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ABSTRACT

A word's indeclinability in Arabic is determined by its similarity to the particles, which are considered to possess the defining characteristics of indeclinability. This similarity is found in four categories: similarity in terms of structure; similarity in terms of meaning; similarity by being ungoverned by a regent; and similarity by requiring a complement.

A substantive's indefiniteness is determined by its ability either to accept the definite article ٍث in those cases where the latter is able to induce definiteness, or to take the place of that which accepts the definite article in the same cases.
INTRODUCTION

The following is a translation of two sections of Al-Alfiyya of Ibn Mālik and of the accompanying commentary and interpretation by Ibn ʿAqīl, as found in Sharḥ ibn ʿAqīl by Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, a modern Egyptian scholar who has provided, in addition to the original texts of Al-Alfiyya and Ibn ʿAqīl's commentary, a thorough parsing of each line of Al-Alfiyya as well as a substantial body of his own writing in which he explains verses, phrases, and words whose antique character has made their meanings obscure to the modern reader. The largest component of Professor ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd's contribution, however, is comprised of minutely detailed analyses which he has made of a number of disputed grammatical points, to some of which Ibn Mālik and Ibn ʿAqīl had themselves made reference as being sources of controversy among grammarians contemporary to them.

No attempt is made in the present effort to undertake any translation or any sort of commentary or analysis with regard to Professor ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd's contributions, for two reasons: first, the sheer volume of these writings in the two sections selected would in their translation alone
far exceed the intended scope of this work; second, his writing in the area of grammatical analysis is characterized by a degree of complexity of language and depth and detail of analysis which makes it quite appropriate for the graduate level of Arab universities, where students in fact traditionally make its first acquaintance, but which, considered with the question of volume mentioned earlier, occasioned the decision to exclude it from the present work in favor of its inclusion in an effort to be undertaken at a more advanced level in the future.

Al-Alfiyya itself is one of the truly monumental examples of the work of early Arab grammarians. As can be inferred from the title, it involves the number 1,000; more specifically, it is a work consisting of approximately one-thousand verses in the rajaz meter, in which Ibn Malik summarizes Arabic grammar. The word "summarizes" is here chosen because Al-Alfiyya is, in fact, a condensation of an earlier and much larger treatise, Al-Käfiya Al-Shäfiya, in which the author makes a presentation of Arabic grammar in 2,757 verses, also in the rajaz meter.²

Abū ʿAbd-ʿallāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd-ʿallāh ibn Mālik al-Tāfī al-Jāyyānī, previously and henceforth known as Ibn Mālik, was
born at Jaen in Andalusia around 1203 A.D. and traveled early in life to the Middle East, first to Damascus, then to Aleppo and Hamah, then back to Damascus which he made his home. He had in the meantime received the tutelage of a number of masters, beginning with his youthful period in Spain, and by the most reliable accounts wrote his important works, among which the two mentioned above figure very prominently, after settling in Damascus, where he died in 1274. He was a master not only of Arabic grammar, but of several branches of Islamic science as well, and was associated with the Adiliyya madrasa as senior teaching master.

The stature among scholars and grammarians of his Al-Alfiyya can be gauged by the fact that it has been the subject of no less than 43 commentaries, among which that of Ibn Aqil has been singled out for exceptionally high praise, and even described as a classic.

'Abd-Allâh Bahâ' al-Dîn ibn 'Abd-Allâh ibn 'Abd al-Rahmân ibn 'Abd-Allâh ibn Aqil, previously and henceforth known as Ibn Aqil (1294-1367 A.D.) was born at Bûlis in Syria and traveled to Cairo, where he distinguished himself as a student of grammar and of Islamic jurisprudence. It is in fact to the activities of teaching and serving as a
substitute qādi that he seems to have devoted most of his energies, and his surviving literary output consists of only a few works. Yet it is through one of these few works, a treatise on Al-Alfiyya of Ibn Mālik, that his name continues to be known to this day among students of Arabic grammar, and it is to this work that the discussion will now turn.
COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS

The two sections of Al-Alfiyya selected for translation in this work are the second and third appearing in Professor ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd's ʿSharḥ ibn ʿAqīl and are titled, respectively, "The Desinentially Inflectional and the Indeclinable" and "The Indefinite and the Definite". Their selection was based on an initial perception that a common thread may somehow link the morphological processes by which the categories of nouns under each of the two headings are differentiated from each other; more specifically, it was initially expected that tanwin, or nunation, which is present in one group but absent from the other in each of the two classifications, would receive a great deal of emphasis in the discussion.

It was, therefore, a great surprise to find that tanwin receives only scant mention in the first section, and then only with reference to some rare forms of the sound masculine and feminine plurals; while in the second section, it receives no mention at all! Its exclusion from the discussion in the second section was all the more surprising since it is in large measure the presence or absence of tanwin by which students of Arabic first learn to make the distinction between definite and indefinite
The section dealing with the definite and the indefinite held another surprise, however. While actually titled "The Indefinite and the Definite", and opening with a broad description of the differences between the two groups, it proceeds with the explanation that there are in fact six different types of definite nouns; the rest of the section is then entirely taken up with the discussion of the first of the six, while the remaining five types are dealt with in five separate, subsequent chapters.

The results of these developments have been, first, the necessary abandonment of tanwin as the basis for any attempt to associate the distinction between desinentially inflectional and indeclinable nouns with that between definite and indefinite nouns. It also becomes necessary to acknowledge that the section dealing with the definite and the indefinite does not provide the exhaustive treatment of the topic planned for inclusion in the present work; indeed, a complete discussion of the topic as presented in Al-Alfiyya would entail the translation and inclusion of five additional complete sections of the book, the volume of which would be incompatible with the intended scope of this paper.
Yet while its analysis cannot proceed along the thematic lines first envisioned and its treatment of the topics presented in its title cannot be as complete as was originally intended, still the present work represents an attempt, however imperfect and fragmentary, at the very worthwhile task of shining yet another interpretative light on some old thoughts and points of view which, despite their age, continue to possess a high degree of relevance as part of the unifying structural foundation of a thoroughly modern language spoken by a large and diverse group of people.

* * *

Since virtually no importance is attached to tanwīn in the analysis of the distinction between the desinentially inflectional and the indeclinable, or the definite and the indefinite, the discussion now focuses on the views, as presented by Ibn 'AQīl in his commentary on Al-Alfiyya, of early Arab grammarians on the topics. (The following discussion presents the salient points of the sections translated in the order in which they appear in the original work; page numbers given are those of the translation.)

* * *
The Desinentially Inflectional and the Indeclinable

Indeclinability, whether of nouns or verbs⁹, is solely attributed to the similarity, or resemblance, of a noun or a verb to a particle; for the particles are characterized as possessing the original or archetypal quality of indeclinability, this by virtue of their fixed, unchanging structure. The particles are thus established as possessing the defining character of the indeclinable, and other categories of words can be considered indeclinable only in that they share in some aspect of this character.

Outwardly, the essential character of the indeclinable would appear to have only one aspect, and that is an ending, whether in a vowel or in sukūn, which is unchanging; that is, which is immune to the processes of inflection and declension operating on other words in a given grammatical setting. Yet while indeclinables may present the same general outward appearance, there is some consensus among the early grammarians that they are divisible into categories according to the type of their similarity to a particle. The discussion of these categories of similarity, beginning on page 33, provided at first the appearance of a needless complication of the issue, since it initially seemed as if the question of similarity to the
particles could be dealt with in a straightforward and entirely adequate fashