāni 'the two Zayds stood' and yaqūmu z-zaydāni 'the two Zayds stand', where he gives the agent as dual and independent in \(ā\), viz. az-zaydāni 'the two Zayds', and the verb which makes it independent is given in two kinds, viz. the past tense (namely qāma 'stood') and the imperfect tense (namely yaqūmu 'stands').\(^1\)

7.23 (3) The sound masculine plural, as in qāma z-zaydūna 'the Zayds stood' and yaqūmu z-zaydūna 'the Zayds stand', where he gives the agent as plural and independent in \(ā\), viz. az-zaydūna 'the Zayds', and the verb which makes it independent is given in two kinds, viz. the past tense (namely qāma 'stood') and the imperfect tense (namely yaqūmu 'stands').
7.24 (4) The 'five nouns' when singular and annexed to anything but the first person singular I 'my', as in qäma 'aküka 'your brother stood' and yaqūmu 'aküka 'your brother stands', where he gives the agent from the 'five nouns' in the independent form with u, and the verb which makes it independent is given in two kinds, the past tense (namely qäma 'stood') and the imperfect tense (namely yaqūmu 'stands').

7.25 (5) The masculine broken plural, as in qäma r-rijālu 'the men stood' and yaqūmu r-rijālu 'the men stand'.

7.26 (6) The feminine singular, as in qāmat hindun 'Hind stood' and taqūmu hindun 'Hind stands'.

7.27 (7) The feminine dual, as in gāmat il-hindāni 'the two Hinds stood' and taqūmu il-hindāni 'the two Hinds stand'.

7.28 (8) The sound feminine plural, as in qāmat il-hindātu 'the Hinds stood' and taqūmu il-hindātu 'the Hinds stand'.

7.29 (9) The broken feminine plural, as in qāmat il-hunüdu 'the Hinds stood' and taqūmu il-hunüdu 'the Hinds stand'.

7.30 (10) That which is annexed to the first person singular I 'my', as in (25a) qäma gulâmi 'my boy stood' and yaqūmu gulâmi 'my boy stands', where gulâmi 'my boy' is an independent agent: its independence marker is an implicit u on the consonant immediately preceding the I 'my', but the u is prevented from appearing by the fact that its place is already occupied by the vowel of correspondence to I, namely i.
7.31 Finally: and the like. In all these examples the agent is an overt noun. Having finished with the section on the overt noun the author now turns to the pronominalized agent.  

7.4 The pronominalized, i.e. that which is used for brevity's sake to allude to the overt noun, is of two kinds, bound and free. Both kinds denote the following: the speaker alone, the speaker with someone else, the male person addressed, the female person addressed, two persons (male or female) addressed, plural males addressed, plural females addressed, the absent male, the absent female, two absent persons absolutely, plural absent males, and plural absent females. Each of the two kinds, bound and free, totals twelve pronouns, making twenty-four in all (by multiplying twelve by two).

7.5 The bound pronoun is the one which cannot occur as the subject of an equational sentence, not may it be suffixed in unconstrained usage to 'illa 'except'. It is made independent by the imperfect tense, the past tense and the imperative verb.

7.51 (1) The first of the twelve, the first person singular, is exemplified by darabtu 'I struck', where daraba 'struck' (spelt with a after the d) is a past tense verb and tu 'I' is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb.

7.52 (2) The first person plural, or the plural of self-magnification,
7.53 (3) The pronoun of the second person masculine singular, viz. ta, is illustrated by darabta 'you (masc. sing.) struck', where daraba 'struck' (spelt with a after the d) is a past tense verb, and ta 'you' (masc. sing.) is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and it does not exhibit inflection. (25b)

7.54 (4) The pronoun of the second person feminine singular, viz. ti, is illustrated by darabti 'you (fem. sing.) struck', where daraba 'struck' (spelt with a after the d) is a past tense verb, and ti 'you' (fem. sing.) is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and it does not exhibit inflection.

7.55 (5) The second person masculine and feminine dual, tumā, is illustrated by darabtumā 'you two (masc. & fem.) struck', where daraba 'struck' (spelt with a after the d) is a past tense verb, and tumā 'you two' is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and it does not exhibit inflection; mā is the marker of the dual.

7.56 (6) The second person masculine plural, viz. tum, is illustrated by darabtum 'you (masc. plur.) struck', where daraba 'struck' (spelt with a after the d) is a past tense verb, and tum 'you two' is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and it does not exhibit inflection; m is the marker of the masculine plural.

7.57 (7) The second person feminine plural, viz. tunna, is illustrated by darabtunna 'you (fem. plur.) struck', where daraba 'struck' (spelt with a after the d) is a past tense verb, and tunna 'you two' is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and it does not exhibit inflection; m is the marker of the feminine plural.
with a after the $d$) is a past tense verb, tu 'you' is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and it does not exhibit inflection, and $nna^2$ is the marker of the feminine plural. In all the above examples the $b$ of $\dot{d}araba$ 'struck' is unvowelled because an independent vowelled pronoun has been suffixed$^3$ as shown.

7.58 (8) The concealed pronoun$^1$ for the third person masculine singular is illustrated by $zaydun \dot{d}araba$ 'Zayd, he struck', where $\dot{d}araba$ 'struck' (spelt with a after the $d$) is a past tense verb, and the pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of $huwa$ 'he' is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and it does not exhibit inflection.

7.59 (9) The concealed pronoun for the third person feminine singular is illustrated by $hindun d\ddot{a}r\ddot{a}b\ddot{a}$ 'Hind, she struck', where $d\ddot{a}r\ddot{a}b\ddot{a}$ 'struck' (spelt with a after the $d$) is a past tense verb, the t is a marker of the feminine,$^1$ and the pronoun concealed in it with the implicit meaning of $hiya$ 'she' is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb.

7.60 (10) The visible pronoun for the third person masculine and feminine dual is illustrated by $az-zay\ddot{d}\ddot{a}n\ddot{a} d\ddot{a}r\ddot{a}b\ddot{a}$ 'the two Zayds, they both struck', and $al-hi\ddot{d}n\ddot{a}n\ddot{a} d\ddot{a}r\ddot{a}b\ddot{a}t\ddot{a}$ 'the two Hinds, they both struck', where $d\ddot{a}r\ddot{a}b\ddot{a}$ 'struck' (spelt with a after the $d$) is a past tense verb, and $a$ '*they two'$^2$ is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and does not exhibit inflection. The $t$ in $d\ddot{a}r\ddot{a}b\ddot{a}t\ddot{a}$ 'they two' (fem.) struck' (26a) is a feminine marker and should normally be unvowelled; however, it has been given a vowel to avoid the clash of two unvowelled consonants,$^2$ that vowel being a because it corresponds to $\ddot{a}$. This last example is omitted from the author's original text.$^3$

7.61 (11) The visible pronoun for the third person masculine plural, namely $\ddot{u}$,' is illustrated by $az-zay\ddot{d}\ddot{a}n\ddot{a} d\ddot{a}r\ddot{a}b\ddot{a}$ 'the Zayds, they struck',
where ḍaraba 'struck' (spelt with a after the ḍ) is a past tense verb, and ʿu 'they' (masc.) is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and does not exhibit inflection. The final ' is superfluous.\(^2\)

7.62 (12) The visible pronoun for the third person feminine plural, namely na, is illustrated by al-hindātū ḍarabna ‘the Hinds, they struck’, where ḍaraba 'struck' (spelt with a after the ḍ) is a past tense verb, and na 'they' (fem.) is an agent with independent status through the preceding verb and does not exhibit inflection.

7.63 The noun preceding the verb, and the agent to which the pronoun refers in all the above examples of the third person agent, are subjects of equational sentences, while the verb and its agent make verbal sentences with independent status as predicates to those subjects.\(^1\)

7.7 Note: This is the rule for the agent as a bound pronoun. The rule for the free pronoun (i.e. that which may occur after ‘illā 'except' or a synonym)\(^1\)is exemplified in mā ḍaraba ‘illā ‘anā ‘none struck but I’, mā ḍaraba ‘illā nahrnu ‘none struck but we’, mā ḍaraba ‘illā ‘anta ‘none struck but you’ (masc. sing.), mā ḍaraba ‘illā ‘antī ‘none struck but you’ (fem. sing.), mā ḍaraba ‘illā ‘antumā ‘none struck but you two’, mā ḍaraba ‘illā ‘antum ‘none struck but you’ (masc. plur.), mā ḍaraba ‘illā ‘antunnā ‘none struck but you’ (fem. plur.), mā ḍaraba ‘illā huwa ‘none struck but he’, mā ḍaraba ‘illā hiya ‘none struck but she’, mā ḍaraba ‘illā huma ‘none struck but they two’, mā ḍaraba ‘illā hum ‘none struck but they’ (masc.), mā ḍaraba ‘illā hunna ‘none struck but they’ (fem.).\(^2\) You likewise say ‘innamā ḍaraba ‘anā ‘it was only I who struck’, ‘innamā ḍaraba nahrnu ‘it was only we who struck’, and so on for all the rest.\(^3\)

7.8 These are all past tense verbs. In the imperfect tense you say ṣadribu 'I strike' (spelt with a after the '), where ṣadribu 'I strike' is an imperfect tense verb whose agent is a bound pronoun concealed in
it with the implicit meaning of 'anā 'I' and independent status through
the preceding verb, and does not exhibit inflection. The same applies
by analogy to the rest of the twelve.

7.81 With the free pronouns you say mā yaḏribu 'illā 'anā 'none strikes
but I', innamā yaḏribu 'anā 'it is only I who strike' and so on.¹

7.82 With the imperative there must always be a bound pronoun:¹ this is
for the second person masculine singular in the example  idrib 'strike,
you!', for its dual in  idribā 'strike, you two!', for its plural in
 idribū 'strike, you!', for the second person feminine singular in
 idribī 'strike, you!', for its dual in  idribā 'strike, you two!', and
for the feminine plural in  idribna 'strike, you!'. In all these
examples the (26b) bound, concealed pronoun is an agent with indepen-
dent status and does not exhibit inflection.

7.9 Having finished with explaining the agent,¹ the author now turns to
the object of the unnamed agent.
CHAPTER EIGHT

8.0 Chapter on the object of an unnamed agent. ¹ That is, where no mention is made of the agent from whom the action proceeds. A better title is the one used in the Alfiyya by Ibn Malik,² who calls it the 'substitute agent',³ because this latter embraces objects other than the direct object,⁴ and because the former can apply to the dependent word dirhaman 'a dirham' in 'uḍṭiya zaydun dirhaman 'Zayd was given a dirham',⁵ which is not what is intended. The author treats this topic immediately after the chapter on the agent because the rules for the object of an unnamed agent are in many respects the same as those for the agent, as you are about to learn. He describes it now in terms of some of its special characteristics to make it easier for the beginner:

8.1 This is the independent noun with which there is no mention of an agent. The reason is that it takes the place of the agent in being independent, in being the subject of a predicate,⁶ in having to follow its verb, and in requiring a feminine verb when it is feminine itself.

8.11 Note: By 'noun' it is understood that it can be neither a verb nor a particle; by 'independent' that the rule is for it to be independent, as already stated; by 'with which there is no mention of an agent' that the agent can only be elided ¹ (since, if the agent were to be mentioned, it would itself be independent and the direct object dependent).
8.2 If the verb is past tense and you wish to transfer its object from the category of direct object to that of object of an unnamed agent, you perform on it three operations: (1) you elide the agent, (2) you move the direct object into its place, and (3) once the object is in the agent's place it becomes formally ambiguous with the agent, and it is necessary to distinguish one from the other, so the verb with the agent is left in its original form, while the verb with the substitute agent is changed. Hence in the past tense you say Ḋuliba zaydun 'Zayd was struck', and it has u on the first letter and i before the last letter. This occurs either in fact, as in the example given, or implicitly, as in qīla 'it was said', bī'a 'it was sold': the original forms are qāla 'he said', bā'a 'he sold', and when you construct them to have their object as agent you should say *quwila, *buyi'a, but i is awkward to pronounce after w and y, so the i moves back to the first letter of the verb, leaving the w and y vowelless; the w then changes to y because it is unvowelled (27a) after i, while the y remains unaffected because it is unvowelled but preceded by a homogeneous vowel. A comparable example is the Qur'anic wa-qīla yā 'ardu blā ḍī mā'ak wa-yā sa-mā'u 'aqīli wa-gīda l-mā'u 'and it was said, "O earth, swallow down thy water" and "O heaven, hold", and the water was diminished'.

8.21 The parsing of Ḋuriba zaydun 'Zayd was struck' is: Ḋuriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb predicated of the object of an unnamed agent, zaydun 'Zayd' is the object of an unnamed agent and is made independent by Ḋuriba because it takes the place of the agent, and its independence marker is u. The original form is daraba ḍarun zaydan 'Amr struck Zayd', then ḍArūn, the agent of ḍaraba 'struck' was elided for some reason leaving the verb in need of something of which to be the predicate, so the formerly dependent object has been put in the place of the agent and has become independent.

8.3 If the verb is imperfect tense it has u after the first letter and a before the last letter. It then becomes a predicate of the object of
an unnamed agent, having formerly been a predicate of the agent, as in
*yudrabu zaydun 'Zayd is struck' (with u after the first letter and a before the last), which is now a predicate of the object of an unnamed agent after being a predicate of the agent. The original form is*yadribu 'Amr strikes Zayd' (the verb spelt with a after the first letter and i before the last), where 'Amr 'Amr' is an agent made independent by*yadribu 'strikes' and*zaydan 'Zayd' is a direct object made dependent by*yadribu. To transfer it into the category of passive you elide the agent (namely 'Amr) and put the direct object (namely*zaydan) in its place, which therefore becomes independent. Then you change the verb from*yadribu 'strikes' (spelt with a after the first letter and i before the last) to*yudrabu 'is struck' (with u after the first letter and a before the last) and make it a predicate of its former object, namely Zayd. Zayd then becomes the object of an unnamed agent and the construction is now*yudrabu zaydun 'Zayd is struck', parsed as follows: *yudrabu 'is struck' is an imperfect tense verb predicated of the object of an unnamed agent, i.e. *zaydun 'Zayd', and zaydun is independent because it substitutes for the agent, with u as its independence marker. Use this as the analogy for all like cases.2

8.31 Note: The author says nothing about the imperative verb because it is not constructed to have its object as agent.1

8.4 It (i.e. the object of an unnamed agent) is of two kinds, overt and pronominalized. This is the same as the agent.1

8.5 The overt with a past tense verb predicated of it (27b) is exemplified by*duriba zaydun 'Zayd was struck', (with u after the d and i after the r, parsed as above), and with an imperfect tense verb as its
There is no difference between the unaugmented verb (as illustrated above) and the augmented verb, e.g. 'ukrima Camrun 'Camrun was honoured', and yukramu Camrun 'Camrun is honoured'. As an analogy for the remaining forms use the overt kinds already dealt with under the heading of the agent. Having finished with the overt kind, the author now turns to the other kind:

The pronominalized object of an unnamed agent is of two kinds, bound and free, each consisting of twelve pronouns.

(1) The tu 'I' of the first person singular is exemplified by duribtu 'I was struck', (with u after the d, i after the r and u after the t). The original form is daraban zaydun 'Zayd struck me', where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, the n is the 'preserving n', the f 'me' is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck' and zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by daraba with u as its independence marker. You have then constructed this to have its object as agent, so that it becomes duribtu 'I was struck', parsed as follows: duriba 'was struck' (with u after the d) is a past tense verb constructed to have its object as agent, and tu 'I' is the object of an unnamed agent with independent status through duriba 'was struck' because it substitutes for the agent.
8.62 (2) The nā 'we' of the first person plural or the plural of self-magnification is illustrated by duribnā 'we were struck', (with u after the d, i after the r and ā after the n). The original form is darabanā zaydun 'Zayd struck us', where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, nā 'us' is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck' and zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by it with u as its independence marker. You have then constructed it to have its object as agent, so that it becomes duribnā 'we were struck', parsed as follows: duriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb predicated of the object of an unnamed agent and nā 'we' is the object of an unnamed agent with independent status through duriba 'was struck' because it substitutes for the agent.¹

8.63 (3) The ti 'you' of the second person feminine singular and (4) the ta 'you' of the second person masculine singular are illustrated by duribta 'you (masc. sing.) were struck', (28a) (with u after the d and i after the r). The original form is darabaka zaydun 'Zayd struck you' (masc. sing.), where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, ka 'you' (masc. sing.) is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck' and zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by it with u as its independence marker. You have then constructed it to have its object as agent so that it becomes duribta 'you (masc. sing.) were struck', parsed as follows: duriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb constructed to have its object as agent and ta 'you' (masc. sing.) is the object of an unnamed agent with independent status through duriba 'was struck' because it substitutes for the agent.
8.64 (5) The tu(ma) 'you' of the second person dual, whether masculine or feminine, is illustrated by duribumā 'you two were struck', (with u after the d and i after the r). The original form is darabakumā zaydun 'Zayd struck you both', where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, kumā 'you two' is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck' and zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by it with u as its independence marker. You have then constructed it to have its object as agent so that it becomes duribumā 'you two were struck', parsed as follows: duriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb predicated of the object of an unnamed agent, tu '*you' is the object of an unnamed agent with independent status through duriba 'was struck' because it substitutes for the agent, and mā is the marker of the dual.¹

8.65¹(6) The tu(m) 'you' of the second person masculine plural is illustrated by duribumā 'you (masc. plur.) were struck', (with u after the d, i after the r, and u after the t suffixed with m). The original form is darabakum zaydun 'Zayd struck you' (masc. plur.), where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, kum 'you' (masc. plur.) is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck' and zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by daraba 'struck'. You have then constructed it to have its object as agent so that it becomes duribumā 'you (masc. plur.) were struck', parsed as follows: duriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb predicated of the object of an unnamed agent, tu '*you' is the object of an unnamed agent with independent status through duriba 'was struck' because it substitutes for the agent, and m is the marker of the second person masculine plural.
8.66 (7) The tu(nna) 'you' of the second person feminine plural is illustrated by duribtunna 'you (fem. plur.) were struck', (with u after the d and i after the r). The original form is darabakunna zaydun 'Zayd struck you' (fem. plur.), where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, kunna 'you' (fem. plur.) is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck' and zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by daraba 'struck'. You have then constructed it to have its object as agent so that it becomes duribtunna 'you (fem. plur.) were struck', parsed as follows: duriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb predicated of the object (28b) of an unnamed agent, tu 'you' is the object of an unnamed agent with independent status through duriba 'was struck', and the double n is the mark of the feminine plural.¹

8.67 Note: To sum up, in every instance the verb has u after the first letter and i before the last, and the t in every instance is the object of an unnamed agent.¹ But since this t is by convention common to the first person singular, the second person masculine and feminine singular, the dual and the plural, it is necessary to distinguish one from the other: so u is added for the first person singular, a for the second person masculine singular, i for the second person feminine singular, (u)mâ for the dual, (u)m alone for the second person masculine plural, and (u)nna for the second person feminine plural. It does not befit this short treatise to deal with their suitability for their own particular purposes.²
8.68 (8) All the above examples concern the first and second persons; the third person masculine singular pronoun is illustrated by *duriba* 'he was struck', (with u after the first letter and i before the last), parsed as follows: *duriba* 'was struck' is a past tense verb constructed to have its object as agent and containing an optionally concealed pronoun with independent status as the object of an unnamed agent, that pronoun having the implicit meaning of *huwa 'he'.

8.69 (9) The third person feminine singular pronoun is illustrated by *duribat* 'she was struck', (with u after the ǧ, i after the r, and no vowel on the t), parsed as follows: *duriba* 'was struck' is a past tense verb constructed to have its object as agent, and the final unvowelled t is the feminine particle. The object of the unnamed agent here is an optionally concealed pronoun in *duribat* 'she was struck', that pronoun having the implicit meaning of *hiya 'she'.

8.70 (10) The pronoun of the third person masculine dual is illustrated by *duribā* 'they two (masc.) were struck', (with u after the first letter and i before the last), parsed as follows: *duriba* 'was struck' is a past tense verb constructed for an unnamed agent, and the suffixed ą is the pronoun of the third person masculine dual with independent function as the object of an unnamed agent.
8.71 Note: The author has overlooked\(^{11}\) the pronoun of the third person feminine dual, e.g. ʾdūribatā 'they two (fem.) were struck', parsed as follows: ʾdūriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb constructed to have its object as agent, the ʾ is the (29a) feminine particle,\(^2\) and the ʾā is the pronoun of the third person dual with independent function as the substitute for the agent.

8.72\(^{12}\) The pronoun of the third person masculine plural is illustrated by ʾdūribū 'they (masc.) were struck', (with ʾu after the first letter and ʾi before the last), parsed as follows: ʾdūriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb constructed to have its object as agent, ā 'they' (masc.) has independent function as the substitute for the agent, and the final ' is a superfluous letter.\(^2\)

8.73 (13) The pronoun of the third person feminine plural is illustrated by ʾdūribna 'they (fem.) were struck', (with ʾu after the ʾā and ʾi before the last letter), parsed as follows: ʾdūriba 'was struck' is a past tense verb constructed for an unnamed agent, and ʾā 'they' (fem.) is the pronoun of the third person feminine plural with independent status through being the object of an unnamed agent.\(^1\)

8.8 All this applies to the object when it is a pronoun bound to the verb: if it is separated from the verb it still has independent status by virtue of substituting for the agent, e.g. mâ ʾdūriba 'ʾillā ʾanā 'none was struck but I', mā ʾdūriba 'ʾillā ʾanta 'none was struck but you' (masc. sing.), mâ ʾdūriba 'ʾillā ʾanti 'none was struck but you' (fem. sing.), mâ ʾdūriba 'ʾillā ʾantumā 'none was struck but you two',
8.9 In all these the verb has u after the first letter and i before the last; do your best with analogy for the imperfect tense, for we are not going to say any more about it. Having finished with the second of the independent forms, the author now turns to the third and fourth of them, namely the subject and predicate:

CHAPTER NINE

9.0 Chapter on the subject and predicate. He next proceeds to define the subject:

9.01 The subject is the noun (i.e. the 'plain noun' or paraphrase of one), of independent form (either formally or by status), and devoid of (i.e. unaffected by) formal operators. (Alternatively, having the
It either has a predicate, or is qualified by a descriptive element (or something having the status of a descriptive element), which makes it independent and dispenses with the need for a predicate.

9.03 'Noun' excludes the verb and the particle; 'of independent form' excludes dependent and oblique forms; 'devoid of formal operators' excludes agents and the subject-noun of ḫāna 'to be' and its related verbs, because their operators are formal, namely the verb itself. As examples of the noun unaffected by formal operators we cite the above illustrations of the 'plain noun' and the noun paraphrase. A noun has the status of being unaffected by formal operators when it is preceded by a redundant particle or the like, an example of the former is the Qur'anic ḫal min kāliqin ǧayrū lāliḥi 'is there any other creator but God?', and bi-ḥasbika dirhamun 'a dirham is enough for you', where kāliqin 'creator' and ḥasbika 'your sufficiency' are still subjects even though not unaffected by the redundant min 'of' and bi 'by', for the existence of a redundant particle is as non-existence.

9.1 The predicate is the independent noun based upon it, i.e. upon the subject.
Note: It is well known that the subject and predicate both have independent form—there is no dispute about that—but there is disagreement about what makes them independent. The soundest view is that the subject is independent by virtue of beginning the sentence (i.e., has been made free of operators so as to be the basis of a predicate), and that the predicate is made independent by the subject. It is also claimed that each makes the other independent, and another view is that the equational sentence structure itself makes both independent.

Subject and predicate may both be masculine singular, e.g., *zaydun qā'imun 'Zayd is standing*', where *zaydun 'Zayd'* is a subject made independent by being the subject and *qā'imun 'standing'* is its predicate made independent by the subject, both having *u* as their independence marker. Both may also be feminine singular, as in *hindun qā'imatun 'Hind is standing'*. Both may be masculine dual, as in *az-zaydāni qā'imāni 'the two Zayds are standing'*, where *az-zaydāni 'the two Zayds'* is a subject made independent by being the subject and *qā'imāni 'both standing'* is its predicate made independent by the subject, both with *ā* as their independence marker instead of *u*. Both may also be feminine plural, as in *al-hindātu qā'imātun 'the Hinds are standing*', or broken masculine plural, as in *az-zaydūna qiyāmun 'the Zayds are standing'* or broken feminine plural, as in *az-hunādātu qiyāmun 'the Hinds are standing'*.4
9.2 The author now divides the subject into two kinds. The subject as such is of two kinds, one overt and one pronominalized.¹

9.21 The overt kind is as already illustrated, by which he means that the subject (namely the first element)¹ in the above examples is overt and not pronominalized.

9.22 Having dealt with the overt subject he now turns to the pronominalized subject;¹ and the pronominalized has twelve forms:—(i.e. 'free pronouns'), viz. 'anā 'I', for the speaker alone,² nahu 'we', for the speaker with someone else or in self-magnification, 'anta 'you', (with a after the t)³ for the male person addressed, 'antī 'you', (with i after the t) for the female person addressed, 'antumā 'you', for the dual absolutely, 'antum 'you', for plural males addressed, 'antunna 'you', for plural females addressed, huwa 'he', for the absent male, hiya 'she', for the absent female, humā 'they', for the dual of absent persons absolutely, hum 'they', for plural absent males, and hunna 'they', for plural absent females.⁴

9.23 These pronouns are called the 'free independent pronouns', and the predominant usage is that whenever they occur as subjects they have predicates of corresponding meaning. An unfamiliar usage is the Qur'anic hum 'āhsanu 'aṭāğan 'they are better as to property'.¹

9.24 The predominant usage¹ is seen in, for example, 'anā qa'ımun 'I am standing', where 'anā 'I' is a free pronoun with independent status by being the subject and qa'ımon 'standing' is its predicate made independent by the subject, with u as its independence marker;² likewise nahu qa'ımuna 'we are standing', where nahu 'we' is a pronominalized subject with independent status by being the subject and qa’ımın 'standing' is its predicate made independent by the subject, with u as its independence marker instead (30b) of u; and the like. For example, ‘anta qa’ımun 'you (masc. sing.) are standing', 'antī qa’ımınun 'you (fem. sing.) are standing', 'antumā qa’ımınì 'you two (masc.) are
standing', 'antum qā'imātāni 'you two (fem.) are standing', 'antum qā'imūna 'you (masc. plur.) are standing', 'antunna qā'imātun 'you (fem. plur.) are standing', huwa qā'imun 'he is standing', hiya qā'imatun 'she is standing', humā qā'imāni 'they two (masc.) are standing', humā qā'imātāni 'they two (fem.) are standing', hum qā'imūna 'they (masc.) are standing', and hunna qā'imātun 'they (fem.) are standing'. In all these examples the subject is an invariable pronoun in which there is no inflection.\(^3\)

9.3 Note: The total number of visible pronouns is sixty.\(^1\) This is because the visible pronoun must be either bound or free, and the bound must be either dependent, independent or oblique, while the free must be either independent or oblique only, which makes five kinds (three bound and two free). Now each of these five has twelve forms, one for the first person singular, one for the first person plural, five for the second person (viz. masc. sing., fem. sing., dual, masc. plur. and fem. plur.), and five for the third person likewise. When you multiply five by twelve the product is sixty, and we shall not prolong the discussion with examples.\(^2\)

9.4 The select opinion on 'anā 'I' is that only 'ana is the pronoun,\(^2\) the lengthening sign being redundant and serving only to make the final a clear in pronunciation, but the Kūfan\(^3\) view is that the whole word with all three letters is the pronoun, and this is the view chosen by Ibn Mālik.\(^4\)

9.41 For 'anta 'you'\(^1\) (masc. sing.) and its derivatives the opinion of the Baṣrans is that 'an itself is the pronoun and that its suffixes are letters of apostrophe. Al-Farrā' held the view that the whole of 'anta was the pronoun, while Ibn Kaysān maintained that ta was the pronoun, being the same as the ta of faqīla 'you did', enlarged by 'an.\(^2\)

9.42 In huwa 'he' and hiya 'she' the whole word is the pronoun, say the Baṣrans, but the Kūfan view is that only hu and hi\(^3\) are the pronoun, and
that *wa* and *ya* are only there to fill out the sound.

9.43 As for *humā* 'they two' and *hum* 'they' (masc.), only the *hu* is the pronoun, though it is related that al-Fārisī regarded the whole word as the pronoun.

9.44 As for *hunna* 'they' (fem.), only the *hu* is the pronoun, the first *n* being like the *m* of *hum* 'they' (masc.) and the second *n* like the *u* of *humā* 'they' (masc.).

9.5 Having finished with (31a) the division of the subject into overt and pronominalized, the author now turns to the division of the predicate into simple and complex. The predicate as such is of two kinds, one simple (by 'simple' here is meant that which is not a sentence or its equivalent, even if the predicate is dual or plural, because in this chapter it is still termed 'simple'), and one not simple.

9.6 The simple predicate is illustrated by, for example, *zaydun qā'imun* 'Zayd is standing', where *zaydun* 'Zayd' is a subject made independent by being the subject and *qā'imun* 'standing' is its predicate made independent by the subject, and is a simple predicate. Similarly *az-zaydānī qā'imānī* 'the two Zayds are standing', where *az-zaydānī* 'the two Zayds' is a subject and *qā'imānī* 'standing' is its predicate; also *az-zaydūna qā'imūna* 'the Zayds are standing'. Here *az-zaydūna* 'the Zayds' is a subject and *qā'imūna* 'standing' is its predicate. In all these examples the predicate is simple, because it is not a sentence or sentence equivalent, but is a single expression. Having finished with the simple predicate, the author now turns to the complex predicate:
The non-simple is of four kinds: two in the form of sentences and two of sentence equivalents.¹

9.71 The two in the form of sentence equivalents are (1) the operator of obliqueness and its oblique element, and (2) the space/time qualifier, both of which must be structurally complete. By 'structurally complete' is meant that which can be understood by simply mentioning it along with what it is semantically connected with (as will be realized from the examples shortly to be given by the author), unlike the structurally defective, e.g. *allağī makānan 'who in a place' or *allağī bika 'who by you', for their meaning cannot be understood without mentioning some specific and reasonable semantically connected element, e.g. by saying jā'a llağī sakana makānan 'there came the one who lived in a certain place' or jā'a llağī marra bika 'there came the one who passed by you'.³

9.72 The two in the form of sentences are (1) the verb and its agent, (with overt or pronominalized agent), and (2) the subject and its predicate, (simple or otherwise).¹

9.73 The operator of obliqueness and its oblique element as a predicate is illustrated by, for example, zaydun fī d-dārī 'Zayd is in the house', where zaydun 'Zayd' is a subject and fī d-dārī 'in the house' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element forming the predicate of zaydun.¹

9.74 An example of the space/time qualifier is zaydun cindaka 'Zayd is with you', where zaydun 'Zayd' is a subject and cindaka 'with you' is a space/time qualifier and predicate of zaydun. The truth is that the predicate is really neither the operator of obliqueness and oblique element nor the space/time qualifier, but some element semantically connected with them: they thus resemble sentence predicates (3lb) in that they are connected with something compulsorily elided, either an
implicit kā'inun 'being' or mustaqirrun 'situated', or käna 'was' or istaqarra 'was situated' respectively. Both predicates reduce to simple predicates if an implicit kā'inun 'being' or mustaqirrun 'situated' are assumed, or to sentence predicates if an implicit käna 'was' or istaqarra 'was situated' are assumed. In the latter case käna and istaqarra are verbs whose agent is a concealed pronoun referring back to the subject, and both are verbal sentence predicates of the subject.

9.75 When the author says 'the verb and its agent', as in zaydun qāma 'abūhu 'Zayd's father stood', this is to show that the predicate is a verbal sentence: zaydun 'Zayd' is a subject and the sentence qāma 'abūhu 'his father stood' (which is made up of a verb, its agent and the element to which the agent is annexed) has independent status as the predicate of zaydun 'Zayd', with the hu 'his' of 'abūhu 'his father' acting as the link between the two.

9.76 The 'subject and its predicate' are illustrated by zaydun jāriyatuhu ḏāhibatun 'Zayd's servant-girl is going'. This is to show that the predicate is a nominal sentence, in which zaydun 'Zayd' is the primary subject and jāriyatuhu 'his servant-girl' is the secondary subject, with ḏāhibatun 'going' as its own predicate: the sentence comprising the secondary subject and its predicate has independent status as the predicate of the primary subject, with the hu 'his' of jāriyatuhu 'his servant-girl' acting as the link between the primary subject and its predicate.

9.8 Supplementary Note: The predicate has three states, one of which is to follow the subject (which is the norm), e.g. zaydun qā'imun 'Zayd is
standing'. This delaying of the predicate is compulsory in certain cases:

9.81 (1) When it is feared that the predicate might become confused with the subject because both are equally defined or undefined and there is no contextual indication to distinguish one from the other, e.g. 

\textit{zaydun 'akūka 'Zayd is your brother',}\quad \textit{afdalu minka 'afdalu minnī 'someone more virtuous than you is someone more virtuous than me'}. But if there is a contextual indication, either formal or abstract, it is put into effect accordingly. An example of the former is \textit{rajulun ṣāḥīrun 'a good man is present'}, where the formal contextual indication determines that the undefined noun qualified by an adjective must be the subject whether it precedes or follows the predicate. An example of the latter is \textit{abū yūsufa 'abū hanīfa 'Abū Yūsuf is Abū Ḥanīfa'}, where the abstract contextual indication, namely a true comparison, determines that Abū Yūsuf is the subject (because he is the thing compared) and that Abū Ḥanīfa is the predicate (because he is the term of the comparison), irrespective of which precedes or follows.\footnote{1}

9.82 (2) When it is feared that the subject might become confused with the agent (32a), e.g. \textit{zaydun gāma 'it was Zayd who stood'}, for it this were inverted to \textit{gāma zaydun 'Zayd stood'} the subject would become confused with the agent.\footnote{1}

9.83 (3) When the predicate is accompanied by a synonym of \textit{'illā 'except'}, as in the Qur'anic \textit{innamā 'anta nādīrun 'you are only a warner'}, where inversion is not allowed because the predicate is restricted by a synonym of \textit{'illā 'except'}, the implicit meaning being \textit{mā 'anta 'illā nādīrun 'you are not but a warner'}. In the same way, when the predicate is formally accompanied by \textit{'illā 'except'}, as in the Qur'anic
9.9 Elision of what is already known of subject or predicate is permitted optionally and is sometimes compulsory:

9.9.1 Optional elision of a subject is illustrated by the Qur'anic saying

*camiša šālihan fa-li-nafsihi wa-man 'asā'a fa-Calayhā 'whoever does a good deed it is for his own credit, and whoever does evil it is against himself',

where the implicit meaning is fa-Camaluhu li-nafsihi 'his deed is for himself' and 'isā'atuhu Calayhā 'his evil-doing is against himself'.

9.9.2 Compulsory elision of the subject is illustrated by the saying ff gimmatī la-'af Calanna 'on my oath I will surely do it!', for ff gimmatī 'on my oath' is the predicate of a subject which has been compulsorily elided because the response to the oath has already filled its position, i.e. ff gimmatī mtāqun (or Cahlun) 'in my oath is a covenant' (or 'bond').

9.9.3 Optional elision of the predicate is illustrated by the Qur'anic saying

'akluhā dā'imun wa-zillūhā 'its food is everlasting and its shade',

where zillūhā 'its shade' is the subject of a predicate which has been optionally elided because it is sufficiently indicated by what precedes it, namely dā'imun 'everlasting'.

9.9.4 Compulsory elision of the predicate is illustrated by the saying

kullu sāni'īn wa-mā ṣana'ā 'every doer and his deed', where kullu 'every' is a subject, sāni'īn 'doer' is what it is annexed to, mā ṣana'ā 'what he has done' is coordinated with the subject by wa 'and', and the predicate (viz. *muqtarināni 'are both linked') has been compulsorily elided. Elision is compulsory here because the wa 'and' is actually meant as maCā 'with' (although if maCā itself had been used the utterance would then have been structurally complete). If the wa does not denote accompaniment, elision is no longer compulsory, e.g. kullu mri'in wa-l-mawtu yaltaqiyāni 'every man and death shall both meet'.

mā muḥammadun 'illā rasūlun 'Muhammad is not but a messenger', inversion is not allowed, as already stated.

 رسول فلا يجوز تقديم الخبر كما أن ويجوز حذف ما علم من مبتدأ وخبر جوازا وقد
بجب شرائط وحذف المبتدأ جوازا قوله تعالى من عمل صالحًا فلتغفره ومن إساءة
فعلهها والتقدير فعلهها إنسانًا عليه ويتلل جوازا جوازا في ذمت
يفلون في ذمت جوازا محدود وجوبا لسد جوابهم مدة أي في ذمت
ميشاش أو عبيد ومثال حذف الخبر جوازا قوله تعالى إكللها دائم وظلهها فطلبهما
مبتدأ وخبره محدود جوازا لدلالة ما قبله عليه الإمام ومثال حذف الخبر-
وجوازا قولهم كل صعب وما صعب فكل مبتدأ وصعب مضاف عليه وما صعب معروف
على المبتدأ والخبر محدود وجوبا أي مغتشران وأما وجوب الحذف لدلالة السوا
مقدم مع ولو جيء مع كان كلامًا شامًا فإن لم تكن السوا نما في المعنى لم يجب
الحذف نحو وكل أمرئ والمموت بملكين واجتمع حذف جوازا كل واحد منهما في

9.9-9.94
A subject and a predicate are elided in the Qur'anic salāmun qawmun munkarūna 'peace...people unrecognized', where salāmun 'peace' is the subject of an elided predicate (namely ḍalaykum 'be upon you') and qawmun 'people' is the predicate of an elided subject (namely antum 'you (are)').

Next, the author turns to the elements which cancel the operations of the subject and predicate:

CHAPTER TEN

10.0 Chapter on the operators which affect the subject and predicate. These are also termed 'cancellers'. They are (at this stage) three in number: (1) kāna 'to be' and its related verbs, (2) 'inna 'verily' and its related words, and (3) zanna 'to think' and its related verbs.

They are termed 'cancellers' because they suspend the grammatical rules of the subject and predicate; the term itself is derived from nask, lexically 'abolition', as in nasakat iš-šamsu ẓ-ẓilla 'the sun abolished the shadow' i.e. put an end to it. The three kinds are different in their operation:

10.1 kāna 'to be' and its related verbs make their subject-noun independent (i.e. the subject of an equational sentence, termed literally their 'subject-noun' and figuratively their 'agent'), and they make their predicate dependent. This is termed literally their 'predicate' and figuratively their 'direct object', because these verbs resemble the true verb which is transitive to a single direct object. This is
the view of the Basran school\(^3\) and the most sound, but the majority of
the Kūfis are of the opinion that these verbs do not operate upon the
independent element at all and, furthermore, that they cannot call the
independent subject-noun literally an agent nor the dependent element
literally a direct object simply because these verbs in their defective
state are devoid of the event which ought to proceed from the agent and
occur to the direct object. Hence they have become more like linking
elements,\(^4\) and for that reason az-Zajjājī calls them 'particles'.\(^5\)

10.101 There are thirteen of these verbs;\(^1\) (as presented here by the
author). They can be divided into three groups: (1) those which make
the subject-noun independent and the predicate dependent uncondition-
al\(\)ly, viz. käna 'to be', laysa 'not to be' and all the verbs listed in
between these two,\(^2\) (2) those which make the subject-noun independent
and the predicate dependent on condition that they are preceded by a
negative or its equivalent, viz. zāla 'to cease', bariha 'to desist',
fatī'a 'to refrain' and infakka 'to stop', and (3) those which make the
subject-noun independent and the predicate dependent on condition that
they are preceded by the temporal and verbal noun mà 'as long as',\(^3\) viz.
dāma 'to last'. The author now proceeds to deal with the first group,
which comprises several cases:\(^4\)

10.11 (1) käna 'to be',\(^1\) which serves to qualify a subject with a predi-
cate in the past, either permanently and continuously, as in the
Qur'anic käna ʿllāhu ʿalāmā bakīfman 'God was (always) knowing and wise', which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, allāhu 'God' is its subject-noun made independent by it with ʿu as its independence marker, and ʿalāmā bakīfman 'knowing, wise' is its predicate made dependent by it with ʿu as a dependence marker). Or discontinuously, as in käna ʿṣayyūkū šabbān 'the old man was (once) a youth', where käna 'was' is a past tense verb which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, ʿṣayyūkū 'the old man' is its subject-noun made independent by it with ʿu as its independence marker, and šabbān 'a youth' is its predicate made dependent by it with ʿu as a its dependence marker).

10.12 (2) ʿamsā 'to be in the evening', which serves to qualify a subject with a predicate in the evening, e.g. ʿamsā ʿazdūn faqīrīn 'Zayd became poor in the evening', where ʿamsā 'was in the evening' is a past tense verb related to käna 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, ʿazdūn 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made independent by it with ʿu as its independence marker, and faqīrīn 'poor' is its predicate made dependent by it with ʿu as its dependence marker.

10.13 (3) ʿasbaha 'to be in the morning', which serves to qualify a subject with a predicate in the morning, e.g. ʿasbaha ʿl-ḥarrū ʿadīdan 'the heat became intense in the morning', where ʿasbaha 'was in the morning' is a past tense verb related to käna 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, ʿl-ḥarrū 'the heat' is its subject-noun made independent by it with ʿu as its independence marker, and ʿadīdan 'intense' is its predicate made dependent by it with ʿu as its dependence marker.

10.14 (4) ʿadhā 'to be in the forenoon', which serves to qualify a subject with a predicate in the forenoon, e.g. ʿadhā ʿl-faqīrīn waḥīdan 'the jurist became devout in the forenoon', where ʿadhā 'was in the forenoon' is a past tense verb related to käna which makes its subject-noun
independent and its predicate dependent, *al-faqīhu* 'the jurist' is its subject-noun made independent by it with *u* as its independence marker, and *wari* 'devout' is its predicate made dependent by it with *a* as its dependence marker.

10.15 (5) *zalla* 'to remain',\(^1\) (spelt with an erect-tailed ẓ), which serves to qualify a subject with a predicate by day, e.g. *zalla zaydun muftiran* 'Zayd remained breakfasting', where *zalla* 'remained'\(^2\) is a past tense verb related to *kāna* 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, *zaydun* 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made independent by it with *u* as its independence marker, and *muftiran* 'breakfasting' is its predicate made dependent by it with *a* as its dependence marker.

10.16 (6) *bāta* 'to be at night',\(^1\) which serves to qualify a subject with a predicate by night, e.g. *bāta zaydun nā'iman* 'Zayd passed the night sleeping', where *bāta* 'was at night' is a past tense verb related to *kāna* 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, *zaydun* 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made independent by it with *u* as its independence marker, and *nā'iman* 'sleeping' is its predicate made dependent by it with *a* as its dependence marker.

10.17 (7) *sāra* 'to become',\(^1\) which serves to denote change and transition, e.g. *sāra ẓ-Ṭīnu kazafan* 'the clay became pottery', where *sāra* 'became'\(^2\) is a past tense (33b) verb related to *kāna* 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, *at-Ṭīnu* 'the clay' is its subject-noun made independent by it with *u* as its independence marker, and *kazafan* 'pottery' is its predicate made dependent by it with *a* as its dependence marker.

10.18 (8) *laysa* 'not to be',\(^1\) which serves to negate a situation when used without qualification and in the absence of any contextual indications,\(^2\) e.g. *laysa Camrun nā'iman* 'Camr is not sleeping', i.e. not now,
where *laysa* 'is not' is a past tense verb related to *kāna* 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, *Amr* is its subject-noun made independent by it with *u* as its independence marker, and *nā‘iman* 'sleeping' is its predicate made dependent by it with *a* as its dependence marker. This is the last of the group which make their subject-noun independent and their predicate dependent unconditionally; the author now turns to the second group, i.e. those which make their subject-noun independent and their predicate dependent on condition that they are preceded by a negative or its equivalent. This comprises several cases, the first being:

10.19 (9) *mā zāla* 'not to cease', e.g. *mā zāla bakrun ġāliman* 'Bakr did not cease being wise', where *mā* 'not' is the negative *mā*, *zāla* 'ceased' is a past tense verb related to *kāna* 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, *bakrun* 'Bakr' is its subject-noun made independent by it with *u* as its independence marker, and *ġāliman* 'wise' is its predicate made dependent by it with *a* as its dependence marker.

10.20 (10) *mā nfakka* 'not to stop', e.g. *mā nfakka zaydun jālisan* 'Zayd did not stop sitting', where *mā* 'not' is the negative *mā*, *nfakka* 'stopped' is a past tense verb related to *kāna* 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, *zaydun* 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made independent by it with *u* as its independence marker, and *jālisan* 'sitting' is its predicate made dependent by it with *a* as its dependence marker.

10.21 (11) *mā fati‘a* 'not to refrain', e.g. *mā fati‘a ġamrun muḥsinan* 'Amr was unceasingly kind', where *mā* 'not' is the negative *mā*, *fati‘a* 'refrained' is a past tense verb related to *kāna* 'to be' which makes
its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, 'Amrun 'CAMR' is its subject-noun made independent by it with u as its independence marker, and muhsinan 'doing good' is its predicate made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker.

10.22 (12) mā bariha 'not to desist', e.g. mā bariha muhammadun karīman 'Muhammad was unceasingly generous', where mā 'not' is the negative mā, bariha 'desisted' is a past tense verb related to kāna 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, muhammadun 'Muhammad' is its subject-noun made independent (34a) by it with u as its independence marker, and karīman 'generous' is its predicate made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker. These last four verbs denote the persistence of the predicate in the subject as the situation requires, and they do not operate in this way unless accompanied by a negative, as in the examples we have given. Finally the author turns to the third group, i.e. those which make their subject-noun independent and their predicate dependent on condition that they are preceded by the temporal and verbal noun mā 'as long as', which is what the author means by:

10.23 (13) mā dāma 'as long as it remains', e.g. lā 'aṣḥabuka mā dāma zaydun mutaraddidan 'ilayka 'I shall not be your friend as long as Zayd keeps on frequenting you', where lā 'not' is a negative, aṣḥabuka 'I befriend you' is an imperfect tense verb of independent form with u as its independence marker, its agent being a concealed pronoun in it with the implicit meaning of anā 'I' (itself having independent status), ka 'you' (masc. sing.) is a direct object with dependent status, mā 'as long as' is the verbal noun mā which fuses with dāma 'he remained' to
form a verbal noun\(^3\) and is also the temporal mā, because it denotes time), dāma 'he remained' is a past tense verb related to kāna 'to be', which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, zaydun 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made independent by it with u as its independence marker, mutaraddidan 'frequently returning' is its predicate made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker, and 'ilayka 'to you' (masc. sing.) is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element semantically connected with mutaraddidan 'frequently returning'.

The implicit meaning of the whole is là 'āshabuka muddat-ad-dawāmu taraddudi zaydin 'ilayka 'I shall not be your friend for the period of the duration of Zayd's frequenting you', for al-muddatu 'the period' is the corresponding time qualifier and ad-dawāmu 'the duration' is the corresponding verbal noun.

10.3 The author then adds: and their conjugated forms,\(^1\) to show that these verbs are of various kinds, some having imperfect tense, imperative, verbal noun and adjectival derivatives (viz. from kāna 'to be' to sāra 'to become' in the above list), some having imperfect tense but no imperative and adjectival but no verbal noun derivatives (viz. zāla 'to cease' and the other verbs in this family), and some having neither imperfect tense, imperative, verbal noun nor adjectival derivatives (viz. laysa 'not to be' and dāma 'to remain').\(^2\)

10.31 Those which conjugate are, for example, kāna 'he was', in the past tense, yakūnu 'he is', in the imperfect tense, kun 'be!', in the imperative, 'asba'ha 'he was in the morning', in the past tense, yusbīhu 'he is in the morning', in the imperfect tense, and 'asbih 'be in the morning!', in the imperative. The fully conjugating verbs operate in the same way as the past tense in their imperfect tense, (34b) imperative, verbal noun, agent noun and patient noun:\(^2\) thus you say (with past tense of kāna operating), kāna zaydun qā'īman 'Zayd was standing', parsed above,\(^3\) and laysa 'Amr muṣ'ābān 'Amr is not setting forth', also parsed above, and the like. Similarly for the rest of the verbs:

10.32 An example of the imperfect tense of kāna 'to be' is yakūnu zaydun qā'īman 'Zayd will be standing', where yakūnu 'he will be' is an
imperfect tense verb conjugated from kāna 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, zaydun 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made independent by it, and qā'iman 'standing' is its predicate made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker.

10.33 An example of the imperative is the Qur'anic kūnū ḥijāratan 'be stones!',1 where kūnū 'be!' (masc. plur.) is an imperative of kāna 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, the ū of kūnū 'be!' is its subject-noun with independent status, and hijāratan 'stones' is its predicate made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker.

10.34 An example of the verbal noun is kawnu zaydin qā'iman 'Zayd's being standing', where kawnu 'being' is a verbal noun of kāna 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, zaydin 'of Zayd' is the subject-noun of the verbal noun made oblique in form and independent in status by it, and qā'iman 'standing' is its predicate made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker.

10.35 An example of the agent noun of kāna 'to be' is kā'īnum zaydun qā'iman 'Zayd being standing', where kā'īnum 'being'1 is the agent noun of kāna 'to be' which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, zaydun 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made independent by it, and qā'iman 'standing' is its predicate made dependent by it.

10.36 An example of the patient noun of kāna 'to be' is makūnum qā'īmun 'standing having been been', where makūnum 'been'1 is the patient noun of kāna 'to be' and qā'īmun 'standing' is made independent by it because it substitutes for the agent.

10.37 An example of the imperfect tense of 'aṣbaḥa 'to be in the morning' is yuṣbihu bakrun ṣā'īman 'Bakr will be fasting in the morning', where yuṣbihu 'he will be in the morning' is an imperfect tense verb
10.38 An example of the imperative of 'asbaḥa 'to be in the morning' is 'asbih sā'iman 'be fasting in the morning!', where 'aṣbiḥ 'be (masc. sing.) in the morning!' is an imperative verb which makes its subject-noun independent and its predicate dependent, its subject-noun here being a pronoun concealed in it with independent status and the implicit meaning of 'anta 'you' (masc. sing.), and sā'iman 'fasting' is its predicate made dependent by it. Use these as an analogy for the rest of the forms conjugated from these verbs.

10.4 Next the author turns to (35a) the second of the cancellers, viz. 'inna 'verily' and its related particles: 'inna 'verily' and its related particles (i.e. all of these particles) make their noun dependent (i.e. the subject of the equational sentence, about which there is general agreement, hence it is termed 'their subject-noun'), and make their predicate independent. (This is the soundest view, meaning the predicate of the equational sentence, hence it may also be termed 'their predicate').

10.401 It is also claimed that the predicate is made independent by the same operator that made it independent before the intervention of these particles, namely the subject itself. These particles only operate because of their resemblance to the verb, to the extent that they make other elements independent and dependent, they operate specifically on nouns, they precede subject-predicate units, they end in invariable a,
and they are triliteral, quadriliteral and quinquiliteral like the numbers of radicals in verbs. And they are (i.e. these particles) six in number:—

10.41 (1) 'inna 'verily',1(spelt with i after the '), e.g. 'inna zaydan gā'īmun 'verily Zayd is standing', where 'inna 'verily' is a particle of emphasis and dependence,2zaydan 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker, and gā'īmun 'standing' is its predicate made independent by it with u as its independence marker.

10.42 (2) 'anna 'that',1(spelt with a after the ', and double n), e.g. balağānī 'anna āmīr ṣafīlun 'it reached me that Āmr was virtuous', where balağā 'reached' is a past tense verb, n is the 'preserving n',2 ā 'me' is the direct object with dependent status, 'anna 'that' is a particle of emphasis and dependence, āmīr 'Āmr' is its subject-noun made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker, and ṣafīlun 'virtuous' is its predicate made independent by it with u as its independence marker. The whole sentence of 'anna 'that' with its subject-noun and predicate has the function of that implicit element which would be the agent of balağā 'reached', and the implicit meaning is thus balağānī ṣafīlu āmīr 'Āmr's virtue reached me'. This particle can only occur when called for by some other operator,3 as in the example given.

10.421 The difference between 'inna 'verily' with i and 'anna 'that' with a is that the i-type together with its subject-noun and predicate function as a sentence which cannot be paraphrased by a single element, while the a-type together with its subject-noun and predicate can be paraphrased by a single element.1

10.43 (3) lākinna 'but',1(spelt with double n), e.g. gāma l-gawmu lākinna qālidan qāfiḍun 'the people have stood but Kālid is (still)
sitting', where qāma 'stood' is a past tense verb, al-qawmu 'the people' is an agent made independent (35b) by qāma 'stood', lākinna 'but' is a particle of amendment which makes its subject-noun dependent and its predicate independent, kālidan 'Kālid' is its subject-noun made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker, and qācidun 'sitting' is its predicate made independent by it with u as its independence marker. This particle may be preceded by a positive statement, as in the above example, or by a negative one, e.g. mā qāma l-qawmu lākinna ūmran qā'imun 'the people did not stand but ūmran is standing'.

10.44 (4) ka'anna 'as if'1 (spelt with double n), e.g. ka'anna zaydan 'asadun 'it is' as if Zayd is a lion',2 where ka'anna 'as if' is a particle of comparison which makes its subject-noun dependent and its predicate independent, zaydan 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker, and 'asadun 'a lion'3 is its predicate made independent by it with u as its independence marker.

10.45 (5) layta 'would that',1 e.g. layta zaydan qā'imun 'would that Zayd were standing', where layta 'would that' is a particle of wishing which makes its subject-noun2 dependent and its predicate independent, zaydan 'Zayd' is its subject-noun made dependent by it with a as its dependence marker, and qā'imun 'standing' is its predicate made independent by it with u as its independence marker.

10.46 (6) la'alla 'perhaps',1 e.g. la'alla l-ḥabība qādimun 'perhaps the beloved is coming', where la'alla 'perhaps' is a particle of hoping which makes its subject-noun dependent and its predicate independent, al-ḥabība 'the beloved' is its subject-noun made dependent by it with a
10.50 The author then illustrates some of these: e.g. 'inna zaydan gā'imun 'verily Zayd is standing', layta camran šāḳišan 'would that Amr were setting forth', and the like.

10.51 Having finished enumerating these particles the author now turns to their senses, which are various. The meaning of 'inna 'verily' (i.e. the one spelt with i) and 'anna 'that' (i.e. the one spelt with a) is to denote emphasis, i.e. to emphasize the relationship between the subject and the predicate.

10.52 The meaning of lākinna 'but' is to amend, which is to follow one utterance with another revoking what was previously supposed to have been asserted or denied.

10.53 The meaning of ka'anna 'as if' is comparison, i.e. to show that one thing shares a certain common meaning with another thing.

10.54 The meaning of layta 'would that' is to express a wish, i.e. the desire for something beyond one's aspirations, such as layta s-Sabība yaḏūd yawan 'would that youth would return some day', or the desire for something difficult, such as (36a) layta lī mālan fa'-ahuja bihi 'would that I had some money to make the pilgrimage with'.

10.55 The meaning of laqalla 'perhaps' is to express a hope, i.e. the desire for something much wanted, or expectation. It is used in the latter sense by people to express apprehension of something unpleasant, e.g. laqalla zaydan hālikun 'perhaps Zayd has perished', while the expression of a hope for something wanted is seen in laqalla lilāha yarhamun 'perhaps God will have mercy on me', for perishing is something unpleasant, and mercy is much wanted.

10.56 The author now turns to the third group of elements which cancel the grammatical rule of the subject and predicate, namely zanna 'to think' and its related verbs. These are the verbs which precede as its dependence marker, and gādimun 'coming' is its predicate made independent by it with u as its independence marker.
equational sentences after their own agent has been duly accounted for and make both subject and predicate dependent as a pair of direct objects. In the author's own words: ẓanna 'to think' and its related verbs make both the subject and predicate dependent. (But only after their own agent has been duly accounted for, as stated already). They comprise ten verbs according to the author, of which four convey the strong probability of occurrence of the second direct object: ⁵

10.61 (1) ẓanantu 'I thought', as in ẓanantu zaydan qā'iman 'I thought Zayd was standing', where ẓanantu 'I thought' is a verb and agent, zaydan 'Zayd' is its first direct object, and qā'iman 'standing' is its second direct object. Here ẓann 'thinking' is used in the meaning of 'reckoning', as in the Qur'anic Ḱinnahu ẓanna 'an lan yahibra 'verily he thought that he would not return', or of 'knowing', as in the Qur'anic wa-ẓannū 'an lā malja'a min allāhi 'iillā 'ilayhi 'and they thought that there was no refuge from God except in Him', and not in the meaning of 'suspicion'.

10.62 (2) ḥasibtu 'I reckoned', as in ḥasibtu zaydan ṣadīqan 'I reckoned Zayd a friend', where ḥasibtu 'I reckoned' is a verb and agent, zaydan 'Zayd' is its first direct object, and ṣadīqan 'a friend' is its second direct object, both made dependent by the verb. Here ḥisiba 'to reckon' (spelt with ṭ after the ṣ) is used in the meaning of 'consider', as in the Qur'anic wa-yahsabūna 'annahum ẓayn 'aynin 'and they reckon they are on to something', or of 'knowing', as in ḥasibtu t-tuqa wa-l-jūda Ḳayra tijāratin 'I reckoned piety and generosity to be the best of merchandise', and not in the meaning of ẓirtu 'ḥṣaba' 'I became tawny' or 'blond' or 'pink'.
10.63 (3) *kiltu* 'I imagined', as in *kiltu* l-hilāla lā’īhan 'I imagined the new moon had appeared', where *kiltu* 'I imagined' is a verb and agent, *al-hilāla* 'the crescent moon' is its first direct object, and *lā’īhan* 'becoming visible' is its second direct object, both made dependent by the verb. Here *kāla* 'he imagined' is the past tense of *yakālu* 'he imagines' in the meaning of *zanna* 'to think', as in *yakālu* l-firāra yurākī l-‘ajala 'he imagines flight will make easier the time of reckoning', or *‘alima* 'to know', as in *wa-kīltunī liya smun* 'and I imagined I had a name'? and is not the past tense of *yakūlu* 'he takes care of' in the meaning of *yatahhadu* 'he looks after' or *yatakabbaru* 'he behaves proudly'.

10.64 (4) *za’amtu* 'I asserted', as in *za’amtu* bakran *‘aliman* 'I asserted that Bakr was wise', where *za’amtu* 'I asserted' (36b) is a verb and agent, *bakran* 'Bakr' is its first direct object, and *‘aliman* 'wise' is its second direct object, both made dependent by the verb. Here *za’ama* 'to assert' has the meaning of *zanna* 'to think', as in the verse *za’amtanī šaykan wa-la-stu bi-šaykin* 

'innamā š-shayku man yadibbu dabīban
‘you asserted that I was an old man, but I am not an old man; an old man is only somebody who goes creeping around slowly', and not in the meaning of *kafala* 'to stand surety', *samina* 'to be fat' or *hazala* 'to joke'. The four verbs listed above convey the strong probability of the occurrence of the second direct object over its non-occurrence.

10.65 (5) *ra’aytu* 'I regarded', as in *ra’aytu* l-maCrūfa maḥbūban 'I regarded the favour as desirable', where *ra’aytu* 'I regarded' is a verb and agent, *al-maCrūfa* 'the favour' is its first direct object, and *maḥbūban* 'a thing desired' is its second direct object. Here *ra’aytu* 'I regarded' has the meaning of *‘alimtu* 'I knew', as in *ra’aytu llāha *‘a’kbara kullī šay’in muḥāwalatan wa-‘akṭarahum junūdan* 'I regarded God as the greatest of all in power and the most numerous in forces', or of
"ẓanna 'to think', as in the Qur'anic 'innahum yarawnahu baṣīdan 'verily they regard it as far off', and not the meaning of 'to catch the eye', 'seeing with the eye', or 'vision'.

10.66 (6)  
\(\text{`calimtu 'I knew',}^1\)  
as in \(\text{`calimtu kālidan nā'imān 'I knew Kālid was sleeping',}^2\)  
where \(\text{`calimtu 'I knew'}\) is a verb and agent, \(\text{kālidan 'Kālid'}\) is its first direct object, and \(\text{nā'imān 'sleeping'}\) is its second direct object, both made dependent by the verb. Here \(\text{`calimtu 'I knew'}\) has the meaning of \(\text{tayaqqantu 'I was certain',}^2\) as in the Qur'anic \(\text{fa-'in `calimtumūhāna mu'minātin 'and if you know that they (fem.) are believers',}^2\) not the meaning of \(\text{`araftu 'I was acquainted with' or ẓirtu 'aqlama 'I became split-lipped'.}^2\)

10.67 (7)  
\(\text{`wajadtu 'I found',}^1\)  
as in \(\text{`wajadtu l-`alima nāfīzan 'I found learning beneficial',}^3\)  
where \(\text{`wajadtu 'I found'}\) is a verb and agent, \(\text{l-`alima 'learning'}\) is its first direct object, and \(\text{nāfīzan 'beneficial'}\) is its second direct object, both made dependent by the verb. Here \(\text{`wajada 'to find'}\) has the meaning of \(\text{`calima 'to (come to) know',}^2\) as in the Qur'anic \(\text{`innā wajadnāhu ṣābiran 'verily we have found him patient',}^2\) not in the meaning of \(\text{`aṣāba 'to come upon', ẓādība 'to be angry' or ḥazina 'to grieve'.}^2\) The three verbs listed above convey the certainty of occurrence of the second direct object.

10.68 (8)  
\(\text{`ittakadtu 'I adopted',}^1\)  
as in the Qur'anic \(\text{`ittakada llāhu 'ibrāhīma kāliyan 'God adopted Abraham as a friend',}^2\) where \(\text{`ittakada llāhu 'God adopted'}\) is a verb and agent, \(\text{`ibrāhīma 'Abraham'}\) is its
first direct object and kalīlan 'a friend' is its second direct object, both made dependent by the verb.

10.69 (9) ja¯caltu 'I made',1 as in ja¯caltu t-t Ina kazafan 'I made the clay into pottery', where ja¯caltu 'I made' is a verb and agent, at-t Ina 'the clay' is its first direct object, (37a) and kazafan 'pottery' is its second direct object, both made dependent by the verb. Note that ja¯cala 'to make' in the meaning of i¯cataqada 'to consider' (as, for example, in the Qur'anic wa-ja¯caltu 1-malā 1lā'ika tala Ina hum cibādu r-rahmānī 'inātān 'and they made the angels, who are the servants of the Merciful God, females')2 is not the same as ja¯cala 'to make' in the meaning of kalaga 'to create' that it has above.3

10.70 (10) sami c tu 'I heard',1 as in sami c tu n-nabiyya 1lā lāhu 'alayhi wa-sallama yaqūlu 'I heard the Prophet (may God bless him and give him peace) say...',2 where sami c tu 'I heard' is a verb and agent, an-nabiyya 'the Prophet' is its first direct object, and the sentence yaqūlu 'he says' is its second direct object, both made dependent by the verb.

10.71 Note: The author is somewhat unusual in mentioning sami C 'to hear' in this category, and is, in fact, following Abū CAlī al-Fārisī,1 who says that if it precedes something that is not actually heard, then it is doubly transitive. The majority say that the sentence yaqūlu 'he says' and such like have dependent status as circumstantial qualifiers of the direct object,2 since the verbs of the five senses3 are transitive to only one direct object,4 e.g. sami C l-kalāma 'I heard the speech', 'abšartu l-hilāla 'I saw the new moon', šamantu t-t Iba 'I smelt the scent', duq¢ tu t-t açama 'I tasted the food', lamistu t-tawba 'I touched the cloth'.

10.8 The author then illustrates some of these verbs:1 e.g. zanantu zaydan munțalīgan 'I thought Zayd had gone away', kiltu Camran Šākīsan
Having finished with the cancellers, the author next turns to the concordants, which are four in number: the adjective, the coordinate, the corroborative, and the substitute.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

11.0 Chapter on the adjective. He then describes it in terms of some of its special characteristics to make it easier for the beginner:

11.01 The adjective concords with its antecedent in independence, (if the antecedent is independent), dependence, (if the antecedent is dependent), obliqueness, (if the antecedent is oblique), definition, (if the antecedent is defined), and indefiniteness, (if the antecedent is undefined). This applies whether the adjective is a true adjective (i.e. which qualifies only its antecedent), or is the semantically linked kind (i.e. which qualifies something other than its antecedent).

11.02 The true adjective, moreover, concords with its antecedent in four out of ten features: one of the three inflections (independence, dependence and obliqueness), one of either definition or indefiniteness,
one of the three numbers (singular, dual and plural), and one of (37b) either masculine or feminine gender. Whichever four of these ten are present in the antecedent must also be present in the true adjective.\(^2\)

11.1 With the true adjective, qualifying its antecedent both in form and meaning and containing a concealed pronoun which it makes independent,\(^1\) you thus say in the independent state \(jā'ā zaydun il-ğā'ilu 'Zayd the intelligent came'\), where \(jā'ā 'came'\) is a past tense verb, \(zaydun 'Zayd'\) is its agent made independent by it and qualified by the adjective, and \(il-ğā'ilu 'the intelligent'\)\(^2\) is an adjective to \(zaydun 'Zayd'\), concording with it in independence (out of the three inflections), in definition (out of the two, definition and indefiniteness), in singular number (out of the three, singular, dual and plural) and in masculine gender (out of the two, masculine and feminine): hence four out of the ten features are present both in the adjective and its antecedent.

11.2 In the dependent state you say \(ra'aytu zaydan il-ğā'ilu 'I saw Zayd the intelligent'\), where \(ra'aytu 'I saw'\) is a verb and agent, \(zaydan 'Zayd'\) is its direct object made dependent by \(ra'ā 'to see'\)\(^2\) and qualified by the adjective, and \(il-ğā'ilu 'the intelligent'\) is an adjective to \(zaydan 'Zayd'\), concording with it in dependence (out of the three inflections), in definition (out of the two, definition and indefiniteness), in singular number (out of the three, singular, dual and plural) and in masculine gender (out of the two, masculine and feminine): hence four out of the ten features are present both in the adjective and its antecedent.

11.3 In the oblique state you say \(marartu bi-zaydin il-ğā'ilu 'I passed by Zayd the intelligent'.\) Here \(marartu 'I passed'\)\(^1\) is a verb and agent,
bi-zaydin 'by Zayd' is an operator of obliqueness and its oblique element semantically connected with marartu 'I passed', with zaydin 'Zayd' qualified by the adjective, and al-Cåqîlî 'the intelligent' is an adjective to zaydin 'Zayd', concordant with it in obliqueness (out of the three inflections), in definition (out of the two, definition and in-definition), in singular number (out of the three, singular, dual and plural), and in masculine gender (out of the two, masculine and feminine); hence four out of the ten features are present both in the adjective and its antecedent.

11.41 In the (38a) defined masculine dual you say jâ‘a z-zaydâni l-Cåqîlayni 'the two intelligent Zayds came', ra‘aytu z-zaydayni l-Cåqîlayni 'I passed by the two intelligent Zayds'. In the defined masculine plural you say jâ‘a z-zaydûna l-Cåqîlûna 'the intelligent Zayds came', ra‘aytu z-zaydîna l-Cåqîlîna 'I saw the intelligent Zayds', and marartu bi-z-zaydîna l-Cåqîlîna 'I passed by the intelligent Zayds'.

11.42 In the defined feminine singular you say jâ‘at hindun il-Cåqîlata 'Hind the intelligent came', ra‘aytun hindan il-Cåqîlata 'I saw Hind the intelligent' and marartu bi-hindin il-Cåqîlati 'I passed by Hind the intelligent'. In the defined feminine dual you say jâ‘at il-hindâni l-Cåqîlatâni 'the two intelligent Hinds came', ra‘aytu il-hindayni l-Cåqîlatayni 'I saw the two intelligent Hinds' and marartu bi-il-hindayni l-Cåqîlatayni 'I passed by the two intelligent Hinds'. In the defined feminine plural you say jâ‘at il-hindûta l-Cåqîlûta 'the intelligent Hinds came', ra‘aytu il-hindâtî l-Cåqîlâtî 'I saw the intelligent Hinds' and marartu bi-il-hindâtî l-Cåqîlâtî 'I passed by the intelligent Hinds'.

11.43 These are all defined; the corresponding undefined forms are, in the masculine singular, jâ‘a rajulun Cåqîlun 'an intelligent man came', ra‘aytu rajulan Cåqîlan 'I saw an intelligent man', marartu bi-rajulun Cåqîlin 'I passed by an intelligent man', in the undefined masculine
11.44 In the undefined feminine singular you say jā'at imra'atun ĕgīlātun 'an intelligent woman came', ra'aytu mra'a tan ĕgīlātan 'I saw an intelligent woman' and marartu bi-mra'ātātin ĕgīlatin 'I passed by an intelligent woman', in the undefined feminine dual, jā'at imra'atānī ĕgīlātānī 'two intelligent women came', ra'aytu mra'ataynī ĕgīlātaynī 'I saw two intelligent women' and marartu bi-mra'ātaynī ĕgīlātaynī 'I passed by two intelligent women', in the undefined feminine plural, jā'at nisā'un ĕgīlā'u 'an intelligent women came', ra'aytu nisā'an ĕgīlā'a 'I saw intelligent women' and marartu bi-nisā'in ĕgīlā'a 'I passed by intelligent women'.

11.45 In all the above, the concealed pronoun referring to the antecedent is made independent by the adjective, and its parsing is clear enough from what has already been said, so there is no need to dwell on it here.

11.5 The 'semantically linked' adjective (i.e. the one which makes independent an explicit noun bearing a suffixed pronoun which refers to the antecedent of this adjective), must concord with its antecedent in two out of the following five features: one of the three inflections, and one of (38b) either definition or indefiniteness. Whichever two of...
these five are present in the antecedent must also be present in the adjective. Conversely, it does not have to concord with its antecedent in two out of the five remaining features from the ten mentioned above, viz. singular, dual or plural number, and masculine or feminine gender.

11.51 Hence you say marartu bi-rajulin qa’imatun ‘ummhu ‘I passed by a man whose mother was standing’, where qa’imatun ‘standing’ (fem. sing.) is an adjective to rajulin ‘a man’ and concords with it in obliqueness (out of the three inflections) and indefiniteness (out of the two, definiteness and indefiniteness), but not in masculine gender because rajulin ‘a man’ is masculine and qa’imatun ‘standing’ is feminine, and hence the adjective does not concur with its antecedent in all four out of the ten features; ‘ummhu ‘his mother’ here is an agent made independent by qa’imatun ‘standing’. Likewise you say marartu bi-imra’atin qa’imin ‘abūhā ‘I passed by a woman whose father was standing’, where qa’imin ‘standing’ (masc.) is an adjective to imra’atin ‘a woman’ and concords with it in obliqueness, indefiniteness and singular number, but not in feminine gender because imra’atin ‘woman’ is feminine while qa’imin ‘standing’ is masculine, and hence the adjective does not concur with its antecedent in all four out of the ten features; ‘abūhā ‘her father’ here is an agent made independent by qa’imin ‘standing’.

11.52 The author's statement that the adjective concords with its antecedent in its independence, dependence etc. is compulsory for every adjective, whether a 'true' adjective or 'semantically linked'; his concision here is due to the fact that the term 'adjective' embraces both types.

11.6 Note: When the antecedent is sufficiently recognizable by itself it is permitted to suspend adjectival concordance, the adjective then retaining its independent form (as predicate of an implicit huwa 'he')
when the antecedent is dependent or oblique, as in al-ḥamdu li-llāhi l-ḥamidu 'praise be to God, (he is) praiseworthy', where al-ḥamidu 'the praiseworthy one' is independent, as if it were the predicate of an elided subject with the implicit meaning of huwa l-ḥamidu 'he is the praiseworthy one'. The adjective may also have dependent form through an implicit 'aṣnā 'I mean' for clarification, or 'amduhu 'I praise' for praise, 'adummu 'I blame' for blame, or 'arhamu 'I pity' for pity, or whatever verb is appropriate for the adjective.

11.61 Supplementary Note: Either the adjective or its antecedent may be elided when the other is sufficiently obvious, but while this is common with the antecedent it is rare with the adjective. An example of elision of the antecedent is the Qur'anic (39a) wa-cindahum qăşirătu t-tarfi 'and with them (damsels) restraining their looks'. An example of elision of the adjective is the Qur'anic ya'kud u kullu ṣāḥbin 'he takes every ship by force', meaning ṣāḥbin 'every ship' (a sound (ship)). Another example is the verse by ʿAbbās ibn Mirdās:

wa-qad kuntu fi l-harbī gā tudraʿin
fa-lam ʿuṣṭa šayʿan wa-lam ʿummaḍī
'and I was mighty in battle, but I was not given anything, nor was I refused', meaning šayʿan ʿuṣṭā 'anything worth having' (for it is a fact that he was given something, witness his words 'nor was I refused'). The occasion for the recitation of this verse is that the Prophet (may God bless him and give him peace) was distributing the booty of the Battle of Ḥunayn a hundred camels at a time to those tribes whose loyalty he had purchased, but gave only a few to ʿAbbās ibn Mirdās, which angered him. He continued with further verses (which it is impracticable to include in such a short work as this) until the Prophet (may God bless him and give him peace) said, 'Stop his tongue for me!', so they gave him more until he was satisfied. The word tudraʿun (spelt with u after the t with two dots above, unvowelled d without dots, a after the r and then ') means 'strength, power'.
11.7 Having said that the adjective concords with its antecedent in definition and indefiniteness, the author now has to explain what definition and indefiniteness are. The fundamental state is indefiniteness because, unlike definition, it needs no contextual element to indicate it, and whatever has a need must be secondary to that which has no need.\(^1\) Nevertheless our author begins with definition, even though it would have been more appropriate to begin with indefiniteness:

11.701 Defined elements\(^1\) as such are of five kinds: (or rather, six, as you will learn).

11.71 (1) The pronoun\(^1\), which may denote the speaker,\(^2\) e.g. ‘anā ‘I’, nāhu ‘we’, the person addressed, e.g. ‘anta ‘you’ (masc. sing.), ‘anti ‘you’ (fem. sing.), or the absent person, e.g. huwa ‘he’, hiya ‘she’.

11.711 The most definite of the defined elements is the name of Almighty God, followed by the pronoun referring to Him,\(^1\) then the pronouns of the first, second and third persons, next the demonstrative pronoun and the vocative (both of equal rank),\(^2\) and finally the relative and that which bears a defining particle\(^3\) (both of equal rank also). Annexed elements have the same rank as the elements to which they are annexed, unless annexed to a pronoun, in which case they have the rank of a proper name. This is the most choice arrangement, though (39b) there are some who disagree with it.

11.712 Pronouns fall into two classes:\(^1\) (a) concealed pronouns, which have no outward form\(^4\) but are merely understood. These are always
independent, and divide into two kinds, (i) compulsorily concealed and (ii) optionally concealed.

11.713 (i) The first kind are those which must remain, as it were, necessarily implicit, being irreplaceable by any explicit noun or free pronoun. They occur in various positions, e.g. made independent by an imperfect tense verb beginning with 'a such as 'aqūmu 'I stand', made independent by an imperfect tense verb beginning with na such as naqūmu 'we stand', or made independent by a masculine singular imperative verb such as qīmūm 'stand'.

11.714 (ii) The second kind are those whose concealment is permitted, which are, so to speak, optionally implicit, being replaceable by an explicit noun or free pronoun. These are the pronouns made independent by the third person masculine singular verb such as zaydun qāmū 'Zayd, he stood', the third person feminine singular verb such as hindun qāmat 'Hind, she stood', the agent noun such as zaydun qā'īmuñ 'Zayd is standing', or the patient noun such as zaydun madīrubun 'Zayd is struck'. In these and like examples the pronoun is optionally concealed: were it to become visible it would take the form of a free pronoun, e.g. zaydun mā qāmā 'illā huwa 'Zayd, none stood but he', and so on for the remainder.

11.715 (b) The others are the visible pronouns, which also divide into two kinds, (i) those which are bound to their operator, i.e. which are never subjects of equational sentences and are never suffixed to 'illā 'except' in unconstrained usage. They divide into independent (e.g. the tu 'I' of qīmtu 'I stood'), dependent (e.g. the ka 'you' of ukrimūka 'I honour you'), and oblique (e.g. the hu 'his' of gūlāmuhu 'his boy'). These three types of pronoun are bound because they never occur as subjects of equational sentences and are never suffixed to 'illā 'except' in unconstrained usage.
11.716 (ii) The second are the free pronouns,\(^1\) which divide into independent (e.g. 'ana 'I' for the first person singular, 'anta 'you'—with a after the t—for the second person masculine singular, and huwa 'he' for the third person masculine singular), and dependent (e.g. 'iyyāya 'me' for the first person singular, 'iyyāka 'you' for the second person masculine singular, and 'iyyāhu 'him' for the third person masculine singular).\(^2\)

11.717 These are the basic pronouns,\(^1\) and they have derivatives. There is only one derivative of the first,\(^2\) viz. nahnu 'we' for the first person plural or plural of self-magnification (either genuine or pretended), because the multiple must be derivative from the singular). The derivatives of the second are four: 'anti 'you' (with i after the t) for the second person feminine singular, 'antumā 'you two' for the second person dual absolutely,\(^3\) 'antum 'you' for the second person masculine plural, and 'antunna 'you' for the second person feminine plural, because the feminine is derivative from the masculine and the dual and plural are derivative from the singular. The derivatives of the third are four: (40a) hiya 'she' for the third person feminine singular, humā 'they two' for the third person masculine singular, and hunna 'they' for the third person feminine plural.\(^4\) There is one derivative of the fourth, viz. 'iyyānā 'us'; the fifth has four derivatives, viz. 'iyyāki 'you' (fem. sing.), 'iyyākumā 'you two', 'iyyākum 'you' (masc. plur.) and 'iyyākunna 'you' (fem. plur.); the sixth also has four, viz. 'iyyāhā 'her', 'iyyāhumā 'them both', 'iyyāhum 'them' (masc.), and 'iyyahunna 'them' (fem.), for the reasons already given.\(^5\)

11.718 Additional Note:\(^1\) The visible pronouns total sixty,\(^2\) because the visible pronoun is either bound or free, and the bound is either independent, dependent or oblique, and the free either independent or dependent only, making five kinds in all (three bound and two free). Each of the five has twelve forms,\(^3\) one for the 1st sing., one for the 1st. plur., five for the 2nd (masc. sing., fem. sing., dual, masc. plur. and
fem. plur.), and five for the 3rd person (the same). The product of five and twelve is sixty pronouns, twelve of which the author has dealt with in the chapter on the agent, twelve in the chapter on the subject and predicate, and another twenty-four will be dealt with in the chapter on the direct object. To these can be added the T of tafcalīna 'you (fem. sing.) do' and the like, but we shall not dwell on them here because they are familiar enough already.

11.719 Note: The select opinion on 'anā 'I' is that only 'anā is the pronoun, the lengthening sign being redundant and serving only to make the final a clear in pronunciation, but the Kūfan view is that the whole word with all three letters is the pronoun, and this is the one chosen by Ibn Mālik. As for 'anta 'you' (masc. sing.) and its derivatives, the opinion of the Basrans is that 'an itself is the pronoun, and that its suffixes are letters of apostrophe. In huwa 'he' and hiya 'she' the whole word is the pronoun according to the Basrans, but the Kūfan view is that only hu and hi are the pronoun, with wa and ya to fill out the sound. As for humā 'they two' and hum 'they' (masc.), only the hu is the pronoun, though some say that the whole word is the pronoun. In hunna 'they' (fem.) only the hu is the pronoun, the first n being like the m of hum 'they' (masc.) and the second like the ū of humū 'they' (masc.). In 'iyyāhu 'him' the pronoun is 'iyyā itself, and the elements suffixed to it are particles of the first (40b) second and third person. The difficulty has been raised that pronouns are supposed to denote a first, second or third person, and that 'iyyā by itself does not: the answer is that originally 'iyyā was by convention common to all three meanings, and that when the need arose to distinguish
between them 'iyyā was suffixed with letters denoting the desired meaning, just as t is suffixed to the verb predicated of a feminine. There are other views on this, but we need not go into them here.

11.72 (2) The second defined element is the proper name,\(^1\) (Calam, with a after the c and l), which makes what it names absolutely specific.\(^2\)

'Specific' excludes undefined elements, since they do not make the things they name specific, and 'absolutely' excludes defined elements which are not proper names, because they only make the things they name specific either through some formal feature (viz. what is made defined by a relative clause, the definite article al, or being annexed), or through some abstract feature (viz. the demonstratives and pronouns).\(^3\)

11.721 The proper name is of two kinds,\(^1\) (a) personal, i.e. conventionally denoting some externally specified individual, and which no others can take because it has been assigned to him alone. It may denote a rational being, either male, e.g. zaydun 'Zayd', or female, e.g. gîrnîqun 'Gîrinq' (spelt with ī after the single-dotted k and the n, a proper name transferred from its literal meaning 'the young of a rabbit' to the name of a poetess),\(^2\) or its may denote an irrational being. The proper name may also be a place, e.g. cadanun 'Aden' (spelt with undotted c and d, the name of a town on the coast of Yemen), and makkatu 'Mecca', and names may also denote other things, such as qaranun 'Qaran' (spelt with a after the q and r), the name of a tribe in the Murād confederation to which belongs 'Uways al-Qarānî (and whoever claims, as al-Jawharî does,\(^3\) that this al-Qarānî is the gentilic\(^4\) name from Qarn al-Manāzil, with unvowelled r, is mistaken). Also
lāhiqun 'Catcher', the name of one of Muḥāwiya's horses, 5 ṣadqamun 'Big Mouth', the name of a camel stallion belonging to Nuḥmān ibn al-Mundīr, ḥaylatun 'Sandy', the name of a goat belonging to a certain Beduin woman, and wāʔiṣqun 'Nimble', the name of a dog. These are the examples given by Ibn Malik in his Alfiyya (except for makkatu 'Mecca'), 6 making seven names in all: the eighth, that of the dog, echoes the Qur'anic wa-yaqūlu wa-tāminuhum kalbuhum 'and they shall say "Seven" and the eighth of them is their dog'. 7

11.722 (b) The other kind is the generic proper name, 1 which (41a) by convention denotes something made mentally specific, i.e. whose existence is perceived in the mind, such as 'usāmatu 'Usāma'. the name given to the lion, and ṭuʿālātu 'Ṭuʿāla', the name given to the fox.

11.723 In itself the proper name, whether personal or generic, is either (a) a simple noun (i.e. excluding nicknames and titles), this being the predominant usage, as already illustrated (e.g. zaydun 'Zayd', 'usāma 'Usāma the lion'), or (b) a title, which imparts the high status of the person so named, e.g. zaynu l-ʿābidīna 'Ornament of the Devout', or even his humble station: a person of humble and lowly standing might, for example, be called 'anfu n-nāqātī 'Nose of the She-camel', or (c) a nickname, i.e. all those annexed compounds beginning with 'abū 'father of' (e.g. 'abū Camrīn 'Father of Camrīn, Abū Ṭamīr' and 'abū bakrīn 'Father of the Young Camel, Abū Bakr') may be pleased with him), or with 'ummu 'mother of' (e.g. 'ummu Camrīn 'Mother of Camrīn, Umm Ṭamīr' and 'ummu kulṭūmīn 'Mother of Kulṭūm, Umm Kulṭūm', 2 i.e. the daughter of the Prophet, may God bless him and give him peace). To these Fakruḍ-Dīn ar-Rāzī added ibnu 'son of' and bintu 'daughter of', as in ibnu daʿyata 'son of the vertebrae' for 'crow' and bintu l-ʾardī 'daughter of the ground' for 'pebble'. 3

11.73 (3) The third defined element is the vague noun, 1 by which the author means the demonstrative noun, defined as that which denotes something named and points to it. Its vagueness lies in its generality and its appropriateness for pointing to every species and to every
individual. What is pointed at may be single, a pair, or a group, and may be either masculine or feminine; each of the resulting six may be either nearby or far away, to which some have added a middle distance, so that the total is eighteen.  

11.731 The demonstratives are: \( dā \) 'this' (with no vowel after the lengthening sign), \( dā'i \) 'this' (with \( i \) after the \( ā \)), \( dā'ih \) 'this' (with \( i \) after the 'ih'), and \( dā'uhu \) (with \( u \) after the 'uh').

11.732 For the near feminine: \( dī \) 'this' (with \( i \) after the first letter and no vowel after the second), \( dīh \) 'this' (with unvowelled \( h \)), \( ti \) 'this' (with \( i \) after the first letter and no vowel after the second), \( tihi \) 'this' (with \( i \) after the 'ih'), \( tih \) 'this' (with unvowelled \( h \)), \( tihi \) 'this' (with \( i \) after the second), \( tā \) 'this' and \( dāti \) 'this'.

11.733 Then there are \( tāni \) and \( dāni \) 'these two', \( gāni \) being for the near masculine dual and \( tāni \) for the near feminine dual. Both have \( ā \) in independence and \( ay \) in dependence and obliqueness. Whether they are true duals or whether they have been produced (41b) only according to the form of the dual are two differing opinions: the latter is the sounder view, since it is a condition of the dual that it should be capable of indefiniteness, and the demonstratives are inherently defined.

11.734 For the masculine and feminine plural: \( 'ulā'ī \) 'these', with the lengthened \( ā \) among the Ḥijāzīs and the shortened \( ā \) among the Tamīmīs. The dialect of the Revelation is Ḥijāzī, cf. the Qur’anic \( 'ulā'ika humu l-muflihūna \) 'those, they are the prosperous ones'.

11.735 All the above are used for the near demonstrative, as already stated, and they must never be suffixed with \( ka \). But they may be prefixed optionally with the 'hā of attracting attention', e.g. \( hādā \).
11.736 The distant demonstratives (if we adopt the first view, which regards them as the other variety of near demonstratives), are made by adding the particle ka, either (a) absolutely without the infix l and regardless of whether the thing pointed at is singular or otherwise, or (b) accompanied by the infix l in order to exaggerate the distance, except in three cases: (1) in the dual absolutely, whether prefixed with theḥā of attracting attention' or not, (2) in the plural when it has the dialect form with the lengthened ā', i.e. the Ḥijāzī, (3) when prefixed with theḥā of attracting attention' but not ending in the lengthened ā'. In these three places ka and l do not combine, hence you do not say *dānilika 'those two', *'ulā'ilikā 'those' or ḥāgālikā 'that'.

11.737 If we adopt the other view, that there are three orders of demonstratives (as followed by Ibn Hishām in his Commentary on the Lumaḥa), the nearest is that which has neither infix l nor ka, the furthest is that in which both are combined, and the middle is that which is combined only with ka, because the addition of a letter conveys the increase in distance, which I have already dealt with exhaustively in my Commentary on Qatār an-nadā. 3

11.74 (4) The fourth of the defined elements is the noun prefixed with al 'the', denoting definition, e.g. ar-rajulu 'the man', al-ǧulāmu 'the boy' and al-farasu 'the horse'. It is al and not l alone which makes defined, in agreement with al-Kallī and Sībawayhi, and the a is not redundant, contrary to Sībawayhi.
11.741 The definite article is either (a) generic, \(^1\) \((42a)\), in which case, if it cannot be replaced by kull 'all, every', it is termed the 'factual article', e.g. the Qur'anic \(\text{wa-ja\text{'}alnā min al-mā}\) 'and we made everything living from the water, so why do they not believe?'. \(^2\) Otherwise, if kull 'all, every' can literally replace the article, it is then termed the 'article which embraces all individuals of the species', e.g. the Qur'anic \(\text{wa-kuliqa 1-}\) 'and man was created weak'. If it can be replaced metaphorically by kull 'all, every', then it is termed the 'article embracing the characteristics of the species hyperbolically', e.g. \(\text{'anta r-rajulu ʿilman 'you are the man as regards knowledge'}\). \(^3\)

11.742 Or (b) it is the 'article of familiarity', \(^1\) in which case awareness may be due either to previous mention, as in the Qur'anic \(\text{fa-Caṣā fir\}}} \text{awmu r-rasūla 'and Pharaoh disobeyed the messenger'}\) \(^2\) or to prior knowledge, as in the Qur'anic \(\text{al-yawma 'akmaltu lakum dīnakum 'today I have perfected for you your religion'}\). \(^3\)

11.75 (5) The fifth member of the defined class, omitted by the author, is the relative. It is of two kinds, particle and noun type. \(^1\)

11.751 The particle type \(^1\) is that which, together with its relative clause, paraphrases a verbal noun and does not need any referential pronoun, e.g. the Qur'anic \(\text{wa-\text{'}an taṣūmū kayrun lakum 'and that you should fast is best for you'}\) \(^2\) i.e. \(\text{ṣawmukum 'your fasting'}\). This is not a member of the defined class.

11.752 The noun type \(^1\) (which is the one intended in this context), is every noun which is incomplete without a relative clause and a referential pronoun. It is of two kinds, (a) that which has one fixed meaning and does not go beyond it, and (b) that which is common to several meanings in the one form.
11.753 (a) The first kind¹ is, for example, *allaḏī 'who* for the masculine singular, whether a rational being or not, *allaḏānī 'who* for the masculine dual, and *allatānī 'who* for the feminine dual. The two latter are pronounced with ā in independence, and ay in dependence and obliqueness, exactly like the dual inflection of nouns,² e.g. *jā‘ānī* *llaḏānī qāmā wa-llatānī qāmatā* 'there came to me the two (masc.) who had stood and the two (fem.) who had stood'.³ In these the 1 of *alladi* 'who' (masc. sing.) and *allātī* 'who' (fem. sing.) has been elided. For the masculine plural there are two forms: *allaḏīna 'who* for rational beings only, with ā in independence, dependence and obliqueness, and *al-‘ulā 'who* for both rational and irrational beings. For the feminine plural there are also two forms: *allā‘ī 'who* (with final ā or ū) and *allātī 'who* (with final ā or ū).⁴

11.754 (b) The other kind is *man 'who'*¹ (spelt with a after the m), which is specifically for rational beings, e.g. the Qur'anic *wa-man C-indahu C-ilmu l-kitābi* 'and he who has knowledge of the Book',² though it can be used for irrational beings if they are given rational status,³ e.g. the Qur'anic *wa-man aḏallu mīm-man yadāḏū dūna llāhī (42b) man ḫā yastażābīlu lahu* 'and who is more in error than him who calls upon something besides God which will not answer him?'.⁴ Sometimes it denotes both rational and irrational beings simultaneously, by allowing the superior to subsume the inferior, as in the Qur'anic *yasjudu lahu man ff s-samāwātī wa-man ff l-‘ardī* 'there bows before him whoever is in the heavens and whoever is on the earth',⁵ in which the former embraces the angels, the sun, moon and stars etc., while the latter embraces mankind, mountains, trees, animals etc.

11.755 And there is also the relative mā 'which',¹ used only for irrational beings, as in the Qur'anic mā C-indakum yanfaqdu 'what you have will run out',² but it may also be used with rational beings, as in the Qur'anic *yusabbiḥu li-llāhī mā ff s-samāwātī wa-mā ff l-‘ardī* 'that which is in the heavens and that which is on the earth praises God'.³
11.76 (6) The sixth, which is the fifth according to the author, is that which is annexed to any of these four. As the author puts it, for 'that which is annexed to any of these five'. This is because an undefined element becomes defined when annexed to a defined element; e.g. jä'a gulāmî 'my boy came', jä'a gulāmu zaydin 'Zayd's boy came', ja'a gulāmu hādā 'this person's boy came', ja'a gulāmu lla dī fī-d-dāri 'the boy of him who is in the house came', and ja'a gulāmu 1-qāūdī 'the judge's boy came'.

11.761 That which is annexed to a defined element has the same rank in definition as that to which it is annexed; thus whatever is annexed to a proper name or a demonstrative has their rank, and so on for the remainder. The exception is that which is annexed to a pronoun, for this has the rank of a proper name and not that of a pronoun, because you say marartu bi-zaydin sāhibika 'I passed by Zayd your friend', qualifying a proper name by a noun annexed to a pronoun: if the noun annexed to a pronoun had the rank of a pronoun it would follow that the qualifier was more defined than its antecedent, which is impossible.

11.77 Note: The feature of absolute definition has been made the criterion here because the above-mentioned defined classes, according to whether they may be qualified by adjectives or be qualifiers themselves, fall into quite different categories, viz. firstly the pronoun, since it is never qualified and never qualifies adjectivally, secondly the proper name, which may be qualified but never qualifies adjectivally, while third, fourth and fifth are the demonstratives, nouns defined by al 'the' and that which is annexed to a defined element, for all of these may be qualified and qualify adjectivally.
The undefined noun cannot be described by enumeration but only by giving a definition. It is defined as being every noun denoting an existing thing that applies generally to the whole species, including itself and all others, without specifying any single member of the individuals to the exclusion of the others, e.g. rajulun 'a man', which denotes by convention a mature, male, rational animal. Whenever any single member of this species exists it is correct to apply this noun to it; the same is true of words applied generally when the species itself is only implicit, e.g. samsun 'a sun', which conventionally denotes a daytime star whose appearance dispels the night. It is perfectly correct for a word such as this to be applied to more than one just as rajulun 'a man' can be, the difference here being simply that other individuals of that species are non-existent in the external world: if they did exist it would then be proper to apply such expressions to them.

It is not the convention for this kind of word to denote a particular individual such as zaydun 'Zayd' or camrun 'Camr'; the convention is that undefined nouns denote entire species.

The author's definition of the undefined noun contains some obscurity for the beginner, so he clarifies it by saying: in simple terms (i.e. to make the undefined noun easier for the beginner): everything (i.e. every noun) to which it is proper (either şalaḥa or şaluğha to be proper) for al 'the' to be prefixed, in the purest speech, is undefined, e.g. ar-rajulu 'the man' for a rational being, and al-farasu 'the horse' (An irrational being). The original form is rajulun 'a man' and farasun 'a horse', and both are undefined before the prefixing of al 'the' and defined afterwards. It is not proper for al 'the' to be prefixed to other words in the category of defined nouns, so as to say *az-zaydu 'the Zayd' or *al-hindu 'the Hind', because these are already defined by their quality of being proper names, and it is improper to prefix al 'the' to them.
11.9 Having finished with the first chapter on the concordants, namely the adjective (and the connected matters of definition and indefiniteness), the author now turns to the second of the concordants, to wit coordination.

CHAPTER TWELVE

12.0 Chapter on coordination; i.e. that which is coordinated. It is of two kinds, explanatory and sequential. Intended here is sequential coordination, i.e. coordination by arrangement in sequence (the term is nasag, spelt with a after the s, used in the meaning of mansaq 'thing arranged in sequence', derived from nasaqtu š-Say'a nasqan 'I arranged the thing in sequence', with no vowel after the s in nasq 'action of arranging in sequence'), in other words, placing consecutively. It is defined as the concordant joined to its antecedent by one of the particles with which the Arabs conventionally denote coordination. The author deals with them as follows:

12.01 The particles of coordination are ten in number: (this is based on the assertion that 'immā 'either', with i after the ', is a coordinator, but the truth is (43b) otherwise: there are only nine of them),

1
and they are (i.e. the particles of coordination, whose meanings vary);

12.1 (1) \textit{wa} 'and',\textsuperscript{1} which associates the coordinated element with its antecedent both in form and meaning. In formal association it makes the second element concord with the first in its inflection,\textsuperscript{2} whether independence, dependence, obliqueness or apocopation, and in associating meaning it makes the second element concord with the first in its logical predicament,\textsuperscript{3} whether of negation or assertion. It serves for absolute coordination in the strict sense and not for ordering or accompaniment: thus when used for coordination you say, for example, 
\[ \text{jā'ā zaydun wa-'amrun 'Zayd and Āmr came', ra'aytu zaydan wa-'amran 'I saw Zayd and Āmr' and marartu bi-zaydin wa-'amrin 'I passed by Zayd and Āmr', where 'amrun 'Āmr' is a concordant of zaydun 'Zayd' in its independence, dependence and obliqueness, and shares in its logical predicament.}\textsuperscript{4}

12.11 When \textit{wa} 'and' is used for absolute joining it can coordinate the logically posterior to the anterior, as in the Qur'anic \textit{wa-la-qad 'arsalnā nūhan wa-'ibrāhīma 'and we did send Noah and Abraham'},\textsuperscript{1} or the anterior to the posterior, as in the Qur'anic \textit{ka-dālika yūfī 'ilayka wa-'ilā ḫaṣiqa min qablika 'thus he inspires you and those before you'},\textsuperscript{2} or the logically concomitant, as the Qur'anic \textit{fa-'anjaynāhu wa-'ashāba s-safinatī 'and so we saved him and the people on the ship'}.\textsuperscript{3}

12.2 (2) \textit{fa} 'and then',\textsuperscript{1} which associates what follows it with its antecedent in inflection and meaning but with an abstract ordering,\textsuperscript{2} which
is that the coordinated element should be subsequent to the antecedent, as in the Qur'anic *kalaqaka fa-sawwāka* 'he created you and then fashioned you'.

12.21 It can also be used for narrative ordering: this means that the element coordinated by *fa* 'and then' is mentioned purely formally after the antecedent, and not that the meaning of the second element occurs later in time than that of the first. This is most common in the coordination of detail to a general idea, as in the Qur'anic *fa-qad sa'ālū mūsā akhārī fa-qālū 'rinā lāhā jahratan* 'and they asked Moses a greater thing than that, and said, "show us God openly"'.

12.22 It can also (44a) denote immediate consequence as well as order, i.e. that something should be connected by it without interval, as in the Qur'anic *'amātāhu fa-'aqbarahu* 'he killed him and then buried him'. The consequence of a thing depends on what it is: do you not see that it is possible to say *tazawwaja fulānun fu-wulida lahu* 'so-and-so married and then had a child', as there is between these two events only the period of pregnancy, no matter how long that might be?

12.23 Using *fa* 'and then' in coordination you say *jā'a zaydun fa-Camrun* 'Zayd came and then *Camr*', *ra'aytu zaydan fa-Camran* 'I saw Zayd and then *Camr*', and *marartu bi-zaydin fa-Camrin* 'I passed by Zayd and then *Camr*', where *Camrun* and *Camr* is a concordant of *zaydun* 'Zayd' in its inflection, and shares in its logical predicament accompanied by ordering and consequence.

12.3 (3) *tumma* 'then', (spelt with *u* after the three-dotted *t*), which associates the coordinated element with its antecedent in inflection and meaning, and conveys ordering and looseness of connection between the two coordinated elements, e.g. *jā'a zaydun tumma Camrun* 'Zayd came, then *Camr*', *ra'aytu zaydan tumma Camran* 'I saw Zayd, then *Camr*' and *marartu bi-zaydin tumma Camrin* 'I passed by Zayd, then *Camr*', where
Camrun 'Amr' is a concordant of zaydun 'Zayd' in its inflection, and shares in its logical predicament, except that the meaning attributed to the coordinated element is later than the meaning attributed to the antecedent, cf. the Qur'anic fa-'aqbarahu tumma 'idā ša'a anšarahu 'and then he buried him; then, if he wishes, he will resurrect him'.

12.4 (4) 'aw 'or',₁ which associates the coordinated element with its antecedent in inflection and meaning: thus you say jā'a zaydun 'aw Camrun 'Zayd or Amr came', ra'aytu zaydan 'aw Camran 'I saw Zayd or Amr', and marartu bi-zaydin 'aw Camrin 'I passed by Zayd or Amr', where Camrun 'Amr' is a concordant of zaydun 'Zayd' in its inflection and shares in its logical predicament. This particle may denote one of two alternatives, e.g. jā'a zaydun 'aw Camrun 'Zayd or Amr came', or one of several alternatives, e.g. jā'a zaydan 'aw Camrun 'aw bakrun 'Zayd, Amr or Bakr came'. It can also convey a restricted choice between the two coordinated elements after a request, e.g. tazawwaj zaynaba 'aw 'ugtahā 'marry either Zenobia or her sister', or a free choice, e.g. jālis il-Culamā' 'aw iz-zuhhāda 'sit with scholars or ascetics'. The difference between restricted and free choice is that in restricted choice it is impossible to combine the two coordinated elements, while that is possible in free choice.

12.41 It is also used after a statement (and then corresponds to a request), i.e. the kind of predicative statement which can be intrinsically true or false, to express the speaker's doubt, e.g. the Qur'anic labīnā yawman 'aw ba'ḍa yawmin 'we tarried a day, or part of a day', or to make the listener have doubts, as in the Qur'anic wa-'înnā 'aw iyyākum la-Calā (44b) hudan 'aw fi ḏalālin mubīn 'verily we, or you, are in a state of guidance, or in plain error'.

12.5 (5) 'am 'or', which serves as a request to be specific when it occurs after the interrogative 'a ?', which denotes one of two relevant alternatives, e.g. 'a-zaydun Cindaka 'am Camrun 'is it Zayd with you or
When you are quite sure that one of the two is there. For this reason the answer must be specifically 'Zayd' or 'Amr', and cannot be 'yes' or 'no' because these do not specify.

Both kinds of 'conjunctive 'am' associate the coordinated elements in inflection and meaning, e.g. sawā'un 'a-jā'a zaydun 'am Camrun 'it is the same whether Zayd or Camrun came', sawā'un 'a-ra'aytu zaydan 'am Camran 'it is the same whether I saw Zayd or Camrun', sawā'un 'a-marartu bi-zaydin 'am Camrin 'it is the same whether I passed by Zayd or Camrun'. Likewise 'a-jā'a zaydun 'am Camrun 'did Zayd or Camrun come?', 'a-ra'aytu zaydan 'am Camran 'did I see Zayd or Camrun?' and 'a-marartu bi-zaydin 'am Camrin 'did I pass by Zayd or Camrun?'. In all these Camrun 'Camran' is a concordant of Zayd 'Zayd' in its inflection and shares its logical predicament.

There is also the 'disjunctive 'am', to which none of the above remarks on the 'conjunctive 'am' apply: it is not preceded by the interrogative 'a '?' which, with 'am 'or', requests specification, nor by the 'equalizing 'a'. It is called 'disjunctive' because it occurs between two independent sentences, and is inseparably associated with the
meaning of retraction, e.g. jā'ā zaydun 'am ʿamr 'Zayd came, or else ʿAmr', raʿaytu zaydan 'am ʿamran 'I saw Zayd, or else ʿAmr', and marartu bi-zaydin 'am ʿamrin 'I passed by Zayd, or else ʿAmr', in the meaning of bal 'or rather'. Hence it associates in inflection but not in meaning.4

12.6 (6) 'immā 'either', (spelt with i after the '), which must be followed by another 'immā or a synonym, e.g. jā'ā 'immā zaydun wa-ʿimmā ʿamr 'either Zayd came or ʿAmr', raʿaytu (45a) 'immā zaydan wa-ʿimmā ʿamran 'I saw either Zayd or ʿAmr' and marartu 'immā bi-zaydin wa-ʿimmā bi-ʿamrin 'I passed either by Zayd or by ʿAmr', where ʿamrun ' ʿAmr is a concordant of zaydun 'Zayd' in its inflection and in its logical predicament. This particle is omitted from the particles of coordination by Ibn ʿHišām, following Abu Ṭālī, Ibn Kaysān and Ibn Bahān (spelt with a after the b). But in the opinion of most grammarians, when it occurs after demands, e.g. tazawwaj 'immā hindan wa-ʿimmā 'uktahā 'marry either Hind or her sister' or in predicative statements, e.g. jā'ā 'immā zaydun wa-ʿimmā ʿamr 'Zayd came or ʿAmr', it has exactly the same status as 'aw 'or' both in being a coordinator and in meaning, in that after demands it serves to denote restricted or free choice, and after statements it serves to denote doubt or to induce it. In the opinion of the former authorities, however, 'immā 'either' is only similar in meaning to 'aw 'or' and not in being a coordinator.

12.7 (7) bal 'nay rather', used as a coordinator after an assertion, e.g. gāmā zaydun bal ʿamran 'Zayd, nay rather ʿAmr stood', raʿaytu zaydan bal ʿamran 'I saw Zayd, nay rather ʿAmr' and marartu bi-zaydin bal ʿamrin 'I passed by Zayd, nay rather ʿAmr', where ʿamrun ' ʿAmr is a concordant of zaydun 'Zayd' in its inflection but not in its logical predicament, since it is ʿAmr, not Zayd, who is qualified by the verb.3
12.71 It also occurs after negation, e.g. mā jā’a zaydun bal ḍāmrun ‘Zayd did not come but rather ḍāmrun’, mā ra’aytu zaydan bal ḍāmarun ‘I did not see Zayd but rather ḍāmarun’, and mā marartu bi-zaydin bal ḍāmarun ‘I did not pass by Zayd but rather ḍāmarun’, where ḍāmarun ‘Zayd’ is a concordant of zaydun ‘Zayd’ in its inflection but not in its logical predicament, since it is ḍāmarun, not Zayd, who is qualified by the verb.2

12.8 (8) lā ‘not’,1 used as a coordinator after assertions, e.g. gāma zaydun lā ḍāmarun ‘Zayd stood, not ḍāmarun’, ra’aytu zaydan lā ḍāmarun ‘I saw Zayd, not ḍāmarun’ and marartu bi-zaydin lā ḍāmarun ‘I passed by Zayd, not ḍāmarun’, where ḍāmarun ‘Zayd’ is a concordant of zaydun ‘Zayd’ in its inflection but not in its logical predicament, since it is ḍāmarun, not Zayd, who is qualified by the verb.2

12.81 It also occurs after the imperative, e.g. ḡādir zaydun lā ḍāmarun ‘strike Zayd not ḍāmarun’, where Zayd is the one who is commanded to be struck, not ḍāmarun, hence the word ḍāmarun ‘Zayd’ is a concordant of zaydun ‘Zayd’ in its inflection only.2

12.9 (9) lākin ‘but’,1(spelt with unwovelled n), used as a coordinator on certain conditions: (a) that the coordinated element be a single word,2(b) that it be preceded by negation or prohibition3 and (c) that it not be accompanied by wa ‘and’, in the opinion of most grammarians.4 Examples after negation: mā gāma zaydun lākiṇ’ ḍāmarun ‘Zayd did not stand, but ḍāmarun’, mā ra’aytu zaydan lākiṇ’ ḍāmarun ‘I did not see Zayd, but ḍāmarun’, and mā marartu bi-zaydin lākiṇ’ ḍāmarun ‘I did not pass by Zayd, but ḍāmarun’, where ḍāmarun ‘Zayd’ is a concordant of zaydun ‘Zayd’ in its inflection but not in its logical predicament, as it is ḍāmarun, who is qualified by the verb (45b) not Zayd. Examples after prohibition:5 lā ḡādir zaydun lākiṇ’ ḍāmarun ‘do not strike Zayd, but ḍāmarun’, where Zayd is the one forbidden to be struck, not ḍāmarun, hence ḍāmarun ‘Zayd’ is a concordant of zaydun ‘Zayd’ in its inflection but not in its logical predicament.
12.901 This particle is not a coordinator if it is followed by a sentence, as in the verse:

\[\text{‘inna bna warqā’ā lā tuğšā bawādiru hu} \]
\[\text{lākin waqā’īCuhu ff l-ḥarbi tuntażaru} \]
‘Indeed the onslaughts (bawādiru 'on slaughts' is the plural of bādiratun, i.e. ḥiddatun 'vehemence') of Ibn Warqā’ are not feared, but his attacks in battle are anticipated’. Here waqā’īCu 'attacks' is the subject, tuntażaru 'are anticipated' is its predicate, and lākin 'but' preceding this sentence is a particle which introduces equational sentences.

12.902 Likewise if it follows wa 'and', as in the Qur’anic mā kāna muhammadun 'abā ‘ahadin min rijālikum wa-lākin rasūla llāhi ‘Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but the apostle of God’ where rasūla llāhi 'the apostle of God' is not coordinated to 'abā ‘ahadin 'the father of one' as one single element coordinated to another, but is the predicate of an elided kāna 'is, has always been', i.e. wa-lākin kāna rasūla llāhi 'but he is the apostle of God'.

12.903 In the same way, when it is preceded by an assertion, e.g. qāma zajdun lākin āmrun lam yaqum 'Zayd stood, but Āmūr did not stand', Āmār 'Amr' is the subject of an equational sentence, lam yaqum 'he did not stand' is its predicate, and lākin 'but' is a particle which introduces equational sentences. It is not allowed to say lākin āmrun 'but Āmūr' by itself as if it were coordinated, because the necessary condition is lacking, viz. that of being preceded by negation or prohibition.
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12.91 (10) hattā 'even',¹ which associates both in inflection and meaning. When the author adds: in certain positions,² he is indicating that its use as a coordinator is rare in the opinion of the Basrans and denied altogether by the Kūfans.³ They attribute its coordinating implications to the fact that, in such cases, it is a particle which introduces equational sentences, and that an operator has been suppressed after hattā 'even', making hattā itself the operator. It operates only on four conditions: (a) the coordinated element must be a noun, because this hattā 'even' is transferred from the hattā 'till' which is an oblique operator and does not occur before verbs,⁴ (b) the coordinated noun must be overt: it is not allowed to say *qâma l-qawmu hattā 'anā 'the people stood, even I',⁵ (c) the coordinated noun must be part of its antecedent, either literally, as in 'akaltu s-samakata hattā ra'sahā 'I ate the fish, even its head', or figuratively,⁶ as in the verse

'alqâ s-ṣâḥifata kay yuqaffifa rahlahu wa-z-zâda hattâ naclahu 'alqâhā 'he threw away the letter to lighten his saddle, and the supplies and even his sandals he threw away',⁷ where the letter (46a) and the supplies can be paraphrased as 'he threw away what weighed heavily on him'. Alternatively the coordinated noun only needs to resemble a part of its antecedent when the connection between the two is extremely close, e.g. 'a'qjabatnî l- jâriyatu hattâ kalāmuhā 'the girl delighted me, even what she said', while it is impossible to say *hattâ wâludhâ 'even her son' because her son is neither part of her nor resembles part of her. The guiding principle for all this is that if it is correct with 'continuous exception' then it is also correct with hattā to occur before it, otherwise not.⁸

¹ What the author means by 'even' is not clear. It seems to mean 'even if'.
² For example: 'even I'.
³ The Kūfans are a tribe mentioned in the Arabic literature.
⁴ For example: 'even if I'.
⁵ This is incorrect.
⁶ This is a figurative use.
⁷ This is incorrect.
⁸ This is incorrect.
⁹ This is incorrect.
12.911 Finally, (d) what follows ḥattā 'even' must be a limit to the antecedent in terms of some perceptible addition ultimately going back to perception and observation, e.g. fulānin yahabu l-‘aḏadā l-kaṭfrata ḥattā l-‘ulūfa 'so-and-so donates large sums, even thousands', or some abstract addition ultimately going back to the meaning of the antecedent, e.g. māta n-nāsu ḥattā l-‘anbiyā’u 'the people died, even the prophets', or some perceptible decrease, e.g. al-mu’minu yujzā bi-1-hasanāt hattā mi ṭqâli d-dārātī 'the believer is rewarded for good deeds, even for the weight of an atom', or some abstract decrease, e.g. galabaka n-nāsu ḥattā n-nisā’u wa-s-ṣibyānu 'the people browbeat you, even the women and children'.

12.912 It also serves for gradation, in that its antecedent proceeds little by little, and it can convey absolute coordination like wa 'and' without any of the ordering implied by fa 'and then' or ʿummama 'then' (contrary to Ibn al-Hājib). This is proved by the Saying of the Prophet (blessing and peace upon him): kullu ʿay’in bi-qadš’ in wa-qadarin ḥattā l-‘ajzu wa-1-kaysu 'everything is by decree and predestination, even incapacity and intelligence', for there is no ordering in decree and predestination, since ordering can only appear in things which are connected with each other.

12.92 These, then, are the ten particles (with their various meanings) which associate their antecedent with what follows them in inflection, and when you use them as coordinators with an independent antecedent you make the coordinated element likewise independent, with a dependent antecedent you make the coordinated element likewise dependent, with an oblique antecedent you make the coordinated element likewise oblique, and with an apocopated antecedent you make the coordinated element likewise apocopated. Thus you say (coordinating one independent noun with another) jā’a zaydun wa-ṣāmrun 'Zayd and ʿAmr came', and in dependence raʾaytu zaydan wa-ṣāmran 'I saw Zayd and ʿAmr', and in obliqueness marartu bi-zaydin wa-ṣāmrin 'I passed by Zayd and ʿAmr'.
12.93 With verbs, when coordinating one verb with another in independence you say yaqūm wa-yaqūdu zaydun 'Zayd stands and sits', in dependence Ian yaqūma wa-yaqūdu zaydun 'Zayd will not stand and sit', and in apocopation lam yagum (46b) wa-yaqūdu zaydun 'Zayd did not stand and sit'. Use these as an analogy for the rest of the particles.

12.94 Note: It is understood from the fact that coordination is not bound by the same conditions as the adjective (i.e. agreement with the antecedent in definition and indefiniteness) that it is allowed to coordinate the undefined to the defined, e.g. jā'a zaydun wa-rajulun 'Zayd and a man came', or the defined to the undefined, e.g. jā'a rajulun wa-zaydun 'a man and Zayd came', or the singular to the dual and plural and vice versa, or the overt to the pronoun and the pronoun to the overt.

12.95 Having finished setting out the second of the concordants, namely sequential coordination, the author now turns to the third of them, i.e. corroboration.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

13.0 Chapter on corroboration. In other words, on the 'corroborating element' (al-muwakkid, spelt with i after the k, but he uses the unqualified verbal noun to mean the agent noun). It is sometimes called ta'kid 'corroboration' with ', or takid, showing alternation of a and a', but tawkid with w is commoner and for that reason its use is most widespread among grammarians.

13.1 Corroboration (meaning 'the corroborating element') is a concordant which establishes the import of its antecedent with regard to its
relationship and scope, and is of two kinds, formal and abstract.²

13.11 (1) In the formal kind the antecedent is repeated either (a) iden-
tically or (b) by means of a synonym.¹ Both types occur with nouns, e.g. the verse

\[ \text{'akāka 'akāka 'inna man lā 'akā lahu} \]
\[ \text{ka-sācin 'ilā 1-hayjā'ī bi-ğayrī silāhin} \]

'your brother! your brother! One who has no brother is like one who runs off into the desert with no weapon',² where the dependent form of the first 'akāka 'your brother' is caused by an implicit ihfāṣ 'look to!', ilzam 'stay by!' or something of that sort, while the second 'akāka 'your brother' is a corroboration of the first. An example of type (b) is the expression haqīqun jadīrun 'true, right', for jadīrun 'right' is synonymous with haqīqun 'true'.³

13.12 It also occurs with verbs, as in the verse

\[ \text{fa-'ayna 'ilā 'ayna n-najā'ū bi-bağlatī} \]
\[ \text{'atāka 'atāka 1-lāhiqūna ḥbisi ḥbisi} \]

'where, whither are you rushing off with my mule? The pursuers have overtaken you, overtaken you, stop! stop!'.¹ The evidence here is in the expression 'atāka 'atāka 'have overtaken you, overtaken you', in which the verb and its direct object are repeated. The agent of the first 'atāka 'have overtaken you' is al-lāhiqūna 'the pursuers', but the second 'atāka has no agent because it was not introduced in order to be a predicate but merely as a corroborative. Another example is
the expression sakata șamata 'he was silent, he was quiet', for șamata 'he was quiet' has the same meaning (47a) as being silent.

13.13 It also occurs with particles, as in the verse
lā lā 'abūhu bi-bubbi bațnata 'innahā
'akadat șalayya mawātīghan wa-țuhūdan
'I shall not, not reveal the love of Bațna (i.e. Butayna his beloved) for she has taken against me covenants and oaths' in which the particle of response, namely lā 'not' has been repeated. Another example is the expression 'ajal jayri 'aye, yes', where jayri 'yes' has the same meaning as 'ajal 'aye'.

13.14 Repetition itself is not necessarily formal corroboration, e.g. in the Qur'ānic kallā 'īdā dukkat il-ârçu dakkan dakkan 'nay, when the earth is crushed with a crushing, a crushing',1 for this means with one crushing after another and that the crushing will be repeated until the earth has become a dispersed cloud of dust. Nor is the repetition in the Qur'ānic wa-jâ'â rabbuka wa-l-malaku saffan saffan 'and your Lord and the angels came, rank upon rank'2 formal corroboration, because it means that the angels will descend and form themselves into row after row, surrounded by the Jinn and mankind. The second element in both these verses is not a corroborative but a deliberate repetition,3 just as when you say 'allamtuha n-naḥwa bāban bāban 'I taught him grammar chapter by chapter'.4

13.2 (2) Second is the abstract kind, which will be discussed in due course. Both kinds are concordants of the antecedent (muwakkad 'corroborated element', with a after the ki1 in its independence, if the antecedent is independent, in its independence, if the antecedent is dependent, in its obliqueness, if the antecedent is oblique, and in its definition, if the antecedent is defined. It is understood from the author's limitation to definition that corroboration is never undefined, unlike the adjective, which may be undefined.2
Abstract corroboration is of two kinds: (a) the corroborative which removes the possibility of an entity being taken metaphorically, and it uses certain well-known expressions, (well-known, that is, to the Arabs), namely:

13.31 an-nafsu 'the self', al-‘aynu 'the essence', these two in particular. Thus, if you say jā‘a zaydun 'Zayd came', it may be that what actually did come was news of Zayd or a letter from him, or his boy, but when you say jā‘a zaydun nafsuhu or ‘aynuhu 'Zayd himself came', this possibility is removed. You may say nafsu- 'self' alone or ‘aynu- 'self' alone, or you may combine them on condition that nafsu- is put before ‘aynu- in the utterance, e.g. jā‘a zaydun nafsuhu ‘aynuhu 'Zayd himself in person came', because an-nafsu 'the self' is the comprehensive term and al-‘aynu 'the essence' is metaphorical for the self. They both make their plural in the ‘afqul pattern (with u after the c), which is a plural of paucity. In pure speech the plural is compulsory with anything not singular (i.e. the dual and plural): in the dual you say jā‘a z-zaydāni ‘anfusuhum or ‘a‘aynuhum, or 'anfusuhum ‘a‘aynuhum ‘the two Zayds themselves came' (47b), though in impure speech it is allowed to say nafsuhum or ‘aynuhum ‘*theirself' with singular corrobatives. In the plural you say jā‘a z-zaydūna (or zaydun wa-‘a‘amrun wa-bakrun) ‘anfusuhum or ‘a‘aynuhum, or 'anfusuhum ‘a‘aynuhum ‘the Zayds (or 'Zayd, ‘Amr and Bakr') themselves came'. It is not allowed to say nufūsuhum, ‘uyūnuhum or nufūsuhum ‘uyūnuhum ‘*theirselves'. In the masculine singular you say, for
example, jā‘a zaydun nafsu hu or Caynu hu or nafsu hu Cayn hu 'Zayd himself came', in the feminine singular you say jā‘at hindun nafsu hu or Caynu hu or nafsu hu Caynu hu 'Hind herself came', and in the feminine plural jā‘at il-hindatu anfusuhunna or 'aCyunuhunna or anfusuhunna 'aCyunuhunna 'the Hinds themselves came'.

13.32 It will be recognized from the foregoing that in the purest speech nafsu- and Caynu- 'self' must always be suffixed by a bound pronoun corresponding to the corroborated element (al-muwakkad, spelt with a after the k), except in the dual, as already mentioned.2

13.4 (b) The second kind of abstract corroboration is that used to remove the supposition of an intended particularity in something of ostensibly general meaning. This is done by means of kullun 'all', 1 'ajma'cu 'whole', and also (but rarely) jamîCun 'all' and Câmmatun 'totality', with everything but the dual2 (i.e. the plural and singular), provided that the non-dual entity is by itself divisible into parts, e.g. jā‘a l-qawmu kulluhum or 'ajmaCuna or jamîCuhum or Câmmatuhum 'the people came, all of them', or is divisible into parts by its own operator,3 e.g. istics atraytu l-Cabda kullahu or jamîCahu 'I bought the slave, all of him'. It is not allowed to say *jā‘a zaydun kulluhu 'Zayd came, all of him', because 'Zayd' is indivisible both in essence and by its own operator.4 This corroborotation is used simply to remove the above-mentioned possibility, because when you say jā‘a l-qawmu 'the people came' it is quite possible that you only mean some of them (as in the Qur'anic yâjCâluna 'aCâbîCahum fI 'âgânihim 'they put their fingers in their ears',5 meaning some part of their fingers, namely the tips), so when you add kulluhum 'all of them', that possibility is removed.6
13.41 kullun 'all', 'ajma'ū 'whole', 'jamī'ūn 'all' and āmmatun 'total­ity' must always be formally suffixed with the pronoun of the corroborated element in order to achieve a link between the corroborative and its antecedent.

13.42 The following is not corroboration: the Qur'anic kalaqa lakum mā fī l-'ardī jamī'ūn 'he created for you what is in the earth, totally', because it lacks a pronoun. If it had been corroboration it would have been jamī'ūahu 'all of it', but in any case corroboration with jamī'ūn is rare, as already mentioned, and the Revelation is not to be taken as evidence of it as Ibn Hišām claims in his Muğnī l-labībīb: on the contrary, jamī'ūn 'all, totally' in this verse is a circumstantial qualifier of the relative mā 'that which'.

13.43 The dual is corroborated by kilā (masc.) and kiltā (fem.) 'all two, both', e.g. jā'ā z­‐zaydānī kilāhūmā wa­‐l­‐mar'atānī kiltāhūmā 'the two Zayds both came and both the women', provided that the predicate of both corroborated elements is the same, e.g. qāma z­‐zaydānī kilāhūm 'the two Zayds both stood'. If it is different kilā and kiltā 'both' must not be used to corroborate: one does not say māta zaydun wa­‐c­‐āša (48a) C'amon kilāhūmā 'Zayd died and Āmūr lived, both of them'.

13.44 'ajma'ū 'whole' is used in corroborating the masculine singular, jamī'ūn for the feminine singular, and jamī'ūhumā 'the whole of them two' for two together. The plural of 'ajma'ū 'whole' is 'ajma'ūna for corroborating the masculine plural (as already mentioned), and the plural of jamī'ū 'whole' is jumā'ū (with u after the j) for corroborating the feminine plural.

13.45 Occasionally the situation requires extra corroboration, and so certain well-known expressions are introduced, which are termed the 'subsidiaries of 'ajma'ū'; and the subsidiaries of 'ajma'ū 'whole', which never precede 'ajma'ū, are (i.e. the 'subsidiaries of 'ajma'ū') namely 'akta'ū 'all', derived from takatta'ā l­‐jīldu 'the skin contracted', i.e. gathered itself together; abta'ū 'all', derived from
It is normal for an-nafsu 'the self' to be used alone without al-'aynu 'the essence', for kullun 'all' to be used alone without 'ajma'u 'whole', and for 'ajma'u 'whole' to be used alone without its subsidiaries: thus you say (using an-nafsu 'the self' alone without al-'aynu 'the essence', in independence) qāma zaydun nafsuhu 'Zayd himself stood', and (using kullun 'all' alone without 'ajma'u 'whole', in dependence) ra'aytu l-qawma kullahum 'I saw the people, all of them', and (using 'ajma'u 'whole' alone without its subsidiaries, in obliqueness) marartu bi-l-qawmi 'ajma'îna 'I passed by the people, all of them'.

Note: 'ajma'u 'whole' and its subsidiaries are all used as corroboratives without being annexed to the pronoun of their antecedent. This is because they are generally used as corroboratives only after kullun 'all', and kullun is annexed itself to the pronoun of the antecedent, so that these, being subsidiaries to it, need not be annexed, cf. the Qur'anic fa-sajada l-malā'ikatu kulluhum 'ajma'ûna 'and the angels bowed down, all of them, all'. They may, in fact, be used as corroboratives in their own right, without being preceded by kullun 'all', e.g. jā'a l-jayšu 'ajma'ûwa-l-qabīlatu jamā'ûwa wa-l-qawmu 'ajma'ûna wa-n-nisā'ûjumā'û 'the whole army came, and the whole tribe, and the whole people and all the women', and cf. the Qur'anic la-'ugwiyannahum 'ajma'îna 'I shall most certainly lead them all astray' and wa-šinna jahannama la-mawṣiduhum 'ajma'îna 'and verily Hell is promised to them all'.

According to the great majority of Baṣrans it is not allowed to dualize 'ajma'û and jamā'û 'whole', because kilā and kiltā 'both' make the dual of 'ajma'û and jamā'û unnecessary, rather in the same way as people have on the whole dispensed with the dual of sawā'un 'like' (spelt with the 'lengthened ā') by using the dual of siyyun 'like'.

bataCun 'being long in the neck', and 'absaCū 'all'; (its ā having no dot above), derived from basCun 'collected sweat'.

13.5 It is normal for an-nafsu 'the self' to be used alone without al-'aynu 'the essence', for kullun 'all' to be used alone without 'ajma'u 'whole', and for 'ajma'u 'whole' to be used alone without its subsidiaries: thus you say (using an-nafsu 'the self' alone without al-'aynu 'the essence', in independence) qāma zaydun nafsuhu 'Zayd himself stood', and (using kullun 'all' alone without 'ajma'u 'whole', in dependence) ra'aytu l-qawma kullahum 'I saw the people, all of them', and (using 'ajma'u 'whole' alone without its subsidiaries, in obliqueness) marartu bi-l-qawmi 'ajma'îna 'I passed by the people, all of them'.

13.6 Note: 'ajma'u 'whole' and its subsidiaries are all used as corroboratives without being annexed to the pronoun of their antecedent. This is because they are generally used as corroboratives only after kullun 'all', and kullun is annexed itself to the pronoun of the antecedent, so that these, being subsidiaries to it, need not be annexed, cf. the Qur'anic fa-sajada l-malā'ikatu kulluhum 'ajma'ûna 'and the angels bowed down, all of them, all'. They may, in fact, be used as corroboratives in their own right, without being preceded by kullun 'all', e.g. jā'a l-jayšu 'ajma'ûwa-l-qabīlatu jamā'ûwa wa-l-qawmu 'ajma'ûna wa-n-nisā'ûjumā'û 'the whole army came, and the whole tribe, and the whole people and all the women', and cf. the Qur'anic la-'ugwiyannahum 'ajma'îna 'I shall most certainly lead them all astray' and wa-šinna jahannama la-mawṣiduhum 'ajma'îna 'and verily Hell is promised to them all'.

According to the great majority of Baṣrans it is not allowed to dualize 'ajma'û and jamā'û 'whole', because kilā and kiltā 'both' make the dual of 'ajma'û and jamā'û unnecessary, rather in the same way as people have on the whole dispensed with the dual of sawā'un 'like' (spelt with the 'lengthened ā') by using the dual of siyyun 'like'.
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When these corroborative expressions are combined they must be arranged in the following order: first kullun 'all', then 'ajmacu 'whole', then 'akta cu, 'absacu and finally 'abta cu 'all'. They may be used severally if it is desired to strengthen the meaning, but in this they are not like adjectives used severally of an antecedent, for this (48b) allows the successive coordination of adjectives, because their meanings differ, whereas it is not allowed to coordinate corroborative words. On the contrary, in the most correct speech they are mentioned in uninterrupted succession, because they all have the same meaning and thereby acquire the status of a single term. Coordination, on the other hand, implies some difference of meaning, so we cannot say *jā'ā zaydun nafsuhu wa-aynuhu 'Zayd came himself and himself', while we can say, with adjectives, jā'ā zaydun il-‘alimu wa-s-sālihu wa-l-wari cu 'Zayd the wise, the good and the pious came' for the reason already given. Nor is it allowed to suspend the concordance of corroborative expressions, unlike adjectives (as dealt with above).

Supplementary Note: If an independent bound pronoun is corroborated by an-nafsu 'the self' or al-‘aynu 'the essence', that pronoun must first be corroborated by the free pronoun; e.g. qumta ‘anta nafsuka 'you yourself (masc. sing.) stood', qūmā ‘antumā ‘anfusukumā 'stand you two yourselves!', qūmā ‘humā ‘anfusuhumā 'they two themselves stood', qūmā ‘antum ‘anfusukum ‘stand you yourselves!' (masc.), qūmā hum ‘anfusuhum ‘they themselves (masc.) stood', qumna hunna ‘anfusuhunna 'they themselves (fem.) stood' and qumtnnna ‘antunna ‘anfusukunna ‘you yourselves (fem.) stood'. This is to avoid giving the impression that the corroborative itself has agent status when there is a concealed feminine pronoun, since, if you were to say *karajat ‘aynuhā 'herself
went out' it might be supposed to mean 'her sight went out',\(^5\) likewise *karajat nafsuhā 'her self went out' might be supposed to mean 'her life went out', thereby leading to a false correlation between the unambiguous and the ambiguous. Conversely, with qāma z-zaydūna 'anfusuhum 'the Zayds themselves stood' it is impossible to use the free pronoun, as pronouns cannot corroborate overt nouns because the pronoun is more strongly defined than the overt noun, hence it is not possible for them to be complementary to something less defined than they are.\(^6\) This in turn is different from the case of ẓarabtuḫum 'anfusuhum 'I struck them themselves', marartu bihim 'anfusihim 'I passed by them themselves'\(^7\) and qāmu kulluhum 'they stood, all of them',\(^8\) for here it is allowed (but not compulsory) to corroborate them with a free pronoun, because the corroborated pronoun in the first two examples is not independent and because the corroborative in the third is neither an-nafsu 'the self' nor al-‘aynu 'the essence'.\(^9\)

13.91 Having finished with the third of the concordants,\(^1\) the author now turns to the fourth of them, namely substitution.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

14.0 Chapter on substitution.\(^1\) This is a Basran term; among the Küfans it is called 'interpretation' and 'clarification' according to al-Ağfaš, though Ibn Kaysān said that they call it 'repetition'.\(^2\) The lexical meaning of the term is 'replacement'; technically it is defined
The concordant which is intended to follow without intermediary (49a) the same grammatical rule as its antecedent. Thus defined, its grammatical rule is that it concords with its antecedent in all its inflections (i.e. independence, dependence, obliqueness and apocopation), as is obvious from the author's next words:

14.01 If one noun is substituted for another or one verb for another, it concords with it in all its inflections, i.e. independence, dependence, obliqueness and apocopation, and it (i.e. the substitution of one noun or verb for another) divides into four kinds: (or rather, six, as you will soon learn).

14.1 (1) The substitution of a thing for an identical thing, i.e. where the second is the same as the first, as in the Qur'anic 'Inna li-l-muttaqīna mafāzāna b̲ādī'īga wa-a nawāban 'verily for the pious there is a blissful place, gardens and vineyards' (and so on to the end of the verse).

14.11 Note: The author's term for this kind of substitution is much more appropriate than that of others who call it 'substitution of a whole for a whole', since it occurs with the name of Almighty God, e.g. 'ilā širāţī 1-Cazīzi 1-hamīdi llāhi 'to the way of the Mighty, the Praiseworthy, God' those who read allāhī 'God' in the oblique form take it as a substitute for al-Cazīzi 'the Mighty' in substitution of a thing for an identical thing, which can hardly be called the 'substitution of a whole for a whole' here because the term 'whole' can only be applied to what is capable of division into parts, and Almighty God is entirely free from such considerations.
14.12 The substitute of a thing needs no pronoun to link it with the antecedent because it is the same as the antecedent in meaning.\(^1\)

14.2 (2) The substitution of some of a thing for the whole of it,\(^1\) i.e. the part for the whole, as in the Qur’anic *wa-li-Ilāhī ṣa[lā n-nāsi ḥajju l-bayti* *man istaṭā* ‘and to God is owed by the people pilgrimage to the house (of God), whoever is able’,\(^2\) where *man istaṭā* ‘whoever is able’ is a substitute for *an-nāsi* ‘the people’.

14.21 It makes no difference whether the part substituted is smaller, equal to or even greater than the remainder of the antecedent, e.g. *'akaltu r-raqīfa tultahu* or *nisfahu* or *tultayhi* ‘I ate the loaf, a third of it’ or ‘a half of it’ or ‘two thirds of it’.\(^1\) In substitution of the part for the whole the part must always be suffixed with a pronoun referring to the antecedent and linking the part with its whole, whether this pronoun be implicit (as in the above Qur’anic example, where the pronoun referring to the antecedent is implicit, viz. *minhum* ‘of them’), or explicit, as in the other examples given.\(^2\)

14.3 (3) Inclusive substitution,\(^1\) as in the Qur’anic *yas’alūnaka c-an iš-šahri l-ḥarāmī qitālin fīhi* ‘they will ask you about the sacred month, fighting in it’.\(^2\)

14.31 There is some dispute (49b) as to what includes what.\(^1\) One view is that the first includes the second, because the second is either a quality of the first, as in *'ačjabatnī l-jāriyatu ṣusnuhā* ‘the girl pleased me, her beauty’, or something from which a quality is acquired, as in *sulība zaydun mālhu* ‘Zayd was taken away, his wealth’, where the
first acquired from the second the fact of its being an owner. One refutation of this is that the sentence 
\( \text{darabtu zaydan } \text{abdahu} 'I struck Zayd his slave' \) would then have to be allowed as a case of inclusive substitution, which is impossible.³

14.32 The other view is that the second includes the first, the proof being \( \text{suriqa zaydun } \text{tawbuhu} 'Zayd was stolen, his garment' \), but this is refuted by \( \text{suriqa zaydun } \text{farasuhu} 'Zayd was stolen, his horse'.¹

14.33 It is also said, and this is the most cogent opinion, that neither one includes the other, but that it is really substitution of a thing for an identical thing, in which the operator comprehensively includes the meaning of the substitute, e.g. \( \text{a} \text{c} \text{jabanl zaydun } \text{cilmuh} \text{or } \text{husnuhu or kalâmuhu} 'Zayd pleased me, his knowledge' or 'his beauty' or 'his speech', for you can see that the act of pleasing includes Zayd figuratively and his knowledge, beauty and speech literally.² Similarly, in \( \text{suriqa zaydun } \text{tawbuhu} \text{or } \text{farasuhu} 'Zayd was stolen, his garment' or 'his horse', Zayd is only figuratively stolen, while his garment and horse are literally stolen.³

14.34 In inclusive substitution, as in substitution of the part for the whole, there must always be a pronoun,¹ either explicitly mentioned (as in the Qur'anic verse quoted above, where \( \text{qitālin } ' \text{fighting}' \) is an inclusive substitute of \( \text{aš-šahri } ' \text{the month}' \), with the \( \text{hi } ' \text{it}' \) made oblique by \( \text{ff } ' \text{in}' \) as the link between them), or implicitly, as in the Qur'anic \( \text{gutila } ' \text{āshāhu l-’ugdūdi } n-nāri } ' \text{may there be killed the people of the pit, of the fire!}'³ where \( \text{an-nāri } ' \text{the fire}' \) is a substitute of \( \text{al-’ugdūdi } ' \text{the pit}' \), and the referential pronoun has been elided, scil. \( \text{an-nāri } \text{ffhi } ' \text{the fire in it}' \).
14.4 (4) **The substitution of retraction.** (5) **The substitution of error.** (6) **The substitution of oversight.** There is no formal difference between these three, which differ only in respect of the speaker's purpose. The example *tasaddaqtu bi-dirhamin dinārín* 'I donated a dirham, a dinar' is appropriate for all three kinds, according to what motivated the first element (the thing substituted for) and the second (the substitute), viz. (a) it may be that you intended to state that you had donated a dirham and then it sprang to mind to state that you had donated a dinar; both words were thus spoken intentionally, and so this is 'substitution of retraction' (which is also called 'substitution (50a) of second thoughts', spelt *badā*, with undotted *d* and the lengthened *ā*), or (b) you intended only the second but your tongue was too quick with the first, so this is 'substitution of error' (i.e. a substitution for the erroneous expression, not that the substitute itself is an error, as might easily be supposed from the formal terminology); or (c) you intended the first, and then it became clear that you had made a mistake in wanting to state that you had donated a dirham, and the moment you uttered it the falseness of that intention became apparent to you after you had thought of the second. This is, therefore, 'substitution of oversight', i.e. substitution for something that was only mentioned in oversight. From what has been set out here it will be realized that 'error' is connected with the tongue and 'oversight' with the mind.

14.51 The author now illustrates the kinds of substitution mentioned above, starting with the first: e.g. *jā'a zaydun 'ağūka 'Zayd, your brother, came'*; parsed as follows: *jā'a 'came' is a past tense verb, zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent, and 'ağūka 'your brother'
is the substitute of a thing by an identical thing, which is also called by Ibn Mālik the 'matching substitute'.

14.52 Next the author illustrates the second kind: *'akaltu r-raḥifā tultahu* 'I ate the loaf, a third of it', parsed as follows: *'akaltu* 'I ate' is a verb and agent, *ar-raḥifā* 'the loaf' is its direct object, and *tultahu* 'a third of it' is a substitute of *ar-raḥifā* 'the loaf' in substitution of the part for the whole. (N.B. The experts do not allow *al* 'the' to be prefixed to *kullun* 'all' and *baqā* 'some').

14.53 He next illustrates the third kind: *nafaqī zaydun ẓilmuhu* 'Zayd benefitted me, his knowledge', parsed as follows: *nafaqī* 'benefitted me' is a verb and direct object, *zaydun* 'Zayd' is an agent, and *ẓilmuhu* 'his knowledge' is a substitute of *zaydun* 'Zayd' by inclusive substitution.

14.54 The author then illustrates the fourth kind: *raʿaytu zaydan il-farasa* 'I saw Zayd—the horse', parsed as follows: *raʿaytu* 'I saw' is a verb and agent, *zaydan* 'Zayd' is a direct object, and *il-farasa* 'the horse' is a substitute of *zaydan* 'Zayd' in substitution of error. This is because you wanted to say 'I saw the horse' in the first place, but you made a mistake when you were about to utter the word 'horse' and substituted 'Zayd' for it. That is, you replaced 'the horse' by 'Zayd'.

14.6 So much for the substitution of nouns. As far as verbs are concerned ʿAbd al-Ṣātibī said that the same occurs with them: an example of substitution of a thing by an identical thing in verbs is the Qur'anic *man yafʿal dārīlika yalqa* 'whoever does that will meet with recompense, will be doubled (his punishment)' since the meaning of 'doubling the punishment' is the same as 'meeting the recompense'.

14.61 An example of substitution of the part for the whole is (50b) *in tuṣalli tasjud li-lāḥī yarḥamka* 'if you pray—bow down—to God, he will have mercy on you'.
14.62 An example of inclusive substitution is the verse

\[ \text{‘inna } \text{calayya } \text{llāha } \text{‘an } \text{tubāyīqā} \]

\[ \text{tu’kāḍa karhan } \text{‘aw taji’} \text{‘āṭ’i} \text{‘an} \]

‘it is my duty, by God, that you should swear allegiance—that you be taken against your will and coming obediently’, because being taken against one’s will and coming obediently are both qualities of the act of swearing allegiance.

14.63 An example of substitution of error is ‘\text{in } ta’\text{tīnā } \text{tas’alnā} \]

\[ \text{nuqāṭika } \text{‘if you come to us—ask us—we shall give you something’}. \]

This is an abridgment of what aš-Šāṭibī\textsuperscript{2} has to say: aš-Šaykh Kālid\textsuperscript{3} adds, ‘that is his own responsibility’.

14.7 Supplementary note: The number of different ways of substituting one noun for another, calculated by multiplication, is sixty-four, the product of four times sixteen.\textsuperscript{1} This is because both nouns may be either defined or undefined, or the first defined and the second undefined and vice versa,\textsuperscript{2} which makes four possibilities. Then they may either be both pronouns or both overt nouns, or both different, which yields sixteen combinations. Finally there may be substitution of a thing for an identical thing, substitution of the part for the whole, inclusive substitution, or substitution of error, and this makes sixty-four all together. The details of what is allowed and what is impossible can mostly be learnt from the above.\textsuperscript{3}

14.8 Having finished with the independent forms of the noun,\textsuperscript{1} the author now turns to their dependent forms.
15.0 Chapter on the dependent forms of nouns.¹ The dependent forms of verbs have already been dealt with. The dependent forms of nouns² are fifteen in number: i.e. fifteen dependent forms listed summarily, each to be dealt with in a separate chapter.³ And they are (i.e. the dependent forms of nouns):

15.01 (1) the direct object,¹ e.g. darabtu zaydan 'I struck Zayd', where daraba 'to strike'² makes zaydan 'Zayd' dependent as a direct object, with a as its dependence marker;

15.02 (2) the verbal noun,¹ e.g. darban 'act of striking' in darabtu darban 'I struck hard', where daraba 'to strike' makes darban 'act of striking' dependent as an absolute object;

15.03 (3) the time-qualifier,¹ e.g. sumtu I-yawma 'I fasted today', where sāma 'to fast' makes the time-qualifier al-yawma 'today' dependent as an object of location;

15.04 (4) the space-qualifier,¹ e.g. jalastu (51a) 'amāmaka 'I sat in front of you', where jalasa 'to sit' makes the space-qualifier 'amāmaka 'in front of you' dependent as an object of location;

15.05 (5) the circumstantial qualifier,¹ e.g. jā'a zaydun rākiban 'Zayd came riding', where jā'a 'to come' makes rākiban 'riding' dependent as a circumstantial qualifier;

15.06 (6) the specifying element,¹ e.g. tāba muḥammadun nafsan 'Muḥammad was content of soul', where tāba 'to be content' makes nafsan 'soul' dependent as a specifying element;
15.07 (7) the excepted element, e.g. qāma l-qawmu 'illā zaydan 'the people stood except Zayd', where 'illā 'except' makes zaydan 'Zayd' dependent by exception;

15.08 (8) the noun negated by lā 'no', e.g. lā ġulāma safarin ḥādirun 'no boy for the journey is present', where ġulāma 'boy' is negated by lā 'no' and made dependent by it;

15.09 (9) the vocative, e.g. yā ġabda illāhi 'O ġAbdullāh!', where ġabda illāhi 'ġAbdullāh' is made dependent by being called;

15.10 (10) the object of reason, e.g. qāma zaydun 'ijlālan li-bakrin 'Zayd stood in honour of Bakr', where qāma 'to stand' makes 'ijlālan 'act of honouring' dependent as an object of reason;

15.11 (11) the object of accompaniment, e.g. sīrtu wa-n-nilā 'I travelled with the Nile', where an-nilā 'the Nile' is made dependent as an object of accompaniment;

15.12 (12) the predicate of kāna 'to be' and its related verbs, e.g. kāna zaydun qā'īman 'Zayd was standing', where qā'īman 'standing' is a predicate of kāna 'to be' and made dependent by it.

15.13 (13) the subject-noun of 'inna 'verily' and its related particles, e.g. 'inna zaydan qā'imun 'verily Zayd is standing', where zaydan 'Zayd' is the subject-noun of 'inna 'verily' and made dependent by it;

15.14 (14) the two objects of zanantu 'I thought' and its related verbs, (this is omitted from most manuscripts of the basic text, but is
preserved in some), e.g. \( \text{zanantu zaydan qā'imān} \) 'I thought Zayd was standing', where zaydan 'Zayd' and qā'imān 'standing' are both made dependent as the two objects of \( \text{zanantu 'I thought'} \);  

15.15 (15) and the concordant of a dependent element, which comprises four things: (which have already been dealt with above under the independent forms of nouns), viz. the adjective, e.g. \( \text{ra'aytu zaydan il-
qāila 'I saw Zayd the intelligent', the coordinated element, e.g. ra'aytu zaydan wa-
Camran 'I saw Zayd and CAmr', the corroborative, e.g. ra'aytu l-
gamma kullahum 'I saw the people, all of them', and the substitute, e.g. ra'aytu zaydan 'ağāka 'I saw Zayd your brother'. All four of these are made dependent by being concordant with the inflection of their antecedent. After this summary presentation, the author now turns (51b) to them in detail, dealing with each one in a separate chapter in the same order as above, beginning with an explanation of the direct object.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

16.0 Chapter on the direct object. This is given first place by the author because (except by the Başrans) the term 'object' is specifically applied to the direct object alone, the others being spoken of as 'quasi-objects', according to Ibn Hišām in his marginal comments.

16.1 The direct object is the dependent noun to which (i.e. upon which) the action of the verb happens, (i.e. the action originating from the agent), e.g. \( \text{darabtu zaydan 'I struck Zayd'}, \) where zaydan 'Zayd' is a
direct object because the blow originating from the agent falls upon him, and similarly rakibtu l-farasa 'I rode the horse'. Here al-farasa 'the horse' is a direct object because the action of the verb, i.e. riding, happens to it.3

16.11 By the happening of the action of the verb is meant that it is semantically connected to the object without intermediary, in such a way that it alone can be conceived of as the object.1 This comprises, for example, mā darabtu zaydan 'I did not strike Zayd' and lā tadrib ʿamran 'do not strike ʿAmr!'. But 'that to which the action of the verb happens' excludes all other objects:2 in the object of accompaniment the action happens with it, not to it; in the object of location the action happens in it, not to it; the absolute object is itself the same as the action of the verb, while in the object of reason the action happens for that reason. The definition given above is purely formal, to make it easier for the beginner.3

16.2 It (i.e. the direct object) is of two kinds:1 one overt and one pronominal. The overt kind is the one already illustrated (viz. zaydan 'Zayd' and al-farasa 'the horse', whose parsing has been given above),2 and the pronominal is of two kinds, bound and free.3

16.3 The bound kind (i.e. the one which never precedes its operator, nor can it ever be separated from its operator by 'illā 'except')1 comprises twelve pronouns:

16.301 (1) the pronoun of the first person singular, namely ʿī 'me',1 as in, for example, ʿarabani ʿaṣydu ʿayd 'struck me', where ʿaraba 'struck' is a past tense verb, the n is preservative (i.e. to protect the verb from ending in i), ʿī 'me' is a direct object with dependent status through ʿaraba 'struck', and ʿaṣydu ʿayd 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by ʿaraba, with u as its independence marker.
16.302 (2) the pronoun of the first person plural and plural of self-magnification, namely ِناأً 'us', as in ٍداрабانَأِ 'Camrun 'C'Amr struck us', where ِداрабا 'struck' (with ِا after the ِد) is a past tense verb, ِناأً 'us' is a direct object (52a) with dependent status through ِدارابا 'struck', and ِCamrun 'C'Amr' is an agent made independent by ِدارابا with ِا as its independence marker;

16.303 (3) the pronoun of the second person masculine singular, namely ِكا 'you', as in ِداراباكَأِ 'Bakr struck you', where ِدارابا 'struck' (with ِا after the ِد) is a past tense verb, ِكا 'you' is a direct object with dependent status through ِدارابا 'struck', and ِBakr 'Bakr' is an agent made independent by ِدارابا with ِا as its independence marker;

16.304 (4) the pronoun of the second person feminine singular, namely ِكي 'you', as in ِداراباكَيِ 'Muhammad struck you', where ِدارابا 'struck' (with ِا after the ِد) is a past tense verb, ِكي 'you' (with ِإ after the ِك) is a direct object with dependent status through ِدارابا 'struck', and ِMuhammad 'Muhammad' is an agent made independent by ِدارابا with ِا as its independence marker;

16.305 (5) the pronoun of the second person dual, whether masculine or feminine, namely ِكَمَأ 'you two', as in ِداراباكَمَأِ 'Kälid struck you two', where ِدارابا 'struck' (with ِا after the ِد) is a past tense verb, ِكَمَأ 'you two' (with ِع after the ِك) is a direct object with dependent status through ِدارابا 'struck', ِمَأ is the marker of the dual, and ِKälid 'Kälid' is an agent made independent by ِدارابا with ِا as its independence marker;

16.306 (6) the pronoun of the second person masculine plural, namely ِكَمَ 'you', as in ِداراباكَمَ 'Sälim struck you', where ِدارابا 'struck' (with ِا after the ِد) is a past tense verb, ِكَمَ 'you' is a direct object with dependent status through ِدارابا 'struck', ِمَ is the marker of the masculine plural, and ِSälim 'Sälim' is an agent made independent by ِدارابا with ِا as its independence marker;
16.307 (7) the pronoun of the second person feminine plural, namely kunna 'you' (with u after the k),¹ as in darabakunna zaydun 'Zayd struck you', where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb,² ku '*you' is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck', nna is the marker of the feminine plural, and zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by daraba with u as its independence marker;

16.308 (8) the pronoun of the third person masculine singular, namely hu 'him', as in darabahu bakrun 'Bakr struck him', where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb,¹ hu 'him' is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck', and bakrun 'Bakr' is an agent made independent by daraba with u as its independence marker;

16.309 (9) the pronoun of the third person feminine singular, namely hā 'her', as in darabahā kālidun 'Kālid struck her', where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, hā 'her' is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck', and kālidun 'Kālid' is an agent made independent by daraba with u as its independence marker;

16.310 (10) the pronoun of the third person masculine and feminine dual, namely humā 'them both', as in darabahumā qāsimun 'Qāsim struck them both', where daraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, hu '*them' is a direct object with dependent status through daraba 'struck', mā is the marker of the dual, and qāsimun 'Qāsim' is an agent made independent by daraba with u as its independence marker. (52b)
16.311 (11) the pronoun of the third person masculine plural, namely hum 'them', as in ġarabaḥum ġāmirūn 'Ō̅mir struck them', where ġaraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, hu *'them' is a direct object with dependent status through ġaraba 'struck', ġāmirūn 'Ō̅mir' is an agent made independent by ġaraba 'struck' with u as its independence marker, and m is the marker of the masculine plural;

16.312 (12) the pronoun of the third person feminine plural, namely hunna 'them', as in ġarabaḥunna sāliḥūn 'Sāliḥ struck them', where ġaraba 'struck' (with a after the d) is a past tense verb, hu *'them' is a direct object with dependent status through ġaraba 'struck', nna is the marker of the feminine plural, and sāliḥūn 'Sāliḥ' is an agent made independent by ġaraba with u as its independence marker.

16.4 These twelve pronouns all have dependent status without exhibiting inflection (as already established) because they are invariable. I have repeated their parsing simply to exercise the beginner in it: things must be judged by their purposes, but probably some carping critic will come across this and exclaim, 'What is this hotchpotch!?!'

16.5 Having finished with the direct object pronoun which is bound to its operator, the author now turns to the pronoun which is free from its operator, i.e. the one which may precede its operator or occur after 'illā 'except' or its synonyms; and the free pronoun comprises twelve also:

16.501 (1) the pronoun of the first person singular, e.g. when you say 'īyyāya 'akramtu 'me I have honoured', where 'īyyā is a preposed direct object, free from the verb, and with dependent status through 'akrama
to honour', not exhibiting inflection because it is a pronoun. The ya is a particle denoting the first person singular, and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is a verb and agent;

16.502 (2) the pronoun of the first person plural or plural of self-magnification, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyānā 'akramtu 'us I have honoured', where 'iyyā is a preposed direct object, free from the verb, and with dependent status through 'akrama 'to honour', not exhibiting inflection because it is a pronoun. The suffixed nā is a marker of the first person plural or plural of self-magnification, and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is parsed as before;

16.503 (3) the pronoun of the second person masculine singular, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyāka 'akramtu 'you I have honoured', where 'iyyā is a preposed direct object, free from the verb, and with dependent status through 'akrama 'to honour'. The suffixed (53a) ka is a particle denoting the second person, and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is parsed as before;

16.504 (4) the pronoun of the second person feminine singular, as in 'iyyāki 'akramtu 'you I have honoured', where 'iyyā is a preposed direct object, free from the verb, and with dependent status through 'akrama 'to honour'. The ki (with i after the k) suffixed to 'iyyā is a particle of the second person, and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is parsed as before;

16.505 (5) the pronoun of the second person dual, whether masculine or feminine, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyākumā 'akramtu 'you two I have honoured', where the parsing of 'iyyā is as before. The ku denotes the
second person, mā is the marker of the dual, and the parsing of 'akramtu 'I honoured' is as before; 2

16.506 (6) the pronoun of the second person masculine plural, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyākum 'akramtu 'you I have honoured', where the parsing of 'iyyā and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is as before. The ku is a particle denoting the second person, and the m is the marker of the masculine plural; 2

16.507 (7) the pronoun of the second person feminine plural, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyākunna 'akramtu 'you I have honoured', where the parsing of 'iyyā and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is as before. The ku suffixed to 'iyyā is a particle denoting the second person, and the nna is a marker of the feminine plural; 2

16.508 (8) the pronoun of the third person masculine singular, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyāhu 'akramtu 'him I have honoured', where the parsing of 'iyyā and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is as before. The hu suffixed to 'iyyā is the marker of the third person masculine singular; 1

16.509 (9) the pronoun of the third person feminine singular, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyāhā 'akramtu 'her I have honoured', where the parsing of 'iyyā and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is as before. The hā suffixed to 'iyyā is the marker of the third person feminine singular; 2

16.510 (10) the pronoun of the third person dual, whether masculine or feminine, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyāhumā 'akramtu 'them both I have honoured', where the parsing of 'iyyā and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is as before. The hu is the marker of the third person, and the mā is the marker of the dual; 1
16.511 (11) the pronoun of the third person masculine plural, namely 'iyyā, as in 'iyyāhum 'akramtu 'them I have honoured', where the parsing of 'iyyā and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is as before. The hu is the marker of the third person, and the m is the marker of the masculine plural;¹

16.512 (12) the pronoun of the third person feminine plural, namely 'iyyā, as in (53b) 'iyāhunna 'akramtu 'them I have honoured', where the parsing of 'iyyā and 'akramtu 'I honoured' is as before. The hu is the marker of the third person, and the nna is the marker of the feminine plural.¹

16.6 In all the above examples the agent has independent status through 'akrama 'to honour'. Having finished with the direct object,¹ which is the first² of the dependent elements, the author now turns to the second of them, to wit the absolute object.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

17.0 Chapter on the verbal noun.¹ The author defines it as a way which makes it easier for the beginner by saying:

17.1 The verbal noun is the dependent element which comes third in conjugating the parts of the verb.¹ Thus, if someone says to you, 'Conjugate the parts of the verb ġaraba "to strike"', you would reply,
17.2 You should know that the verbal noun occurs in three ways: (a) independent, as in 'aṣjabani ḍarbuka 'your striking amazed me', where aṣjab 'amazed' is a past tense verb, n is the 'preserving n', I 'me' is a direct object with dependent status through aṣjaba 'amazed', and ḍarbuka 'your striking' is an agent made independent by aṣjaba, with the ka 'your' (masc. sing.) being what it is annexed to; (b) oblique, as in aṣjibu min ḍarbi 'I was amazed at your striking', and (c) dependent, which is the topic of this chapter.  

17.3 Note: The author could just as easily have said 'Chapter on the absolute object' instead of 'Chapter on the verbal noun', since the verbal noun is not infrequently independent and oblique (as illustrated above), in addition to being dependent as an absolute object, which is what the author really means by 'verbal noun' here.

17.4 It (i.e. the verbal noun which is dependent as an absolute object) is the noun which is congruent with the verb, not as in īgtasala guslan 'he bathed himself with a wash', tawaḍḍaʿa wudūʿ an 'he made ablution with a ritual washing', or ʿuṣṭiyya ṣaṭṭan 'he was given a gift': these are synonyms of verbal nouns, not true verbal nouns, because they are not congruent (54a) with their verbs (the first has as its regularly derived verbal noun al-īgtīsālu 'the act of washing', the second has at-tawaḍḍuʿu 'the act of ritual ablution' and the third has al-ʿiṣṭāʿu 'the act of giving').

17.5 Now the verbal noun is of two kinds, (a) formal, i.e. the kind whose constituent letters agree both in form and meaning with those of the verb, and (b) abstract.
If its form agrees with that of its verb it is the formal kind, e.g. gätaltuhu qatlan 'I killed him with a killing'. Here qatlan 'act of killing' is a formal verbal noun because it shares the same constituent letters and meaning as qatala 'to kill', and is made dependent by qatala as an absolute object.

If it agrees with its verb in meaning but not in form it is the abstract kind, e.g. jašastu ququđan 'I sat down with a squatting action', qumtu wuğụfan 'I rose with a standing action'. Here ququđan 'act of squatting' and wuğụfan 'act of standing' are dependent verbal nouns of the abstract type because they agree in meaning but not in form with jaša 'to sit' and qämä 'to stand', and both are made dependent by jaša and qämä respectively as absolute objects.

Note: The author's illustration of the formal type with a transitive verb and the abstract type with an intransitive verb is simply for the sake of clarity, not to imply any special peculiarity; both types are made dependent both by transitive and intransitive verbs, so that you may say, with the formal kind, darabtuhu darban 'I struck him with a striking action' and farichtu farahan 'I rejoiced with a rejoicing action', and with the abstract kind, qaçađtu juļūsan 'I squatted with a sitting action' and aḥbabtuhu miqatan 'I loved him with a fondness'.

The division of the verbal noun into formal and abstract follows al-Māzīnī, who asserts that the abstract verbal noun is made dependent by the accompanying verb. But others maintain that the abstract verbal noun is made dependent by an implicit verb of the same form, so that in
jalastu qu'ūdan 'I sat down with a squatting action' there is an implicit *jalastu wa-qa'adtu qu'ūdan 'I sat down and squatted with a squatting action'. According to this view the verbal noun is always of the formal type, but the former opinion is more self-evident.2

17.6 Other elements indicating the verbal noun may replace it and take dependent form themselves as absolute objects:1

17.61 (1) an adjective, as in sīrtu 'ahsana s-sayrī 'I travelled with the best of travelling', where the antecedent of the adjective has been elided because it is sufficiently indicated by having the adjective annexed to that same word, and the adjective then replaces the verbal noun and takes its dependent form;2

17.62 (2) an expression indicating the number of the verbal noun, as in dārabtuhu ḍašara dārbātin 'I struck him with ten strikings', where ḍašara 'ten' replaces the verbal noun. (54b) Likewise the Qur'ānic fa-jlidūhum ṭamanīna jaldatan 'scourge them with eighty scourgings',2 whose original form3 is *fa-jlidūhum jaldan ṭamanīna 'scourge them with a scourging, eighty': the verbal noun has then been elided and replaced by ṭamanīna 'eighty', with jaldatan 'scourging' being a 'specifying element'.4

17.63 (3) an expression indicating the instrument, e.g. dārabtuhu sawtān 'I struck him with a whip' or ḍašan 'with a stick', or any like things with which blows are commonly known to be struck.

17.64 (4) kullun 'all' or its synonyms,1 annexed to the verbal noun, as in the Qur'ānic fa-lā ūmālū kullā 1-maylī 'so do not incline with a
total inclining', 2 where kulla 'all' is an absolute object replacing an elided verbal noun, the original form being *fa-lā tamālū maylan kulla l-mayli 'so do not incline with an inclining, with all inclining'.

17.65 (5) baqḍun 'some' or its synonyms, 1 annexed to the verbal noun, as in the Qur'anic wa-law tagawwala ḍala ay bādī-‘aqāwīlī 'and if he were to speak against us with some sayings', 2 where baqḍa 'some' is an absolute object replacing an elided verbal noun, the original form being *wa-law tagawwala ḍala gawlan baqḍa l-‘aqāwīlī 'and if he were to speak against us with a saying, some sayings'. I have dealt with this topic at length in my Commentary on Qatir an-nadā 3 in more detail than a short work such as this will bear.

17.7 Supplementary Note: The grammarians 1 agree that the operator of a non-corroborative verbal noun may be elided if sufficiently indicated by the context of discourse, 2 for example, when someone says mā jālasta 'you have not sat down', and this is answered by balā julūsan ṭawfīl 'on the contrary, a lengthy sitting down' or balā jalsataynī 'on the contrary, two sittings down'. 3 It may also be elided if sufficiently indicated by the context of situation, for example, when you say to someone who is arriving from a journey, gudūman mubārakān 'a blessed arrival'. 4

17.71 As for the corroborative verbal noun, 1 Ibn Mālik said in his Commentary on the Kāfiya 2 that its operator may not be elided because the verbal noun here only occurs for the purpose of reinforcing the operator and affirming its meaning, both of which are incompatible with elision. In this he was opposed by his son. 3

17.8 Having finished with the second of the dependent elements, 1 the author next turns to the third and fourth of them, namely the object of
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

18.0 Chapter on the time-qualifier and space-qualifier.¹ Both are termed the 'object of location', though al-Kisā'ī and his followers call these qualifiers 'adjectives'² (but let us not quarrel about that!).³ The author begins with the time-qualifier.

18.1 The time-qualifier is the noun of time that is made dependent with the implicit meaning of *ff 'in'¹⁴ (the space/time qualifier *ff), thus excluding the rest of the objects, because the power exerted by their operators is not from the meaning of *ff 'in'. 'Systematically'³ must be added to the definition, to exclude cases irregularly containing the meaning of *ff 'in', namely nouns made dependent by latitude of speech,⁴ e.g. dakaltu d-dāra 'I went in the house', sakantu l-bayta 'I lived in the home' (55a) for their dependence is due to the latitude of omitting the particle of obliqueness, not to their being space-qualifiers: note that other verbs do not regularly behave transitively towards ad-dāru 'the house' and al-bayta 'the home', and you do not say *sallaytu d-dāra 'I prayed the house' or *nimtu l-bayta 'I slept the home'.

18.101 Having introduced us to the time-qualifier¹ to us, the author now proceeds to mention twelve expressions of this category which it is
proper
to make dependent as time-qualifiers: for example, (1) al-yawma 'today', i.e. from sunrise to sunset. It occurs undefined with final n, as in sumtu yawman 'I fasted for a day', defined, as in sumtu l-yawma 'I fasted today', and in annexation, as in sumtu yawma l-ṣanīsi 'I fasted Thursday'. In all three examples yawma 'day' is a time-qualifier made dependent by the preceding verb as an object of location.

18.102 (2) al-laylata 'tonight', i.e. from sunset to dawn. It occurs undefined with final n, as in iTakaftu laylata 'I made my devotions for a night', defined (i.e. without final n, because it is prevented from full inflection by being a feminine proper name), as in ji'uka laylata 'I came to you early' (without final n), and in annexation, as in iTakaftu laylata l-jumātī 'I made my devotions Friday night'. In all three examples laylata 'night' is a time-qualifier made dependent by the preceding verb as an object of location. 2

18.103 (3) gudwatan 'early', i.e. between morning prayer and sunrise. It is used undefined with final n, as in azūruka gudwatan 'I shall visit you early', defined (i.e. without final n, because it is prevented from full inflection by being a feminine proper name), as in ji'uka gudwata 'I came to you early' (without final n), and in annexation, as in ji'uka gudwata yawmī l-ṣanīsi 'I came to you early on Thursday'. In all three examples gudwata 'early' is a time-qualifier made dependent by the preceding verb as an object of location. 2

18.104 (4) bukratan 'on the morrow', i.e. the first part of the day. It occurs in the same three states and with the same parsing as gudwatan 'early'.

18.105 (5) saharan 'early in the morning', i.e. at the very end of the night. It also occurs in the same three states and with the same parsing as gudwatan 'early', but is only defined if you mean by it the
early morning of a specific day.

18.106 (6) ǧadan 'tomorrow', i.e. the day after the one you are in, as in 'ajī'uka ǧadan 'I shall come to you tomorrow', where ǧadan 'tomorrow' is a time-qualifier made dependent by the preceding verb as an object of location.2

18.107 (7) ġatmatan 'at night', i.e. the first third of the night.1 It occurs with the same three states and parsing as ġudwatan 'early'. (55b)

18.108 (8) sabāhan 'in the morning', i.e. the first part of the day. It is used undefined, as in 'ītūnī sabāhan 'come to me in the morning',2 and in annexation, as in 'ītūnī sabāha yawmi l-jum'atī 'come to me on Friday morning', where sabāhan 'in the morning' is a time-qualifier made dependent by the preceding verb as an object of location.

18.109 (9) masā'an 'in the evening', (spelt with a 'lengthened ā'), i.e. from noon to sunset. It occurs in the same way as sabāhan 'in the morning'.

18.110 (10) 'abadan 'ever', which is a noun of infinite future time, as in lā 'adgulu d-dāra 'abadan 'I shall not enter the house ever', and 'abada l-'abadīna 'for ever and ever'. It is used both undefined with final n and in annexation,2 as illustrated, where 'abadan 'ever' is a time-qualifier made dependent by the preceding verb as an object of location. *

18.111 (11) 'amadan 'ever' which is a noun of future time occurring in the same way as 'abadan 'ever', mentioned above.2
18.112 (12) *ḫīna'at a time*, which is a noun of vague time. It is used undefined with final *n*, as in *qara’tu ḥīna* 'I read for a time', and in annexation, as in *qara’tu ḥīna ṭala ḥīna talaʾš-šamsu* 'I read at the time the sun rose', where *ḥīna* 'at a time' is a time-qualifier made dependent by the preceding verb as an object of location.

18.113 By and the like, the author indicates that all nouns of time similar to the above may properly take dependent form as time-qualifiers, whether they are (i) vague (i.e. those which it is improper for them to occur in answer to the questions 'when?' or 'how long?'), for example *waqt* 'point of time', *sāqa* 'moment, instant'), or (ii) particular (i.e. those which occur in answer to the question 'how long?'), for example *'usbū* 'week', *šahr* 'month', *hawl* 'year', as in *sumtu* *'usbū* 'I fasted for a week', or *šahran* 'for a month', or *hawlan* 'for a year').

18.2 Having finished with the time-qualifier, the author now turns to the space-qualifier: and the space-qualifier (which he defines thus) is the noun of place that is made dependent with the implicit meaning of *fī* 'in', that is, when it is a vague noun, since every vague noun may properly take dependent form as a space-qualifier.

18.201 The author now lists thirteen of them: for example (1) *'amūma* 'in front of', synonymous with *quddāma* 'in front of', as in *jalastu* *'amūma* l-ʾamīrī 'I sat in front of the prince', i.e. *quddāmahu* 'in front of him', where *'amūma* 'in front of' is a space-qualifier made dependent by the preceding verb as an object of location.

18.202 (2) *kalfā* 'behind', the antonym of *quddāma* 'in front of', as in *jalastu* *kalfaka* 'I sat behind you', parsed as above.
18.203 (3) *quddāma* 'in front of', synonymous with *'amāma* 'in front of', as in *jalastu quddāma d-dāri* 'I sat in front of the house', parsed as above.¹

18.204 (4) *warā’a* 'behind',¹ synonymous with *galfa* 'behind', as in *jalastu warā’a l-masjidi* 'I sat behind the mosque', parsed as above. It is also known for *warā’a* to occur in the meaning of *quddāma* 'in front of',² as is the opinion regarding the Qur'anic verse *wa-kāna* *warā’a* ahum malikun 'and there was before them a king',³ in which *warā’a* is said to have the meaning of *quddāma* 'in front of'.

18.205 (5) *fawqa* 'above',¹ for every high place; it is the antonym of *tahta* 'beneath', as in *jalastu fawqa s-sathi* 'I sat on top of the roof', parsed as above.

18.206 (6) *tahta* 'beneath', the antonym of *fawqa* 'above', as in *jalastu tahta š-Šajarati* 'I sat beneath the tree', parsed as above.¹

18.207 (7) *cinda* 'at',¹ for every near place, as in *jalastu cinda zaydin* 'I sat next to Zayd', i.e. near him, where *cinda* 'at' is a space-qualifier made dependent with the implicit meaning of *ff* 'in', and the element which makes it dependent is the preceding verb, as an object of location.

18.208 (8) *maqa* 'with',¹ which is a noun denoting a place of meeting, as in *jalastu maqa muḥammadin* 'I sat with Muhammad', i.e. in his company, parsed as above.

18.209 (9) *'izā’a* 'opposite', (spelt with *z* and 'lengthened ā’'),¹ in
the meaning of being face to face, as in jalastu 'izā'a l-bayti 'I sat opposite the house' (55c)\(^2\), i.e. muqābalatahu 'being face to face with it', parsed as above.

18.210 (10) hidā'a 'opposite', (spelt with dotted ġ and 'lengthened ā'^\(\sim\))\(^1\), meaning 'near', as in jalastu hidā'a Camrin 'I sat opposite Camr', i.e. near him, parsed as above.

18.211 (11) tilqā'a 'opposite',\(^1\) in the meaning of being face to face, like 'izā'a 'opposite', as in jalastu tilqā'a Bakr 'I sat opposite Bakr', i.e. muqābalahu 'facing him', parsed as above.

18.212 (12) hunā 'here', (spelt with u after the h and a single n), which is a demonstrative noun\(^1\) of near place, as in jalastu hunā 'I sat here', i.e. in this near place,\(^2\) parsed as above.

18.213 (13) tamma 'there', (spelt with a three-dotted ġ and an following),\(^1\) which is a demonstrative noun of remote place, as in ijlis tamma 'sit over there', i.e. in that remote place, parsed as above.

18.214 Finally: and the like.\(^1\) By this the author indicates that every vague noun of place may take dependent form as a space-qualifier, e.g. * yaminun 'right' and šimālun 'left', as in jalastu yamin Camrin wa-šimāla Zaydin 'I sat on the right of Camr and the left of Zayd', in which yamin 'right' and šimāla 'left' are both made dependent as space-qualifiers\(^2\) with the implicit meaning of fī 'in', and the element which makes them dependent is the preceding verb, as objects of location.\(^3\)

18.3 Note: Like the nouns of time and place are the nouns which accidentally happen to denote\(^1\) one of the two, of which there are four kinds:

18.31 (1) The nouns of number\(^1\), which are followed by specifying elements, e.g. sirtu ḫiṣrīna yawman wa-ṭalāṣīna farsaḥan 'I travelled twenty days
18.32 (2) That which is used to characterize the totality or partiality of either, e.g. sirtu jamīca l-yawmi jamīca l-farsaği 'I travelled the whole day the whole parasang', or kulla l-yawmi kulla l-farsaği 'all day all the parasang', or ba2da l-yawmi ba2da l-farsaği 'some of the day some of the parasang', or niṣfa l-yawmi niṣfa l-farsaği 'half the day half the parasang', in which jamīca 'whole', ba2da 'some' and niṣfa 'half' all have the dependent form of the time-qualifier and space-qualifier.

18.33 (3) That which is an adjective to either, e.g. jalastu ṭawilan (min ad-dahri) garbiyya d-dāri 'I sat long (in time) west of the house', from an original zamānan ṭawilan 'for a long time' and makānan ḡarbiyyan 'in a westerly place'.

18.34 (4) That which was previously made oblique by having either of these two annexed to it, but then the annexing element has replaced the elided annexed element. This is very common with time-qualifiers, e.g. ji’tuka šalāta l-ṭṣārī wa-gudūma l-ḥājjī 'I came to you at the evening prayer and on the arrival of the pilgrim', from an original waqta šalāti l-ṭṣārī (56a) wa-waqta quḍūmi l-ḥājjī 'at the time of evening prayer and at the time of the pilgrim's arrival'. It is rather rare with space-qualifiers, e.g. jalastu qurba zaydīn 'I sat near Zayd', i.e. makāna qurbihi 'in the place of his nearness'.

18.4 Supplementary Note: In the accepted usage and technical vocabulary of the grammarians the term 'fully current' is applied to those nouns of time and place which are used as other than space/time qualifiers, and which are seen to occur as subjects, predicates, agents, direct...
objects and with other elements annexed to them, such as yawmun 'a day' and šahrun 'a month'.

18.41 In the accepted usage and technical vocabulary of the grammarians the term 'not freely current' is applied to those nouns which never leave the category of space/time-qualifier, such as šahara 'early' (referring to a specific day), qaṭṭu 'at all' (for bringing out the full meaning of the past tense) and qaḍuwa 'ever' (for bringing out the full meaning of the future tense); likewise those which only leave the category to become part of an equivalent construction, namely to be made oblique by min 'from', as with ẓinda 'at, with', which can be used either as a space-qualifier, e.g. jalastu ẓindaka 'I sat with you', or made oblique by min 'from', e.g. karajtu min ẓindika 'I went out from with you'.

18.5 Having finished with the fourth of the dependent elements (which is one of the two kinds of object of location), the author now turns to the fifth of them, namely the circumstantial qualifier, because of the relationship between it and the object of location in being made dependent with the meaning of ẓī 'in'.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

19.0 Chapter on the circumstantial qualifier. (The ẓ of ḥālun 'a circumstance, situation' is converted from w, as can be seen from the fact that people say 'ahwālun 'circumstances' in the plural and ḥawlālatun
'a small circumstance' in the diminutive. The word may be masculine or feminine, either formally or abstractly, e.g. hālun hasanun or hālun hasanatun 'a good circumstance', the feminine being the purer usage). The author defines it as follows:

19.1 This is the noun that is structurally redundant, of dependent form (through the verb or its equivalent), which explains what is otherwise vague in exterior aspects (from the term 'noun' it is understood that the circumstantial qualifier can only be a noun, not a verb or a particle; from 'dependent' that it is not independent or oblique, and from 'which explains what is vague in exterior aspects' that the circumstantial qualifier explains vague exterior aspects pertaining to both rational beings and others, unlike the 'specifying element', which explains what is vague in the beings themselves).

19.21 The circumstantial qualifier occurs (1) unambiguously qualifying the agent, e.g. jā'ā zaydun rākiban 'Zayd came riding', where rākiban 'riding' is a circumstantial qualifier of the agent, namely zaydun 'Zayd', and is made dependent by jā'ā 'to come', which also makes the agent independent. As it was not clear in what circumstances Zayd (the antecedent of the circumstantial qualifier) actually came, the circumstances are explained by saying that he came rākiban 'riding'.

19.22 (2) It occurs unambiguously qualifying the direct object, e.g. rakibtu al-farasa musrajan 'I rode the horse saddled', where rakibtu 'I rode' (56b) is a verb and its agent made independent by it, al-farasa 'the horse' is a direct object made dependent by rakiba 'to ride', and musrajan 'saddled' is a circumstantial qualifier of the direct object also made dependent by rakiba 'to ride'.
19.23 (3) It occurs qualifying either the agent or the direct object, e.g. *laqītu ʿabdallāhī rākībān* 'I met ʿabdullāh riding', where *rākībān* 'riding' is a circumstantial qualifier which is capable of qualifying either the agent (i.e. the *tu* 'I' of *laqītu* 'I met') or the direct object (i.e. *ʿabdallāhī* 'abdullāh'); in any case it is made dependent by *laqīya* 'to meet', and is explanatory of its antecedent.

19.24 (4) It also occurs qualifying both together, e.g. *laqītu zaydān rākībaṃī* 'I met Zayd, both (of us) riding', where *rākībaṃī* 'both riding' clarifies the exterior aspect of both the agent and the direct object.

19.25 By and the like, the author is referring to the examples already given above. On the whole the circumstantial qualifier does not occur with the subject of an equational sentence, though it is found with nouns made oblique by particles, e.g. *marartu bi-hīdin jālisatān* 'I passed by Hind sitting', and by annexation, e.g. the Qur'ānic *a-yūḥībbu ʿaḥadūkum ʿan yaʿkula ṭāḥma *aḡīhi maytaṃ* 'would any one of you like to eat the flesh of his brother, dead', where *maytaṃ* 'dead' is a circumstantial qualifier of *aḡīhi* 'his brother's'.

19.3 The predominant usage is for the noun which occurs as a circumstantial qualifier to be both derived and transient.

19.31 By *derived* is meant the noun which denotes an entity in terms of some specifically intended semantic function, such as the agent noun, the patient noun, the quasi-participial adjective and the elative noun.
19.32 By 'transient' is meant that which is not inherent in the antecedent.

19.33 With regard to derivation, in rare instances the circumstantial qualifier may be an underived noun, as long as it can be paraphrased without difficulty by a derived noun, for example, when it denotes a comparison, e.g. badat il-jăriyatu gamaran 'the girl appeared as a moon', i.e. 'like a moon', or an ordering, e.g. udkül̄ rajulan rajulan 'enter man by man', i.e. 'thus ordered', or a price, e.g. bi cîtuhu muddan bi-kādā 'I sold it at so much a measure', i.e. 'at that price', or mutual action, e.g. bi cîtuhu  t-tawba yadan bi-yadin 'I sold him the garment hand in hand', i.e. 'shaking hands on that amount'.

19.34 With regard to being transient, in rare instances the circumstantial qualifier may be inherent and not transient, for example dacût al-lāha samîc an 'I prayed to God all-hearing', where samîc an '(all)-hearing' is a circumstantial qualifier which is also inherent in its antecedent. Similarly kalaqa al-lāhu az-zarāfata yadayhā 'atwala min rijlayhā 'God created the giraffe with its two front legs longer than its two back legs', where az-zarāfata 'the giraffe' is a direct object made dependent by kalaqa 'to create', which also makes independent the name of the Almighty which is its agent, yadayhā 'its two front legs' is a substitute of az-zarāfata 'the giraffe' by substitution of the part for the whole, 'atwala 'longer' is a circumstantial qualifier of az-zarāfata 'the giraffe', and min rijlayhā 'than its two back legs' is semantically connected with 'atwala 'longer'.

19.4 Next, what makes the circumstantial qualifier dependent in all situations is a verb or its equivalent (e.g. the agent noun).
Moreover, the circumstantial qualifier is always undefined, because, as already stated, it is predominantly a derived noun, while its antecedent (57a) is defined, hence the circumstantial qualifier must always be undefined lest it should be supposed to be an adjective when its antecedent also has dependent form (leading to a false correlation).

Even if the circumstantial qualifier does occur in defined form it is still interpreted as undefined in compliance with the need for indefiniteness already laid down, e.g. udgulū l-‘awwala fa-l-‘awwala 'enter, first the one then the other', i.e. 'thus ordered', or rajawā‘awdahu calā bad‘ihi 'he came back no better than he set out', where āwa‘awdahu 'return' is a circumstantial qualifier of the agent concealed in rajawā‘ he came back', but can be paraphrased as undefined either by means of a formal equivalent such as ā‘idān 'returning' or a semantic equivalent such as rājitān 'coming back'. Another example is jā‘awahdahu 'he came by himself', where wahdahu 'by himself' is a circumstantial qualifier of the agent concealed in jā‘a 'he came', but can be paraphrased as undefined either by means of a formal equivalent such as muṭawāḥhidan 'being by himself' or a semantic equivalent such as munfaridān 'being alone'.

Furthermore the circumstantial qualifier occurs only after the completion of the utterance (in predominant usage). By 'the completion of the utterance' before the circumstantial qualifier is mean that the verb should already have its agent and direct object as in the examples above. It does not mean that the utterance should already be self-sufficient with regard to meaning without the circumstantial qualifier (as is the case in the above examples), because it does happen
that the utterance needs the circumstantial qualifier with regard to meaning. This is evident in the verse:

"'innamā l-maytu man ya'īsū ka'īban
kāsīfān bāluhu gālīfī r-rajā'ī
'the dead man is simply he who lives grieving, wretched his plight and small of hope', since it would be incorrect for the utterance to be made self-sufficient with only the antecedent of the circumstantial qualifier (i.e. by saying 'innamā l-maytu man ya'īsū 'the dead man is simply he who lives', without mentioning the circumstantial qualifiers ka'īban 'grieving' etc.).

19.7 Finally: and its antecedent is always defined. This is because the antecedent is judged to be in the circumstance, and to that extent is like the subject of a predicate: it is only right that something so judged should be defined because, as a rule, a verdict on the unknown conveys no information.²

19.71 An undefined antecedent may occur when justified by specialization, generalization, or inversion. (1) Specialization¹ may be effected either by annexation (as in the Qur'anic wa-qaddara fīhâ 'aqwātahâ fī 'arba'cāti 'ayyāmin sawā'an li-s-sā'īlīn 'and he apportioned therein its foods in four days together,² for those who ask'), where sawā'an 'together' is a circumstantial qualifier of 'arba'cāti 'four', an undefined expression made specific by being annexed to 'ayyāmin 'days'), or by adjectival qualification, as in the verse:

najjayta yā rabbi nūhān wa-stajabta lahu
fi fulukin mākirin fi l-yammi mašhūnān
'you rescued, O Lord, Noah and answered his prayers with an ark cleaving the deeps, laden',² where mašhūnān 'laden' (57b) is a circumstantial qualifier of fulukin 'an ark', because the latter is qualified by the adjective mākirin 'cleaving' (spelt with k, dotted above, and meaning 'splitting the water').⁴

19.72 (2) Generalization¹ may be effected by negation (as in the
Qur'anic wa-mä 'ahlknä min qaryatin 'illä lahä mundirüna 'and we have destroyed no town without its having warners',² where the sentence lahä mundirüna 'a town', which is a generalized undefined element because it occurs in the context of negation), or by prohibition,³ as in the saying lā yabği mru'un 'alä mri'in mustashilan 'let one man not oppress another man thinking it easy',⁴ in which mustashilan 'thinking it easy' is a circumstantial qualifier of the first imru'un 'man'.

19.73 (3) Inversion occurs, for example, in fī d-däri jälisan rajulun 'in the house, sitting, is a man', where jälisan 'sitting' is a circumstantial qualifier of rajulun 'a man'.

19.74 Sometimes the antecedent of a circumstantial qualifier is undefined without any particular justification:¹ Malik relates in the Muwatta' the following Tradition:² šallä rasūlu llähī šallā llähū Calayhi wa-sallama qaćidan wa-šallä warā'ahu rijälun qiyałman 'The Apostle of God (may God bless him and give him peace) used to pray sitting down, and men would pray behind him standing up', where qiyałman 'standing up' is a circumstantial qualifier of rijälun 'some men', with no particular justification.

19.8 Supplementary Note: The operator of the circumstantial qualifier is sometimes elided when sufficiently indicated by the context of discourse,¹ e.g. when you answer rākiban 'riding' to someone who has asked you 'how did you come?', or by the context of situation,² e.g. when you say to someone arriving after a journey, mabrūran ma'jūran 'accepted, rewarded'.

لا لى مندرون فجأة لى مندرون حال من قرية وهي نكرة عامة لوقوعها في
سياق النفي أو النهي نحو قولهم لا ينفع من نفي لوى آمر على أمر متساهل فهو حال
آمر الأول والثاني وهو التأثير نحو في الدار جالسا رجل فجالسا حال من رجل وقد
يقع صاحب الحال نكرة بلا مسوع روي مالك في النموذج على اللة عليه
بسم قاعدا وعلى ورائه رجال قياما فقياما حال من رجال وهو نكرة بلا مسوع
شعبة قد يحذف عامل الحال جوازا إذا دل عليه دليل لغفي كقولك راكباً لمن قال
لك كيف جئت أو حالي كقولك للقادم من سفر مبورو ماجوراً ووجوهًا إذا ضرب
19.81 Elision is compulsory in expressions that have become proverbial, e.g. when you say to an inconstant person 'a-tamīmiyān marratan wa-qaysiyān 'uƙrā 'as a Tamīmī one moment and as a Qaysī the next?', i.e. 'you keep changing...'.

19.82 Normally it should always be permissible to elide the circumstantial qualifier, but there may be something which happens to prevent this, as, for example, when it is an answer to a question (e.g. rākiban 'riding', to someone who has just asked kāfi jī 'how did you come?') or where the intention is to restrict it (e.g. lām yaji’ 'illā rākiban 'he came only riding') or when it replaces a predicate (e.g. darbī zaydan qā’iman 'my striking of Zayd was while standing') or when it is prohibited (e.g. lā taqrabū s-salāta w-a’antum sukārā 'do not come to prayer while you are intoxicated').

19.9 Having finished with the fifth of the dependent elements, the author now turns to the sixth of them, namely the specifying element, because it has the following in common with the circumstantial qualifier: indefiniteness, structural redundancy, clarification, and dependence through the meaning of a particle (ff 'in' for the circumstantial qualifier and min 'of' for the specifying element).

CHAPTER TWENTY

20.0 Chapter on specification; i.e. the mumayyiz 'specifying element', also known as tābyīn 'clarification' and mubayyin 'clarifying element', or tafsīr 'explanation' and mufassir 'explanatory element', all of which have the same lexical meaning. The author now sets out the
The specifying element is the noun (by which he excludes the verb and the particle) of dependent form (by which he excludes independent and oblique nouns, as well as everything which is structurally indispensable, e.g. *zaydun ġālimun 'Zayd is learned'*, (58a) which explains what is otherwise vague in entities, by which he excludes the circumstantial qualifier, because it does not remove vagueness in a noun but only clarifies its exterior aspects.

20.02 Specification is of three types: (1) explaining relationship (converted from the original agent), (2) explaining number, and (3) explaining quantity. The author gives three examples of type (1):

20.11 (a) e.g. *tasabbaba zaydun ġaraqan 'Zayd dripped with sweat'*, where *tasabbaba 'dripped' is a past tense verb, *zaydun 'Zayd' is an agent made independent by it, and *čaraqan 'sweat' is a specifying element explaining the relationship between the dripping and the entity of Zayd (the meaning of *tasabbaba 'to drip' is *sāla 'to pour'*. The original form is *tasabbaba ġaraqu zaydīn 'the sweat of Zayd dripped': then the predicate of the annexed element has been converted into predication of the annexing element, producing a certain vagueness about the relationship, and so the annexed element which had formerly been the agent has been restored as a specifying element.
20.12 (b) *tafaqqa’a bakrun šahman* 'Bakr was bursting with fat', where *tafaqqa’a* 'was bursting' is a past tense verb, *bakrun* 'Bakr' is an agent made independent by it, and *šahman* 'fat' is a specifying element explaining the relationship between the bursting and the entity of Bakr (the meaning of *tafaqqa’a* 'to burst' is *imtala’a* 'to be full to overflowing'). The original form is *tafaqqa’a šahmu bakrin* 'the fat of Bakr was bursting', and the same operation has been carried out here as in the first example.²

20.13 (c) *tāba muhammadun nafsan* 'Muhammad was content in mind', where the parsing of *tāba muhammadun* 'Muhammad was content' is the same as above, and *nafsan* 'mind, spirit' is a specifying element explaining the relationship between the being contented and the entity of Muhammad. The original form is *tābat nafsu muhammadin* 'the mind of Muhammad was content',² and the same operation has been carried out here as above. The motive for this construction is that to mention something vaguely at first and then to have it explained makes more impact on the mind.³

20.21 The author gives two examples of type (2) which explains number:¹
(a) *ištaraytu Cīšrīna gulāman* 'I bought twenty slave-boys', where *ištaraytu* 'I bought' is a verb and its agent, *Cīšrīna* 'twenty' is a direct object made dependent by *ištarā* 'to buy', with *I* as its dependency marker instead of *a*, and *gulāman* 'slave-boy' is a specifying element explaining what is affected by 'twenty' and made dependent by it.

20.22 (b) *malaktu tisCīna nac;jatan* 'I owned ninety ewes', where *malaktu* 'I owned' is a verb and its agent with independent status through *malaka* 'to own', *tisCīna* 'ninety' is a direct object made dependent by *malaku* 'to own', with *I* as its dependence marker instead of *a*, and *nac;jatan* 'ewe' is a specifying element of the vagueness obtaining in the entity 'ninety' (because numerals are vague (58b) by virtue of being proper for every countable).
Lastly, type (3), specification of quantity, e.g. 

\[
\text{Cindī raṭlun zaytan wa-manawāni tamran 'I have a rotl-weight of oil and two mann-weights of dates', in which Cindī 'with me' is a preposed predicate, raṭlun 'a rotl-weight' is a delayed subject, zaytan 'oil' is a specifying element explaining the quantity of a rotl and made dependent by raṭlun 'a rotl-weight', likewise tamran 'dates' is a specifying element of manawāni 'two mann-weights' and is made dependent by it. The implicit original form is *raṭlu zaytin wa-manawā tamrīn Cindī 'a rotl-weight of oil and two mann-weights of dates are with me'.}
\]

The author then adds: and zaydūn 'akramu minka 'aban wa-'ajmalu minka wajhan 'Zayd is nobler than you as to father and more handsome than you in face'. This does not belong to type (3) just dealt with, but to the specification of relationship, and it should by rights have been dealt with before type (2) (number).  

The condition for the occurrence of a specifying element in dependent form after an elative is that it should have the meaning of an agent, as in the two examples above: you can see that it would be equally correct to replace the elative with a verb and make the specifying element into an agent, saying zaydūn karuma ‘abūhu wa-jamula wajhuhu 'Zayd, his father was noble and his (Zayd's) face was handsome'.  

We have described these two as specification of relationship simply because the original form is *‘abū zaydin ‘akramu minka wa-wajhuhu ‘ajmalu minka 'Zayd's father is more noble than you and his (Zayd's) face is more handsome than yours', then the predicate of the annexed element has been converted into predication of the annexing element and the former annexed element made into a specifying element:
this has become zaydun 'akramu minka 'aban wa-'ajmalu minka wajhan

'Zayd is nobler than you as to father and more handsome than you in

face'. Here zaydun 'Zayd' is the subject, 'akramu 'nobler' is its pre-
dicate, minka 'than you' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique ele-
ment semantically connected with 'akramu 'nobler', and 'aban 'father'
is made dependent as a specifying element; 'ajmalu 'more handsome' is
coordinated to 'akramu 'nobler', minka 'than you' is semantically con-
nected with it, and wajhan 'face' is a specifying element.3

20.5 The specifying element is always undefined. Contrary to the opin-
ion of the Kufans,1 but they have no argument in the verse which they
cite:

ra'aytuka lammā 'an ċarafta wujūhanā

'Woe is to you, when you recognized our faces, turn aside, and be content

in the mind, O Qays, about ċAmr',2 because it is possible for the al
'the' on an-nafsu 'the mind' to be construed as redundant.3

20.6 Note: Occasionally the specifying element has not been converted
from any original form, as in imtala'a l-'inā' u mā'an 'the pot became
filled with water'.1 Similarly li-llāhi darrihu fārisan 'what an excel-
lent rider he is!' and other like expressions conveying wonder, because
these constructions have been conventionally established2 for beginning
such sentences. The specifying element is also found not in an expla-

natory function but as a corroborative, e.g. in this verse of Abū Tālib:
wa-la-qad ḍalīlū bi-'anna dīna muḥammadin
min ḍayrī 'adyānī l-bariyyatī dīnān

'and I already knew that the religion of Muḥammad is among the best
religions in creation, as a religion',⁵(59a) where dīnān 'as a relig­
ion' is a specifying element corroborating his words 'the best relig­
ions in creation'. Cf. also the Qur'anic 'inna ciddīta šūhūri qinda
llāhi ṭnā qāšara šahran fī kitābi llāhi 'verily the number of months
with God is twelve months in God's book'.⁴

20.7 Supplementary Note: The specifying element never precedes its
operator if the latter is an underived noun¹(e.g. ṭalītun ṣaytan 'a rotl­
weight of oil') or an underived verb²(e.g. mā 'aḥsanahu rajulan 'what
a good man he is!'), because underived elements have no morphological
freedom of their own and so lack the syntactical freedom to invert the
elements on which they operate.

20.8 The specifying element may be made oblique by min 'of', except in
three cases:¹(1) specification of number (e.g. cīsrūna ḍirhaman 'twenty
dirhams'), (2) the converted direct object (e.g. ġaṣarū l-'ardā
ṣajaran 'I planted the land with trees'), and (3) that which had the
meaning of an agent before being artificially converted²from an agent,
e.g. ṭāba zaydun nafsan 'Zayd was content in mind', since the original
form is *ṭābat nafsu zaydin 'the mind of Zayd was content'.

20.9 Having finished¹with the sixth of the dependent elements,² the

 wolq dīnāt bi-'anna dīna muḥammadin (59a), ḍalīlū bi-'anna dīna muḥammadin 'and I already knew that the religion of Muḥammad is among the best religions in creation, as a religion',⁵(59a) where dīnān 'as a religion' is a specifying element corroborating his words 'the best religions in creation'. Cf. also the Qur'anic 'inna ciddīta šūhūri qinda llāhi ṭnā qāšara šahran fī kitābi llāhi 'verily the number of months with God is twelve months in God's book'.⁴

20.7 Supplementary Note: The specifying element never precedes its operator if the latter is an underived noun¹(e.g. ṭalītun ṣaytan 'a rotl-weight of oil') or an underived verb²(e.g. mā 'aḥsanahu rajulan 'what a good man he is!'), because underived elements have no morphological freedom of their own and so lack the syntactical freedom to invert the elements on which they operate.

20.8 The specifying element may be made oblique by min 'of', except in three cases:¹(1) specification of number (e.g. cīsrūna ḍirhaman 'twenty dirhams'), (2) the converted direct object (e.g. ġaṣarū l-'ardā ṣajaran 'I planted the land with trees'), and (3) that which had the meaning of an agent before being artificially converted²from an agent, e.g. ṭāba zaydun nafsan 'Zayd was content in mind', since the original form is *ṭābat nafsu zaydin 'the mind of Zayd was content'.

20.9 Having finished¹with the sixth of the dependent elements,² the
The author now turns to the seventh of them, namely exception.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

21.0 Chapter on the excepted element. As defined in the Tash{īl, it is 'that which is excluded, either actually or implicitly, from something stated or omitted, by means of 'illā 'except' or its synonyms, on condition that some information is conveyed'.

21.01 The term 'excluded' is generic, and comprises which is excluded by substitution (e.g. 'akaltu r-rağīfa ṭulqahu 'I ate the loaf, a third of it'), by limitation (e.g. the Qur'anic 'atimmū š-suṣyama 'illā l-layli 'complete the fast, until night') as well as by exception. 'By means of 'illā 'except' and its synonyms' excludes everything but strict exception. By 'actually or implicitly' both continuous exception and discontinuous exception are included, and 'from something stated or omitted' comprises both complete exception and exhaustive exception. By 'on condition that some information is conveyed' are excluded such utterances as *jā'anī nāsun 'illā zaydan 'some people came to me except Zayd' and jā'anī l-qawmu 'illā rajulan 'the people came to me except a man', for these convey nothing.

21.02 The particles of exception (i.e. its instruments) are eight: (he calls them all particles because the commonest of them is one). They divide into four groups: (a) comprising two particles, viz. 'illā...
except' and ḥāšā 'except' (the latter sometimes also ḥāṣa with elision of the final long ā, and ḥāšā with elision of the first long ā) (b) comprising two verbs, viz. laysa 'not to be' and lá yakūnu 'is not', (c) comprising two nouns, viz. gāryu 'other than' and siwā 'other than' (and its variant realizations, (59b) it being said as siwā, like riḍā 'contentment', suwā, like hudā 'guidance' and sawā 'un' with a after the s and a long ā, this last being the most unusual), (d) comprising two elements which fluctuate between being verbs and particles, viz. kalā 'except' andCADā 'except'.

21.03 The author now lists them collectively and they are 'illā 'except', gāryu 'other than', siwā 'other than' (like riḍā 'contentment'), suwā 'other than' (like hudā 'guidance'), sawā 'un' 'other than' (with long ā, like samā 'un' 'sky'), kalā 'except', CADā 'except' and ḥāšā 'except'.

21.11 The element excepted by 'illā 'except' is always dependent and its dependence operator (in the preponderant opinion) is 'illā alone, whether you have made the antecedent independent, dependent or oblique. The same applies to 'discontinuous exception', i.e. where the excepted element is not actually part of the antecedent, e.g. gāma l-gawmu 'illā zaydan 'the people stood except Zayd' (also rā'aytu l-gawma 'illā zaydan 'I saw the people except Zayd', marartu bi-l-gawmi 'illā zaydan 'I passed by the people except Zayd') and karaja n-nāsu 'illā camran 'the people went out except Camran'.

21.11 The element excepted by 'illā 'except' is always dependent and its dependence operator (in the preponderant opinion) is 'illā alone, whether you have made the antecedent independent, dependent or oblique. The same applies to 'discontinuous exception', i.e. where the excepted element is not actually part of the antecedent, e.g. gāma l-gawmu 'illā
21.12 In all these examples the excepted element is dependent and nothing else: it is no rebuttal of this to cite the Qur'anic law kāna fi himāran 'illā 'ālihatun 'illā lāhu 'if there had been in them a god other than God', with allāhu 'God' in independent form, because 'illā 'except' in this verse does not denote exception but simply has the meaning of ġayru 'other than', and is thus an adjectival qualifier of 'ālihatun 'a god'; it has, however, been necessary to transfer the inflection in this instance from 'illā to the following word, because 'illā has the form of a particle.

21.13 It is a matter of indifference whether the excepted element appears after the antecedent (as in the above examples) or before it, as in qāma (60a) 'illā zaydan (or 'illā himāran) il-qawmi 'except Zayd (or 'except a donkey') the people stood'.

21.14 Note: There is some dispute as to the precise operator of the excepted element: the soundest view is that it is 'illā 'except' itself alone, as already stated.

21.2 (2) The author now treats the second state of 'illā 'except'. If the utterance preceding 'illā 'except' is negated by having before it a negative or its equivalent, and is already structurally complete, (i.e. if the antecedent is explicitly mentioned), then it (i.e. the excepted element) may be treated as a substitute of the antecedent. This is substitution of the part for the whole according to the Baṣrāns, but
is sequential coordination according to the Kūfans⁴ (because they regard 'illa 'except' as belonging to the particles of coordination, specifically in the category of exception: so said Abū Ḥayyān).⁵

21.21 An example of the negative is the Qur'anic mā fa'agalūhu 'illa qalīlun minhum 'they did not do it, except a few of them', with the independent form of qalīlun 'few' in the Seven Canonical Readings (apart from Ibn CAmir)² here qalīlun 'few' is a substitute of the ĥ 'they' in fa'agalūhu 'they did it',³ by substitution of the part for the whole according to the Basrans. The operator is thus understood as repeated, from an implicit *mā fa'agalūhu 'illa fa'agalūhu qalīlun minhum 'they did not do it, except a few of them did it'. The Kūfans consider this to be sequential coordination.

21.22 Equivalent to negation are prohibition and interrogation:¹ an example of prohibition is the Qur'anic wa-lā yaltafit minkum 'ahadun 'illa mra'atuka 'and let not one of you look except your wife',² with the independent form of mra'atuka 'your wife' in the Reading of Abū CAmr and Ibn Kaṭīr.³ An example of interrogation is the Qur'anic wa-man ydqānu min rahmati rabbihi 'illa d-dālīna 'and who despairs of the mercy of his Lord except those who err?',⁴ with the independent form in all Readings.

21.23 The author goes on: or it may take dependent form through 'illa 'except' by being excepted: which is excellent Arabic, and indeed the Seven Canonical Readings also have the dependent form in the case of qalīlun 'few' and mra'atuka 'your wife' as variants in the above examples.¹

21.24 He illustrates both alternatives: e.g., mā qāma l-gawmu 'illa zaydun 'the people did not stand except Zayd' (with the independent form by substitution),¹ or 'illa zaydan 'except Zayd'. This time with the dependent form by being excepted. Further examples: mā marartu
bi-l-qawmī 'illā zaydīn 'I did not pass by the people except Zayd', with oblique form by substitution, or 'illā zaydan 'except Zayd' with dependent form by being excepted;2 mā ra‘aytu l-qawma 'illā zaydan 'I did not see the people except Zayd', with dependent form only, whether you make it a substitute of the dependent element or dependent through 'illā 'except' by being excepted.

21.241 The effect of the two possibilities1 still shows up in the question of what is the dependence operator and whether there is an implicit pronoun or not. (60b) On the assumption that it is a substitute, the dependence operator is an implicit ra‘aytu 'I saw', because in substitution the operator is understood as repeated (which is the soundest opinion), so it must be accompanied by an implicit pronoun according to the rules set out above. On the assumption that it is made dependent by being excepted, the dependence operator is 'illā 'except' (in the soundest view, according to Ibn Mālik)2 and there is no need for an implicit pronoun.

21.3 (3) The author now deals with the third state of 'illā 'except'. If the utterance is structurally incomplete,1 in that no antecedent is explicitly mentioned, and it is preceded by negation or its equivalent2 it (i.e. the excepted element) accords with the operators, which determine its independence, dependence or obliqueness, and the operation of 'illā 'except' is neutralized.3

21.31 If what precedes 'illā 'except' requires an agent, the excepted element has independent form as agent, e.g. mā qāma 'illā zaydun 'none stood but Zayd', where zaydun 'Zayd' is made independent as agent of qāma 'to stand', and 'illā 'except' is neutralized, as if you had said qāma zaydun 'Zayd stood'.1 Cf. the Qur‘anic wa-mā 'amrunā 'illā wāhidatun 'our command is not but one',2 as if you had said *'amrunā wāhidatun 'our command is one'.
21.32 If what precedes 'illā requires an object, the excepted element is made dependent as an object, e.g. mā ḍarabtu 'illā zaydan 'I did not strike but Zayd', where zaydan 'Zayd' has dependent form as object of ḍarabtu 'I struck', and 'illā 'except' is neutralized, as if you had said ḍarabtu zaydan 'I struck Zayd'.

21.33 If what precedes 'illā requires an operator of obliqueness and oblique element semantically connected with it, the excepted element is made oblique by a particle of obliqueness, e.g. mā marartu 'illā bi-zaydin 'I did not pass except by Zayd'. Here zaydin 'Zayd' is made oblique by bi 'by', being semantically connected with marra 'to pass', and 'illā 'except' is neutralized, as if you had said marartu bi-zaydin 'I passed by Zayd'.

21.34 This kind of exception is called 'exhaustive', because what precedes 'illā 'except' is fully occupied by what is required after 'illā and is not diverted from it by operating on anything else.

21.35 In fact, as Šayk Kālid put it, this kind of exception is really exception from an elided general antecedent, and what follows 'illā 'except' is a substitute for that elided antecedent. Thus in the independent state it is implicitly mā qāma 'aḥadan 'illā zaydin 'not one stood but Zayd', in the dependent state mā ra'aytu 'aḥadan 'illā zaydan 'I saw no-one but Zayd', and in the oblique state mā marartu bi-'aḥadin 'illā bi-zaydin 'I passed by no-one but by Zayd' (6la) but the antecedent has been elided and its operator preoccupied instead with the excepted element, for which reason they call this 'exhaustive' exception.

21.4 The element excepted by ḍayru 'other than', siwā 'other than' (spelt with i after the s), suwā 'other than', (with u after the s, and both ending in a), and sawā'a 'other than' (ending in ä, and with a after the s, which is a purer form than siwā'un 'other than' with i
21.41 The inflection of these four nouns themselves is the same as that of the element excepted by 'illā 'except', viz. (a) the dependent form is compulsory for exception from the structurally complete and positive utterance, (b) they may either concur with the inflection of their antecedent or take dependent form in exception from the structurally complete and negative utterance, and (c) for exception from the structurally incomplete and negative utterance they behave according to their operators.  

21.42 Examples: (a) exception from the structurally complete and positive utterance, with the antecedent in the independent state, qāma la-qawmu ġayra zaydin or siwā zaydin (with ġ after the s), or suwā zaydin (with u after the s), or sawā'a zaydin (with a after the s, and long ġ ending), 'the people stood except Zayd'. In all these four the exceptive is dependent, with an explicit a on those which exhibit inflection and an implicit one in those whose inflection is implicit.  

21.43 Exception from an antecedent in the dependent state, ra'aytu l-qawmu ġayra zaydin or siwā zaydin (and the alternative vowels of siwā mentioned above), 'I saw the people except Zayd'. In all these four of these the exceptive is dependent, with an explicit a on those which exhibit inflection and an implicit one in those whose inflection is implicit.  

21.44 Exception from an antecedent in the oblique state, marartu bi-l-qawmi ġayra zaydin or siwā zaydin (and the above variant realizations), 'I passed by the people except Zayd'. In all four of these the exceptive is dependent, with an explicit a on those which exhibit inflection and an implicit one in those whose inflection is implicit.  

21.45 Their behaviour is the same as that of the element excepted by 'illā 'except', but each of these exceptives is made dependent as a circumstantial qualifier, whereas the element excepted by 'illā is made
dependent by being excepted. With these four, as already mentioned, the excepted element is always and only oblique.

21.46 (b) Exception from the structurally complete and negative utterance, with the antecedent in the independent state: mā qāma l-qawmu ḡayru zaydin or siwā zaydin (and the above-mentioned variant realizations), 'the people did not stand except Zayd'.1 Either all four have dependent form like the excepted element after 'īllā 'except' in the structurally complete and negative utterance (except that the dependent form of the excepted element after 'īllā is due to being excepted, while the dependence of these four is that of circumstantial qualifiers); the dependence marker of each is an explicit a on those which exhibit inflection and an implicit one on those whose inflection is implicit.2

21.47 Or else each of the four is made a substitute for its antecedent with independent form, by substitution of the part for the whole,3 in exactly the same way as the element excepted by 'īllā 'except' after a structurally complete and negative utterance; the independence marker in all four is then an explicit u on those which exhibit inflection and an implicit one in those whose inflection is implicit.2

21.48 Under this heading the rest of the above rules also apply and the examples are obvious,1 so we shall not say any more about them. (61b)

21.5 The element excepted by kalā 'except', ġadā 'except' and hāšā 'except' may have oblique form,1 by assuming them to have the quality of
particles, or dependent form, by assuming them to have the quality of verbs, e.g. qāma l-qawmu kalā zaydan 'the people stood except Zayd', in the dependent form, taking kalā 'except' as a past tense verb with a concealed pronoun as its agent, and zaydan 'Zayd' as its direct object, or kalā zaydin 'except Zayd', in the oblique form, taking kalā 'except' as a particle of obliqueness, with zaydin 'Zayd' made oblique by it. Similarly Cadā c'amran 'except C'Amr', in the dependent form, taking Cadā 'except' as a past tense verb with a concealed pronoun as its agent, and c'amran 'C'Amr' as its direct object, or Cadā c'amrin 'except C'Amr', in the oblique form, taking Cadā 'except' as a particle of obliqueness, with c'amrin 'C'Amr' made oblique by it; so also hāšā zaydan 'except Zayd', in the dependent form, or hāšā zaydin 'except Zayd'. This time with oblique form, parsed in the same way as kalā 'except' and cadā 'except' above.

21.6 Supplementary Note: Exception by means of mā kalā 'excepting', mā cadā 'excepting', laysa 'is not' and lā yakūnu 'is not' makes the excepted element only dependent. 1

21.61 The reason for this in the case of mā kalā and mā cadā 'excepting' is that, since they are preceded by the 'verbal noun mā', the dependent form is specified by virtue of their being specifically verbal under those conditions, cf. the verse of Labīd: 'a-lā kullu šay'īn mā kalā lāša bāšilan 'is not everything, excepting God, vain?' (i.e. 'passing away, coming to an end', taken from the Qur'anic kullu šay'īn hālikun 'illā wajhahu 'everything shall perish except His face'). Cf. also the verse: tamallu n-nadāmā mā c'adānī fa'-innanī bi-kullī llaḍī yahwā nadāmī mūla'ūn 'the companions grow bored, excepting me, for I am inflamed by everything which my companion desires'. Occasionally these two do make the
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21.62 With laysa 'is not' and lā yakūnu 'is not' the excepted element is always made dependent by them as a predicate (their subject-nouns being concealed in them), e.g. qāmū laysa zaydan wa-lā yakūnu bakran 'they stood, but not Zayd and not Bakr'. In the Traditions we find mā 'anhara d-damma wa-gukira smu llāhi Caleyhi fa-kulū laysa s-sinna wa-s-ṣufra 'whatever has caused the blood to flow, as long as God's name is said over it, eat, but not the teeth and claws', with dependent forms.

21.7 Having finished with the seventh of the dependent elements, the author now turns to the eighth, namely the noun made dependent by la 'no'.

22.0 Chapter on lā 'no'. This negates generically, and is also called the 'lā of quittance', because it denotes the negation of the genus and hence, as it were, quittance from it. It operates only because it resembles 'inna 'verily' in that it precedes nominal sentences, and because it reinforces negation just as 'inna 'verily' reinforces (62a) assertion (one may correlate something with its opposite as well as with its analogue), and also in that it belongs to the beginning of the utterance. Since it only operates by correlation it has a lower rank than 'inna 'verily': consequently its noun is always undefined, its predicate may not precede its noun when the predicate is a space/time qualifier or oblique operator and its oblique element, and its noun never has final n, unlike 'inna 'verily' in these respects.
22.1 The author draws attention to some of these points. *Know* (ʼīqlam 'know!', with ʼi after the ′, is an imperative verb)' from taqlamu 'you (masc. sing.) know') that lā 'no' makes undefined nouns dependent, compulsorily, either in form or status, without final n, when it (i.e. lā 'no') directly precedes the undefined noun (i.e. is not separated from it by anything) and is not repeated.¹

22.11 It makes the undefined noun formally dependent when it is annexed to another undefined noun, e.g. lā șāhiba ʼilmīn mamqūtun 'no possessor of knowledge is despised',¹ where șāhiba ʼilmīn 'possessor of knowledge' is the noun of lā 'no' and is made dependent, and mamqūtun 'despised' is its predicate and made independent by it.²

22.12 It makes the undefined noun dependent in status¹ if it is isolated from annexation or its equivalent, e.g. lā rajula ʾfī d-dāri 'no man is in the house'. Here lā 'no' is a particle of negation and rajula 'man' is its noun which, in combination with lā 'no', ends in an invariable a and has dependent function through lā, with ʾfī d-dāri 'in the house' as its predicate. A certain group of Başrans maintain that rajula 'man' and such like are formally dependent without the final n, which is clearly what our author means; this view is attributed to Sībawayhi.²

22.2 This applies when lā 'no' directly precedes the undefined noun. But if it does not directly precede it (because some element intervenes, as in, for example, the Qur’anic lā ʾfīhā ǧawlun 'in it is no ill-effect' or because it precedes a defined noun, e.g. lā zaydun ʾfī d-dāri 'not Zayd is in the house'),² the independent form is compulsory. The noun is then treated as the subject of an equational sentence.
22.3 It is also compulsory (except in the opinion of al-Mubarrad and Ibn Kaysān)\(^1\) for \textit{la 'no'} to be repeated, e.g. \textit{la fi d-dāri rajulun wa-lā mra'atun 'in the house is no man and no woman'}. Similarly \textit{la zaydun fi d-dāri wa-lā Camrun 'not Zayd is in the house and not Amr'}\(^2\).

22.31 If \textit{la 'no'} is repeated before an undefined noun it may either operate upon it or be neutralized,\(^1\) so that, if you wish, you may say (by making it operate, as the author does here), e.g. \textit{la rajula fi d-dāri wa-lā mra'ata 'no man is in the house and no woman', with a on rajula 'man', while \textit{imra'at- 'woman'} may be independent, dependent, or end in a;\(^2\) and if you wish, you may say (by neutralizing \textit{la 'no'}, \textit{lā rajulun fi d-dāri wa-lā mra'atun 'no man is in the house and no woman'}.

(62b) This time \textit{rajulun 'man'} is independent, while \textit{imra'at- 'woman'} may be independent or end in a.\(^3\)

22.4 The gist of all this is that there are five modes\(^1\) for the undefined noun after \textit{la 'no'}: three when the first undefined noun ends in a, and two when the first undefined noun is independent. An illustration\(^2\) is \textit{lā hawla wa-lā quwwata 'illā bi-llāhi 'there is no power and no might except with God'}\(^1\); here you may give the first noun a by making the first \textit{la 'no'} operate upon it, leaving three possibilities for the second noun:

22.41 (1) The first, and regular way,\(^1\) is to give the second noun a by making the second \textit{la 'no'} operate upon it, cf. the Qur'anic \textit{lā bay'ā fihih wa-lā kullata 'no barter on it and no friendship'}\(^2\), both with a in the Readings of Abū 'Amr and Ibn Kaṭīr.\(^3\)

22.42 (2) Or both may be dependent, cf. the poet's verse:
\textit{lā nasaba l-yawma wa-lā kullatan 'there is no breeding today and no friendship'},\(^1\) making the second \textit{lā
redundant and corroborative, coordinating the following noun to the status of the noun after the first lā, that status being dependence.  

22.43 (3) Or the second noun may be independent, as in the verse:

\[
\text{hādā la-} \text{c-amrukumu } s-\text{sagāru bi-} \text{caynihi}
\]

lā 'umma lī 'in kāna gāka wa-lā 'abu
'this, by your life, is lowliness itself! I have no mother, if that be so, and no father!', with independent form of 'abu 'father', treating the second lā 'no' as redundant, and coordinating its noun to the status of the first lā and its noun, their function being independence as the subject of an equational sentence.

22.44 (4) You may also make the first noun independent as the subject of an equational sentence, in which case the second noun may take a by making the second lā 'no' operate upon it, as in lā lağwun fīhā wa-lā ta'ēma 'no vanity in it and no cause of sin'.

22.45 (5) Or the second noun may be independent by neutralizing lā 'no' and coordinating its following noun to the preceding noun. But the dependent form is impossible here because the antecedent is not dependent in form or status.

22.5 Supplementary Note concerning the parsing of lā 'illāha 'illā llāhu 'there is no god but God': lā 'no' is a particle of negation and 'illāha 'god' is its noun; 'illā llāhu 'except God' is a substitute with the same function as the previous lā 'no' and its noun, this function being (according to Sībawayhi) independence as the subject of an equational sentence. It is not a substitute of the noun formally expressed after lā 'no', because lā does not operate upon defined elements, as already stated above. The true predicate of this lā has been elided, and is
implicitly \( lā 'ilāha fi l-wujūdī \) or \( mawjūdūn \) 'there is no god in existence' or 'existing'.

22.6 Having finished with the eighth of the dependent elements, namely the noun of \( lā \) 'no', the author now turns to the ninth of them, which is the vocative.

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

23.0 Chapter on the vocative.\(^1\) The term \( munādā \) 'vocative' is actually the patient noun of the verb \( nādaytuhu \) 'I called him', so that he has become \( munādā \) 'called'. 'Calling' \( (63a) \) \( nūdā \) or \( nīdā \), with \( i \) or \( u \) after the \( n \) is lexically the unqualified action of invoking, and its technical meaning is invocation by means of a particular particle, of which there are eight, viz. \( 'a, 'ay \) (both in long and short varieties), \( yā, 'a-yā, ha-yā \) and \( wā \).\(^3\)

23.1 Now that you have learnt this much, you should know that the person called may be considered in two ways, from the aspect of his essence and from the aspect of his form.\(^2\)
23.2 From the aspect of essence the person called is either nearby, far away or lamented. The short 'a is for the near person (unless he has the status\(^1\) of someone far away, e.g. someone who is inattentive, in which case all the remaining particles may be used for him as well as for the person far away: it is generally agreed that the nearby person may be invoked by particles of the far vocative for the sake of emphasis, but the converse is forbidden, according to Badr ad-Dīn Ibn Malik).\(^2\)

23.21 In invoking the name of Almighty God the particle yā specifically is used,\(^4\) and this particle also serves for calling for help.\(^3\)

23.22 For lamentation\(^1\) ha-yā and wā are used; yā is only used in lamentation when there is no danger of confusion with the regular vocative.

23.3 The vocative particle may be elided,\(^4\) as in the Qur'anic yūsufu 'aCrīḍ can hāgā 'Joseph, turn away from this',\(^2\) except in certain cases, viz. the remote vocative (e.g. yā zaydu 'O Zayd!'), calling for help (e.g. yā la-llāhi 'O God') and lamentation (e.g. yā ʾAmrā 'alas for ʾAmr!'),\(^3\) because the desire in these three is to prolong the sound, and elision is incompatible with that desire.

23.31 Nor may it be elided when followed by a generic noun,\(^1\) e.g. when a blind man says yā rajulan kud bi-yadī 'O (any) man, take my hand', or followed by a pronoun\(^2\) (but this is rare in the vocative anyway), or by the name of Almighty God when the vocative particle is not replaced by the final compensatory double m.\(^3\)

23.4 From the aspect of form the person called is of five kinds: \(^4\)
23.41 (1) the single proper name, which here (as in the chapter on lā 'no') means that which is not annexed to anything or equivalent to such. This type is constructed as invariable in the short or long vowel it would have had if it had been inflected, e.g. yā zaydu 'O Zayd', which is constructed as invariable in u because if it had been inflected it would have been independent in u. Likewise yā rijālu 'O men', yā hindātu 'O Hinds', yā hunūdu 'O Hinds', yā rajulu 'O man' (to a specific man, being a single word and defined by the act of accosting), (63b) yā zaydāni 'O both Zayds' (constructed as invariable in ā because that would be its independence marker if it were inflected, as in jā'a z-zaydāni 'the two Zayds came'), and yā zaydūna 'O Zayds' (constructed as invariable in ā because that would be its independence marker if it were inflected, as in jā'a z-zaydūna 'the Zayds came').

23.411 As for nouns that are already invariable before being invoked, such as sībawayhi 'Sībawayhi' and ḥaḍāmi 'Ḥaḍāmi' (in the Hijāzī dialect), or which end in the 'shortened ā', e.g. al-fatā 'the boy', or are defective, such as al-qādī 'the judge', in all these the final u is implicit. The trace of this implicit inflection appears in their concordants, e.g. yā sībawayhi l-Cālimu 'O wise Sībawayhi', with independent form of al-Cālimu 'wise' in keeping with the implicit u of sībawayhi, or else with the dependent form al-Cālima in keeping with the status of sībawayhi, in the same way as the concordants of nouns which have been given their new, invariable form, e.g. yā zaydu l-fādilu or l-fādila 'O virtuous Zayd', with independent or dependent form of al-fādil- 'virtuous'.

23.42 (2) the specifically intended individual, i.e. deliberately called to the exclusion of everyone else. This is also constructed as invariable in the form it would have had if it had been inflected, e.g. yā rajulu 'O man', for a particular man, constructed as invariable in u because that would be its independence marker if it were inflected, as
in jä'a rajulun 'a man came'. Likewise yā rajulāni 'O both men', for two particular men, constructed as invariable in ā because that would be its independence marker if it were inflected, as in jä'a rajulāni 'two men came'. The undefined noun in these examples behaves like the proper name in being constructed as invariable with one of the inflection markers.  

23.421 When the author says of these two kinds that they are 'constructed as invariable in u'14 he means that they are constructed as invariable in u or whatever replaces it, as illustrated above. He omits to point out the replacements for u simply for the sake of brevity, and because the vocative is not nearly so frequent with the dual and the plural as it is with the singular.  

23.43 (3) the individual, not specifically intended in essence: only any one of various individuals is meant, as when the preacher says yā gāfilan wa-1-mawtu yaṭlubuhu 'O heedless one, while death is chasing him', where no particular heedless one is meant.  

23.431 All the examples so far are of single nouns, since in this chapter mufrad 'single, singular' means that which is not annexed to anything or equivalent to such.  

23.44 (4) that which is annexed to something else, e.g. yā gūlāma zaqaydin 'O slave-boy of Zayd', where the vocative noun must be formally dependent;  

23.45 (5) that which is equivalent to something annexed. This is the noun suffixed by something which completes (64a) the sense, either by being operated upon or being coordinated. It must also be formally dependent. Examples of operation: yā ḥasanān wajjihuhu 'O handsome of face', where ḥasanān 'handsome' is formally dependent as a vocative and
wajhuhu 'his face' is made independent by it as an agent which completes the sense; likewise yā ṭāliʾan jabalan 'O mountain climber', where ṭāliʾan 'climber' is formally dependent as a vocative and jabalan 'a mountain' is made dependent by it as a direct object, the agent being a concealed pronoun in ṭāliʾan 'climber'; similarly yā mārran bi-zaydīn 'O passer by Zayd', where mārran 'passing' is formally dependent as a vocative and bi-zaydīn 'by Zayd' is an operator of obliqueness and oblique element semantically connected with mārran 'passing' and with dependent status. An example of coordination is yā tālātatan wa-tālātina 'O Thirty-Three' (to someone so named): here tālātatan 'three' is formally dependent as a vocative and tālātina 'thirty' is coordinated to it and completes the sense.

23.5 Next the author sets out the rule for the first two kinds. The single proper name and the specifically intended individual are constructed as invariable in u without final n, that is, if there is any choice. He then illustrates the single proper name: e.g. yā zaydu 'O Zayd' and as an example of the specifically intended individual, yā rajulu 'O man', addressed to one particular man.

23.51 This applies when the individual is not qualified by an adjective, in which case the Arabs prefer to make it dependent rather than give it a u, and so they say yā rajulan ġalīman 'aqbil 'O wise man, approach', of the Tradition yā ġalīman yurjā li-kullī ġalīmin 'O great one, in whom it is hoped for every great deed', this being the view of al-Farrā', transmitted and confirmed by Ibn Mālik.

23.52 Then the author gives the rule for the remaining three kinds: and the remaining three kinds (viz. the individual not specifically intended, the annexed and the equivalent to such), are dependent and nothing but. By this he means that only the dependent form is allowed; examples have already been given above.
23.6 Note: The author's statement applies to everything except what is annexed to the first person singular I 'my'. This divides into four kinds:

23.61 (1) With six variant realizations, when the last letter is sound (e.g. yā gulām— with all three short vowels on the m, 'O my boy', meant as annexed to the first person singular I 'my'), viz.

(a) with i, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādi (64b) fa-ttaqūni 'O my servants, fear me', where i suffices for I;

(b) with a, as in the verse wa-lastu bi-rājiCin mā fāta minnī bi-lahfa wa-lā layta wa-lā law 'annī 'nor shall I get back what has escaped me by an "O my regret" or a "would that" or an "if only I..."' where lahfa 'O my regret' is a vocative with the vocative particle elided. It was originally yā lahfā 'O my regret', but the final ā (which is itself converted from I 'my') has been elided and a suffices in its stead;

(c) with u, just like the u of single, non-annexed nouns, as in the rare Reading of the Qur'anic rabbu s-sijnu 'ahabbu 'ilayya 'O my Lord, prison is more dear to me'. This was originally yā rabē 'O my Lord', but the I 'my' has been elided for phonetic ease and the word construct-ed as invariable in u by analogy with the specifically intended individual vocative noun;

(d) with iya, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādiya llaḏīna 'asraflū 'O my servants who have been prodigal';

(e) with unwovelled I, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādi lā kawfun Calaykum 'O my servants, no fear be upon you';

23.6 Note: The author's statement applies to everything except what is annexed to the first person singular I 'my'. This divides into four kinds:

23.61 (1) With six variant realizations, when the last letter is sound (e.g. yā gulām— with all three short vowels on the m, 'O my boy', meant as annexed to the first person singular I 'my'), viz.

(a) with i, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādi (64b) fa-ttaqūni 'O my servants, fear me', where i suffices for I;

(b) with a, as in the verse wa-lastu bi-rājiCin mā fāta minnī bi-lahfa wa-lā layta wa-lā law 'annī 'nor shall I get back what has escaped me by an "O my regret" or a "would that" or an "if only I..."' where lahfa 'O my regret' is a vocative with the vocative particle elided. It was originally yā lahfā 'O my regret', but the final ā (which is itself converted from I 'my') has been elided and a suffices in its stead;

(c) with u, just like the u of single, non-annexed nouns, as in the rare Reading of the Qur'anic rabbu s-sijnu 'ahabbu 'ilayya 'O my Lord, prison is more dear to me'. This was originally yā rabē 'O my Lord', but the I 'my' has been elided for phonetic ease and the word construct-ed as invariable in u by analogy with the specifically intended individual vocative noun;

(d) with iya, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādiya llaḏīna 'asraflū 'O my servants who have been prodigal';

(e) with unwovelled I, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādi lā kawfun Calaykum 'O my servants, no fear be upon you';

23.6 Note: The author's statement applies to everything except what is annexed to the first person singular I 'my'. This divides into four kinds:

23.61 (1) With six variant realizations, when the last letter is sound (e.g. yā gulām— with all three short vowels on the m, 'O my boy', meant as annexed to the first person singular I 'my'), viz.

(a) with i, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādi (64b) fa-ttaqūni 'O my servants, fear me', where i suffices for I;

(b) with a, as in the verse wa-lastu bi-rājiCin mā fāta minnī bi-lahfa wa-lā layta wa-lā law 'annī 'nor shall I get back what has escaped me by an "O my regret" or a "would that" or an "if only I..."' where lahfa 'O my regret' is a vocative with the vocative particle elided. It was originally yā lahfā 'O my regret', but the final ā (which is itself converted from I 'my') has been elided and a suffices in its stead;

(c) with u, just like the u of single, non-annexed nouns, as in the rare Reading of the Qur'anic rabbu s-sijnu 'ahabbu 'ilayya 'O my Lord, prison is more dear to me'. This was originally yā rabē 'O my Lord', but the I 'my' has been elided for phonetic ease and the word construct-ed as invariable in u by analogy with the specifically intended individual vocative noun;

(d) with iya, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādiya llaḏīna 'asraflū 'O my servants who have been prodigal';

(e) with unwovelled I, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādi lā kawfun Calaykum 'O my servants, no fear be upon you';

23.6 Note: The author's statement applies to everything except what is annexed to the first person singular I 'my'. This divides into four kinds:

23.61 (1) With six variant realizations, when the last letter is sound (e.g. yā gulām— with all three short vowels on the m, 'O my boy', meant as annexed to the first person singular I 'my'), viz.

(a) with i, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādi (64b) fa-ttaqūni 'O my servants, fear me', where i suffices for I;

(b) with a, as in the verse wa-lastu bi-rājiCin mā fāta minnī bi-lahfa wa-lā layta wa-lā law 'annī 'nor shall I get back what has escaped me by an "O my regret" or a "would that" or an "if only I..."' where lahfa 'O my regret' is a vocative with the vocative particle elided. It was originally yā lahfā 'O my regret', but the final ā (which is itself converted from I 'my') has been elided and a suffices in its stead;

(c) with u, just like the u of single, non-annexed nouns, as in the rare Reading of the Qur'anic rabbu s-sijnu 'ahabbu 'ilayya 'O my Lord, prison is more dear to me'. This was originally yā rabē 'O my Lord', but the I 'my' has been elided for phonetic ease and the word construct-ed as invariable in u by analogy with the specifically intended individual vocative noun;

(d) with iya, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādiya llaḏīna 'asraflū 'O my servants who have been prodigal';

(e) with unwovelled I, as in the Qur'anic yā Cibādi lā kawfun Calaykum 'O my servants, no fear be upon you';
(f) with а, as in the Qur’anic *yā ḥasratā 'O my woe', whose original form is *yā ḥasratī;¹¹

This makes six variant realizations, of which the purest is to elide the I and make i suffice in its stead.¹²

23.62 (2) With only one recorded form.¹ This is the vocative of the defective noun ending in ā or I, where it is compulsory for the y element to be retained and followed by a, e.g. yā ṭatāya 'O my boy', yā ḍādiyya 'O my judge'. Because of resulting ambiguity this yā must not be elided; moreover it may not be left unvowelled, as this produces a clash of two unvowelled consonants, nor may it be vowelled with u or i because these are phonetically cumbersome after y.³

23.63 (3) With two variant realizations, viz. the adjective which is equivalent to an imperfect tense verb in having present or future meaning,¹ e.g. yā mukrīmī 'O one honouring me', yā ḍāriḥī 'O one striking me', where the y is always retained, either unvowelled or with a.²

23.64 (4) With eight variant realizations, viz. ‘abun 'father', ‘ummun 'mother'.¹ These have the six variant realizations already mentioned,² and two more: you say yā ‘abata or yā ‘abati 'O my father', and yā ‘ummata or yā ‘ummati 'O my mother', with the feminine т compensating for the first person singular I 'my'.³

23.7 When the noun is annexed to a noun itself annexed to the first person singular I 'my' you may say, in the case of ibnu ‘ummin 'cousin' and ibnu ‘ummin 'brother', yā bna ‘ummi or yā bna ‘ummi 'O my brother' and yā bna ‘umma or yā bna ‘ummi 'O my cousin'.¹ (The т in the preceding paragraph may have either a or i, and the m in this paragraph likewise).
23.8 Having finished with the ninth of the dependent elements, namely (65a) the vocative, the author now turns to the tenth of them, to wit the object of reason.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

24.0 Chapter on the object of reason.¹ This is also known as the 'object for which the action is done' and the 'object because of which the action is done'. The author defines it as follows:

24.1 This is the dependent noun mentioned to explain the cause of the action's occurrence,¹ and by 'noun' he excludes the verb and the particle. By 'dependent' he excludes the independent and oblique (although dependence is only one of its rules,² and it would have been better not to mention it in the definition, which he only did to make it easier for the beginner). By 'to explain the cause of the action's occurrence' he indicates that the object of reason explains the cause for which the action takes place.

24.21 You already know that the rule is for it to be dependent, but there are certain conditions: (1) that it must be a verbal noun,¹ because verbal nouns can give the idea of causality whereas, on the whole, concrete nouns² cannot be reasons for actions—you never say, for example, *jiʾtuka s-samma wa-l-qaṣala 'I came to you because of fat and honey', with dependent forms, because they are concrete and not verbal nouns.

24.22 (2) It must be a reason,¹ since this is the stimulus for the
action, e.g. qaC-dtu Can il-į̄harbi jubnan 'I stayed away from the war out of cowardice'. This excludes all the other types of object, because they contain no idea of causality.

24.23 (3) The action caused (muC-allal 'caused', with a after the double l)1 must be simultaneous with the verbal noun which is causing it (muC-allil 'causing', with i after the double l).2 It is not allowed to say *taC-ahhabtu l-yawma s-safara ġadan 'I prepared today because of travelling tomorrow', because the time of the preparation is not the same3 as the time of journeying.

24.24 (4) The agent of the verb and the agent of the verbal noun must be one and the same. It is not allowed to say *jiC-tuka mahabbataka 'iyāya 'I came to you because of your loving of me',1 because the agent of the coming is the speaker and the agent of the loving is the person addressed.

24.25 (5) The verbal noun must belong to a mental verb.1 It is not allowed to say *jiC-tuka girāC-atan liC-į̄-Cilmì 'I came to you because of lecturing in science',2 using a verb of the tongue, or *qatlan liC-į̄-kāfiri 'because of killing the pagan', using a verb of the hand.

24.31 The author is content to illustrate all these conditions in two examples: (1) e.g. qāma zaydun 'į̄jlālan liC-Camrin 'Zayd stood out of respect for ġAmr',1 in which 'į̄jlālan 'out of respect' is a dependent verbal noun mentioned as the reason and cause of the occurrence of the action proceeding from Zayd: the cause of Zayd's standing for ġAmr is his respect (65b) and esteem for him. It is parsed thus: qāma zaydun 'Zayd stood' is a verb and its agent, 'į̄jlālan 'out of respect' is an object of reason, and liC-Camrin 'for ġAmr' is an oblique operator and oblique element semantically connected with 'į̄jlālan 'out of respect'.2

24.32 (2) qaC-sadtuka btiC-gāCmaC-ruC fidika 'I have made my way to you out of desire for your favour'. Here btiC-gāCmaC 'out of desire'1 is a dependent verbal noun mentioned as a reason to explain the cause of making one's
way. It is parsed thus: qaṣadztuka 'I made my way to you' is a verb, agent and direct object, ibtiġā’a 'out of desire' is an object of reason, and maṣrūfika 'for your favour' is what ibtiġā’a is annexed to.

24.4 In these two examples the author draws our attention to the fact that there is no difference here between the transitive and intransitive verb, nor between the annexed verbal noun and the non-annexed.

24.5 If the cause (muqalil 'causing', with i after the double l) lacks any one of the conditions allowing the dependent form, then the object of reason must be made oblique by one of the particles of causation, namely bi 'by', li 'for', ff 'in' and min 'from', and no others.

24.51 An example of the absence of the first condition (that the object of reason must be a verbal noun) is the Qur’anic ǧālaqa lakum mā ff l-ʾarđī jamīzan ‘he created for you what is in the earth, totally’, where the reason for the act of creation is the people being addressed, and so their pronoun is made oblique by the causal li 'for', because the reason is not a verbal noun.

24.52 An example of the absence of the second condition (that the object must be a reason) is qataltuhu šabrān ‘I killed him in bondage’, except that in this case it is impossible to make it oblique with a causative particle, because that would then convey causality, when the intention here is nothing of the kind.

24.53 An example of the absence of the third condition (simultaneity) is the verse
wa-qad naddat li-nawmin tiyābahā
'she had already doffed her clothes for sleep',

where even though sleep is the reason for taking off the clothes, the time of taking off is nevertheless prior to the time of sleeping and, since they differ, the word 'sleep' is made oblique by li 'for'.

24.54 An example of the absence of the fourth condition (that both agents should be the same) is the verse:

wa-'innī la-ta'rūnī li-dikrāki hizzatun
'and there comes over me, from the thought if you, a liveliness',

where the thought is the reason why the liveliness comes over him but their agents are different: the agent of the coming over is the liveliness, while agent of the thought is the speaker, because the meaning is li-dikrī 'iyākī 'because of my thinking of you', hence dikrā 'thought' has been made oblique by li 'for' (hizzatun 'liveliness' means 'briskness' or 'cheerfulness').

24.55 An example of the absence of the fifth condition (that it must be a mental verb) is the Qur'anic wa-lâ taqtulū 'awlādakum min 'imlāqin
'do not kill your children from destitution' (i.e. 'poverty'), which is the reason for the killing but is not a mental verb, and so (66a) has been made oblique by the causative min 'from'.

24.6 In my Commentary on Qaṭr an-nadā I have gone further into this than a short work such as this will bear. Having finished with the tenth of the dependent elements, namely the object of reason, the author now turns to the eleventh of them, the object of accompaniment.
CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

25.0 Chapter on the object of accompaniment.¹ The author only puts this after all the other objects because (unlike the others) there is disagreement about whether it is a productive² construction, and because (unlike the others) its operator is joined to it through the mediation of a particle. He defines it as follows:

25.1 This is the noun (i.e. the single noun)¹ which is made dependent² (i.e. is structurally redundant),³ which occurs after wa 'and' with the intention⁴ of denoting accompaniment, and is mentioned to explain with whom the action of the verb is done. This wa 'and' must always be preceded by a sentence containing a verb⁵ or something with the constituent letters and meaning of a verb⁶ (such as the agent and patient nouns), i.e. by a sentence with a verb or a noun having the meaning and constituent letters of a verb.

25.11 An example of the verbal sentence is sirtu wa-n-nīla 'I travelled with the Nile', and of the sentence containing a noun with the meaning and constituent letters of a verb, 'ana sā'irun wa-n-nīla 'I am travelling with the Nile'.¹ In both these examples it is true of an-nīla 'the Nile' that it is a noun because it is prefixed by al 'the',² that it is structurally redundant because it has dependent form,³ that it is preceded by wa 'and' (that wa which has the meaning of 'with'),⁴ and that the wa 'and' is preceded by a sentence containing either a verb (namely sirtu 'I travelled' in the first example) or one containing a noun with the meaning and constituent letters of a verb (namely sā'irun 'travelling' in the second example).

25.21 By 'noun' are excluded such cases as lā ta'kul is-samaka wa-tašraba l-labana 'do not eat fish and drink milk together'.¹
25.22 By 'single' are excluded such cases as *sirtu wa-aš-šamsu tāliʿatun* 'I travelled while the sun was rising', with independent form of both *aš-šamsu* 'the sun' and *tāliʿatun* 'rising'. In both the above examples the *wa* 'and', though it does have the meaning of 'with', in the first instance formally precedes a verb and in the second a sentence.

25.23 By 'structurally redundant' are excluded such cases as *ištaraka zaydun wa-camrun* 'Zayd and Amr worked together', where both nouns are structurally indispensable.

25.24 By 'mentioned to explain with whom the action of the verb is done' all the other objects are excluded.

25.25 By 'after *wa* "and"' are excluded such cases as *jiʿtu ma clazz zaydin* 'I came with Zayd', because that is after *ma clazz* 'with' and not after *wa* 'and' in the meaning of 'with'.

25.26 By 'with the intention of denoting accompaniment' are excluded such cases as *raʾaytu zaydan wa-camran* 'I saw Zayd and Amr', when the intention is merely coordination or having seen one before or after the other.

25.27 By 'preceded (66b) by a verb or something with the constituent letters and meaning of a verb' are excluded such cases as *kullu rajulin wa-jayʿatuhu* 'every man and his trade', where the dependent form as object of accompaniment is not allowed because there is no preceding verb or anything of the kind.

25.3 Next, the object of accompaniment is of two kinds:

25.31 (1) One allows both independent and dependent forms, which the author illustrates as follows: e.g. *jāʾa l-ʾambru wa-l-jayša* 'the commander came with the army', where *jāʾa* 'came' is a past tense verb, *al-ʾambru* 'the commander' is an agent, *wa* 'and' is the 'wa of accompaniment', and *al-jayša* 'the army' is an object of accompaniment, of which
it is true to say that it is a dependent noun mentioned to explain who accompanied the commander in his coming, after the possibility that it might have been the army or something else. This is the case when you make al-jayṣa 'the army' dependent, but you may also make it independent by coordinating it to the agent of the verb (namely al-amīru 'the commander), and then the wa 'and' merely denotes coordination, not accompaniment: the implicit meaning is then *ja'a 1-′amīru wa-jā′a al-jayṣu 'the commander came and the army came'.

25.32 (2) The second kind specifically has dependent form, and the author's example is: istawā 1-mā'u wa-1-kašābata 'the water became level with the piece of wood'. Here istawā 'became level' is a past tense verb, al-mā'u 'the water' is its agent, and al-kašābata 'the piece of wood' is a noun which specifically must be dependent as an object of accompaniment. It is not correct for it to be independent in coordination with the agent of the verb (namely al-mā'u 'the water'), because the piece of wood does not become level with the water—it is the water which becomes level with the piece of wood, i.e. reaches to it.

25.33 In this category belongs the expression lā tanha ġan al-qabīḥi wa-′ityānahu 'do not forbid evil while doing it', where the dependent form of ′ityāna 'doing' is compulsory because the meaning is 'do not forbid evil alongside doing it yourself'. If you coordinate here, the meaning becomes 'do not forbid evil nor the doing of it', which it the opposite of the intended meaning. Indeed it becomes a command to affirm and commit evil and to say nothing against it, because of the prohibition it contains.

25.34 Similarly māta zaydun wa-ṭulū qaṣ́ṣāmī 'Zayd died with the rising of the sun', with compulsory dependent form of ṭulū 'rising',
because the meaning is 'Zayd died as the sun was rising', and if you were to coordinate the meaning would become '*Zayd died and the rising of the sun died', but death is not something which can occur in sunrise.

25.4 In such cases as qāma zaydun wa-Amrun 'Zayd and Amr stood', coordination predominates because it is the norm, although the dependent form would be possible without weakness in form or meaning.

25.5 With (67a) ištaraka zaydun wa-Amrun 'Zayd and Amr worked together' and such like, coordination is specifically prescribed because it is indispensable for the verb, since working together can only come about between two people.1

25.6 Having finished with the eleventh of the dependent elements, the author now proceeds to deal with the remainder:

25.61 The predicate of kāna 'to be' and its related verbs, e.g. kāna zaydun 'āliman 'Zayd was learned', and the subject-noun of 'inna 'really' and its related particles, e.g. inna zaydan 'āliman 'verily Zayd is learned' (add to these the two objects of zanantu 'I thought', e.g. zanantu zaydan qā'īman 'I thought Zayd was standing') have been dealt with under the independent elements, (in the exhaustive treatment following on from the chapter on the subject and predicate) i.e. there is no need for us to repeat it here; likewise the concordants which have dependent form, which are four in number, viz. the adjective, e.g. ra‘aytu zaydan il-fādila 'I saw Zayd the virtuous', the coordinated element, e.g. ra‘aytu zaydan wa-Amran 'I saw Zayd and Amr', the corroborative, e.g. ra‘aytu zaydan nafsahu 'I saw Zayd himself', and the substitute, e.g. ra‘aytu zaydan 'ākāka 'I saw Zayd your brother', have also been dealt with there. (In four chapters following on from the 'cancellors', i.e. there is no need for us to repeat them here).

25.62 Those four categories (the predicate of kāna 'to be' and its related verbs, the subject-noun of 'inna 'really' and its related particles, the two objects of zanantu 'I thought' and the concordants to
dependent elements) complete the fifteen dependent elements to which the author (may God have mercy on him and be content with him) has devoted individual chapters. Having finished with the dependence of the noun he now turns to its obliqueness.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

26.0 Chapter on oblique nouns. (The word maḏfūdūti 'things made oblique' is annexed to al-'asma'i 'nouns' in explanatory annexation, not in order to exclude verbs, since obliqueness is not found in verbs anyway: the implicit meaning is thus, 'Chapter on oblique elements, which are nouns'). This is the last chapter of the book; may God give us a good end, and our families, and those who love us and all Muslims, Amen.

26.01 The oblique elements (which are well known) are of three kinds: (1) made oblique by a particle, e.g. jalastu fī d-dāri 'I sat in the house', (2) made oblique by annexation, e.g. ǧulāmu zaydin 'the slave-boy of Zayd' (but this is somewhat weak: the correct view is that it is made oblique by the element annexed to it, not by annexation itself), and (3) made oblique by concordance, in the opinion of al-Akfaš, which is what our author means by the concordant to the oblique element. (As in marartu bi-zaydin il-fādīli 'I passed by Zayd the virtuous', but this, too, is rather weak). All three kinds of obliqueness (67b) are found in bi-smi llāhi r-raḥmāni r-raḥīmi 'in the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful'.

26.1 The nouns made oblique by particles (of which there are twenty: three already dealt with under exception, viz. ḥalā 'except', Cadā
'except' and ħāšā 'except', then three rare ones, (1) matā 'when' in the Hudaylī dialect, where it has the meaning of 'from' denoting the beginning of a limit: thus one of them was heard to say 'akrājahā matā kummihi 'he took it from his sleeve', (2) laqalla 'perhaps' in the Uqaylī dialect, as one of their poets said: laqalla llāhi faḍdalakum callaynā 'perhaps God has made you superior to us', with the oblique form of the name of the Almighty, and (3) the 'verbal noun kay' 'so that' and its attached clause, e.g. ji’tuka kay tukrīmānī 'I came to you so that you might honour me', if an implicit 'an 'that' is assumed after the kay).

26.2 The remaining fourteen divide into two kinds: (1) seven which make oblique both overt nouns and pronouns. As the author goes on to point out, nouns and pronouns are made oblique by:

26.21 min 'from', which is the fundamental particle of obliqueness, e.g. the Qur’anic wa-minka wa-min nūhin 'and from you and from Noah'.

26.22 'ila 'to', as in the Qur’anic 'ila llāhi marji‘ukum 'to God is your return' and 'ila‘yhi marji‘ukum 'to him is your return'.

26.23 can 'from', as in the Qur’anic ṭabagān can ṭabagān 'rank after rank', raḍiyya llāhu canhum 'may God be content with them'.

26.24 ẓalā 'on', as in the Qur’anic ẓalaynā wa-ẓalā l-fulki tuḥmalūna 'on it and on the ark you shall be carried'.

26.25 ff 'in', as in the Qur’anic wa-fī l-‘ardī ʿayṭun 'and in the earth are signs' and fīhā mā taṣṭahif l-‘anfusu 'in it is what souls desire'.

26.26 To these must be added bi 'by', which the author will speak about later, as in the Qur’anic ʿāminī bi-llāhi wa-rasūlihi 'believe in God and his Prophet' and ʿāminī bihi 'believe in him'.

وهي خلا وعلا وحاتا وتلثمة شادة إحداها مش في لغة هديل وهي معنى مماثل، الأسباب الحانية معي من بعضهم إخراجا مش كله والشاقية لعل في لغة عقيل قال قائلهم لعل الله فضلهم علينا

بجر الهاء من الجملة الخشبة والثالثة كي المصدرية وعليتها نحو جئتكي كي تكرمسي إذا قدرت ان بعدها والأربعة عن الباقية قسمة سبعاً جبر الظاهر والمضار قد اشار إليها المصدر به معنا ما يخص بين هي أم حروف الخلف نحو قوله تعالى وملك ومن نوح إلى نحو قوله تعالى إلى الله مرحومكم وألبي مرحومكم وعن نحو قوله تعالى طبقاً عن طلق رضي الله عنهم وعلى نحو قوله تعالى وعليها وعلى الفلك تحللون وهم نحو قوله تعالى وفي الأرث ايات وفيها ما تستسي النفس والباء كما سباني في كلهم أيضاً نحو قوله تعالى امنوا بالله ورسوله وامنوا به وألواه كما
26.27 Likewise 

\[\text{li 'for', which the author will also speak about later, as in the Qur'anic li-llāhi mā fī s-samāwāti 'to God belongs what is in the heavens' and lahu mā fī s-samāwāti 'to Him belongs what is in the heavens'.}\]

26.3 Then there are seven which are peculiar to overt nouns,\(^1\) and these divide into four groups:

26.31 (1) those which are not peculiar to any specific overt noun, viz. \(\text{ḥattā 'till', ka 'like', and wa 'and, by'}.\)

26.32 (2) those peculiar to time, viz. \(\text{mū ṣ 'since' and mūnūṣ 'since'}\), which the author will speak about in due course.\(^1\)

26.33 (3) that which is peculiar to undefined nouns,\(^1\) namely \(\text{rubba 'how few, how many', e.g. rubba raǰulīn 'how few men, how many a man'}\). In some speech this particle is also found before the third person pronoun, but always in the masculine singular and followed by an explanatory specifying element\(^3\) of corresponding meaning, as in the verse:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{rubbahu fīyatan da'awtu 'ilā mā yūritu} \\
\text{1-majda da'iban fa-'ajābū}
\end{align*}\]

'how many of him—such youths—have I called to that which bequeathes glory perpetually, and they answered!'\(^4\)

26.34 (4) that peculiar to the words \(\text{allāhu 'God', and rabbun 'Lord'}\) (when the latter is annexed to al-kaḥbatu 'the Kaaba' or to the first person singular I 'my'), viz. ta, as the author will speak about later, in the Qur'anic wa-ta-llāhī la-'akīdanna 'aṣnāmakum 'and by God I will surely outwit your idols!' also \(\text{ta-raḇbi l-kaḥbatī 'by the Lord of the Kaaba'}\) and \(\text{ta-rabbi (68a) la-'afcaḷanna 'by my Lord I shall surely do it'}\)'. The expressions \(\text{ta-r-raḥmānī 'by the Merciful One'}\) and \(\text{ta-ḥayātika 'by your life'}\) are rare.\(^3\)
26.4 The author does not deal with the particles in this order, however, but continues after rubba 'how many, how few' with bi 'by', of which an example has already been given above, ka 'like', e.g. zaydun ka-l-'asadi 'Zayd is like a lion', and li 'for', also illustrated already.

26.5 Then those peculiar to the particles of swearing, (i.e. of swearing an oath), namely wa, as in wa-llāhi 'by God!', bi, as in bi-llāhi 'by God!', and ta, as in ta-llāhi 'by God!', the peculiarities of this last having been set out above.

26.61 The remaining particles are wa in the meaning of rubba 'how many, how few', e.g. wa-laylin meaning rubba laylin 'how many a night'.

26.62 Finally mud 'since' and munuq 'since'. These make oblique only overt nouns which are peculiar to time, whether a present time, as in mā ra'aytu hu muđ yawminā or munuq yawminā 'I have not seen him today' (the implicit meaning being that up to that time I had not seen him during that day), or past time, as in mā ra'aytu hu muđ yawmi 1-ḵamīsi or munuq yawmi 1-ḵamīsi 'I have not seen him since Thursday' (the implicit meaning being that I have not seen him from the time of last Thursday).

26.63 The author does not mention here among the particles of obliqueness kalā 'except', ḍadā 'except' and ḍūšā 'except', as he has no need to mention them here because he has already mentioned them at the beginning of the book and in the chapter on exception.

26.64 The senses of all these particles are numerous. I have mentioned most of them in my Commentary on Qatr an-nadā, where I point out that
they divide into four kinds: (1) used as both a noun and a particle, viz. muḏ 'since', mundu 'since', cān 'from', and the ka 'like' of comparison; (2) used as both a particle and a verb, viz. ḥāāā 'except', kalā 'except' and cādā 'except'; (3) used as a particle, a noun and a verb, viz. only cālā 'on', and (4) used as a particle only, viz. the remainder of the particles.3

26.7 The nouns made oblique by annexation,1 (it has already been indicated that in the preponderant view obliqueness is caused by the annexed element, not by annexation), e.g. ġulāmu zaydin 'the slave-boy of Zayd', where zaydin 'Zayd' is made oblique by what is annexed to it, not by annexation itself (thus contradicting Abū Ḥayyān and our author; nor is it made oblique by the meaning of li 'for', nor by an implicit particle which has been replaced by the annexed element, contradicting certain other grammarians).2 The term 'iḍāfa 'annexation' lexically denotes the absolute propping up of one thing upon another, and technically it denotes the propping up of one noun upon another in such a way that the second noun has the status of a final n of tanwīn on the first noun.3

26.71 They are (i.e. the nouns made oblique by annexation) of two kinds:1 (1) with an implicit li 'for', (namely the 'li of possession'),2 e.g. (66b) ġulāmu zaydin 'the slave-boy of Zayd'; this annexation may also convey particularization, e.g. sarju d-dābbati 'the horse-saddle', bābu d-dāri 'the house door'. This is by far the largest group, which is why az-Zajjāj confined himself to it.3

26.72 (2) with an implicit min 'from',1 (namely the 'explanatory min').
This is a numerous group, whose main principle is that the annexed element should be part of the element it is annexed to, and that it should be proper for the latter to be predicated of the annexed element, e.g. *tawbu kazzin 'a garment of silk*, *kātamu hadīdin 'a ring of iron*, because the garment is part of the silk (*al-kazzu* denotes a certain kind of silk), and the ring is part of the iron. Hence it is possible to say *ḥādā t-tawbu kazzun 'this garment is silk* and *ḥādā l-kātamu ḫadīdu 'this ring is iron*, unlike *tawbu zaydin 'the garment of Zayd* and *gulāmu zaydin 'the slave-boy of Zayd* in possessive annexation, and unlike *ḥasīru l-masjidi 'the mosque carpet* and *qindīlu l-masjidi 'the mosque lamp*, whose annexation conveys specialization, since both conditions are contravened: in the above examples the annexed noun is neither part of what it is annexed to nor is it proper to predicate the latter of the annexed noun.

26.73 This kind of annexation is also unlike, for example, *yawmu l-ḥamlsī 'Thursday*', because the first condition is contravened, for, even though it would be proper to predicate *al-ḥamlsu 'the fifth* of *al-yawmu 'the day*, it is still not part of it. Likewise this kind of (explanatory) annexation is also unlike, for example, *yadu zaydin 'the hand of Zayd*', because the second condition is contravened, for, even though the hand is part of Zayd, it would not be proper to predicate Zayd of it. The author concludes with: and the like. By this he means the examples of both kinds of annexation.

26.8 The concordant of the oblique element has already been dealt with under independent elements, to which reference should be made.

26.9 Note: The author omits to mention one other kind of annexation, namely with an implicit **ff 'in'** denoting space or time. This kind is somewhat rare, and so is mentioned only by a small group of grammarians, who have been followed by Ibn Mālik. The main principle here is that the second noun should be a space or time qualifier of the annexed noun, either temporal, as in the Qur'anic *makru l-layli 'the scheming of the night'* or spatial, as in the Qur'anic *yā šāhibayi s-sijni 'O two companions of the prison*', since the implicit meaning is 'scheming in...
the night' and 'O two companions in the prison', which are not the same as *tawbu zaydin* 'the garment of Zayd' or *gulāmu zaydin* 'the slave-boy of Zayd' as the above mentioned condition is absent (because these latter convey only possession, as already stated).

26.92 As for 'formal annexation', this is the result of annexing an adjectival operator (namely the agent noun, patient noun, or the quasi-participial adjective) to the noun on which it operates. An example of the first is the Qur'anic *haydān bālīga l-kaʿbatī* 'an offering reaching the Kaaba', where *bālīga* 'reaching' is an agent noun annexed to the direct object (*al-kaʿbatī*), which thus has oblique form by having its operator annexed to it. An example of the second is *muʿāmūr d-dāri* 'inhabited of house', where the patient noun has been annexed to the noun on which it operates (the substitute agent) and thereby becomes more specific. An example of the third is *ḥasana l-wajhi* 'handsome of face', where the quasi-participial adjective has been annexed to the noun on which it operates and thereby becomes more specific.

26.93 This kind is called 'formal annexation' because it conveys something formal: it simply enables the realization of forms without the *n* which is suffixed after inflection, or the *tanwiN*, and it does not of itself convey either definition or specialization.
Conclusion. It is possible for the annexed masculine noun to acquire feminine gender from the noun it is annexed to when the latter is properly feminine, and vice versa.\(^1\) The condition for both forms is that it should be proper for the first noun, if omitted, to become dispensable by means of the second, while the overall meaning remains correct. An example of the first is \(\text{guṭīc\(\text{at}\)} \text{ba\(\text{c\(\text{du}\)}\) 'asābī\(\text{hī}\) 'some of his fingers were cut off', where \text{ba\(\text{c\(\text{du}\)}\) 'some' is a substitute agent of the verb \text{guṭīc\(\text{at}\) 'were cut off', and the verb predicated of \text{ba\(\text{c\(\text{du}\)}\) has been made feminine because \text{ba\(\text{c\(\text{du}\)}\) has acquired feminine gender from the noun to which it is annexed, namely \text{aṣābi\(\text{c\(\text{u}\) 'fingers'}.\(^2\) A similar case is the Reading of al-Hasan al-Baṣrī\(^3\) (but it is an abnormal Reading) of the Qur'anic \text{talṭaqīt\(\text{hū ba\(\text{c\(\text{du\) s-s\(\text{ayyārātī 'one of the caravans might pick him up',\(^4\) with t (spelt with two dots above) on talṭaqīt 'might pick up'.

\(^1\) An example of the second\(^1\) is the verse of the poet (69b) 
\[
\text{'ināratū l-\(\text{c\(\text{a\(\text{q\(\text{ī\(\text{a\(\text{l\(\text{ī maksū\(\text{fū\(\text{ū\(\text{n bi-\(\text{taw\(\text{ū\(\text{i havān}
\]
\text{wa-Cāg\(\text{l\(\text{ū Ča\(\text{sī l-hawā yazdā\(\text{ū tanwī\(\text{ān}
\]}

'the illumination of the mind is eclipsed by obedience to lust, but the mind of him who disobeys lust increases in enlightenment',\(^2\) where \text{maksū\(\text{fū\(\text{n 'eclipsed' is masculine even though it is the predicate of a feminine noun, namely \text{'inārat\(\text{ūn 'illumination', but the latter has acquired masculine gender by annexation to al-\(\text{C\(\text{a\(\text{q\(\text{l\(\text{ī 'the mind'.}

\(^2\) Perhaps to this category also belongs the Qur'anic \text{'inna rahmātā lillāhī qarībūn min al-muhsīnīnā 'verily God's mercy is near for those that do good'.\(^1\) The Qur'anic lā\(\text{a\(\text{q\(\text{ī\(\text{a\(\text{l\(\text{ī s-sā\(\text{hata qarībūn 'perhaps the hour is near',\(^2\) on the other hand, with the masculine form of qarībūn 'near' has nothing to do with this, since there is no annexation: it has been
observed by al-Farraj that the masculine of qarîbun 'near' has been adhered to here for the purpose of differentiation, when nearness of kinship is not intended. But beware of thinking that qarîbun is masculine because the feminine gender of sâcata 'hour' is only figurative: that this is a misconception is proved by the compulsory feminine in, for example, aš-šams tali‘atun 'the sun is rising'.

There is a different rule for the figurative and the literal when both are overt nouns, not when they are pronominalized, Ibn Hišâm says in his Muğnī.

EPILOGUE

May God enrich us with His grace and generosity and seal our work with good things through Muhammad and his Family. God, who is praised and exalted, knows best.

This is the end of what it has pleased God to allow of The Ājurrūmîyya's Exposition by the Light of Intuition. This Commentary has been produced, praise be to Almighty God, so as to put in the clearest terms all the essential features of the art of Grammar and to make plain its inflections and details, over which the mind has been exercised far into the night. And if you come across some stray benefit therein, then pray for my good end, and if you come across some slip of the pen, then excuse me, for excuse is readily accepted from people of quality, and kindness is always hoped for from the character of the nobility.

That this work will be pure in His sight the Almighty God I ask, and that when the shadows of the afterlife roll back He will make me profit from my task, and on this Commentary as on the original the breeze of favour make to blow, for on all that pray to Him he does most generously bestow, and is most Mighty, as we who put our hopes in Him do know; and may He guard us from the evil of the envious, and may He not on
Epilogue

Judgement Day dishonour us, through His grace and bounty (70a) for He is bountiful and generous. And I ask that He will do the same to our parents, our brothers, our loved ones and all Muslims male and female, for He is near and answers every prayer. Praise be to God who guided us to this, for how else would we have been guided if not by God? And God bless our Lord Muhammad and his Family, and his Companions, his wives, his seed and the people of his House with blessing and peace for ever, continuing so until the Day of Resurrection, Amen.

Appendix: This edition is based on the following manuscripts,

B. (Berlin), Ahlwardt 6679 (G.A.L. II, 238, item 10). An incomplete manuscript of 35 folios, ending at 8.0 (=text, p. 168 l. 3, laysa, in the present edition). The writing is hasty but easily legible, and no evidence of date or provenance is forthcoming.

C. (Cairo). This manuscript came into the editor's possession in Cairo. Apart from errors (e.g. 18.209 n 2) it is complete in 70 folios and neatly written by Šāliḥ ʿAbdullāh al-Manfalūṭī al-Mālikī, who dates the final copying at the last Friday of Rabīʿ II, 1203, i.e. the 23rd January, 1789.

D. (Damascus), Zāhiriyya 162; complete in 77 folios, very neatly and clearly written, finished on Wednesday, 17th ʿĀbān, 1046, i.e. the 14th January, 1637, by Zayn ad-Dīn ibn ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn al-Kufayrī.

Manuscript D. being the oldest, it has usually been trusted in cases of doubt, but there are insufficient grounds to establish whether the three manuscripts are related in any way.

N.B. Brockelmann's reference to another Damascus manuscript, Zāhiriyya 68 (G.A.L. II, Suppl. 333, item 10) is wrong: this is Isfarāʾīnī's Commentary on the Kāfiya.

Errata: 5.81, trans. p. 132 line 13, omits 'with independent status through it' after 'huwa 'he''.
5.89, trans. p. 142 line 7, omits 'made independent by it' after 'concealed in it'.
5.90, trans. p. 142 line 16, ditto.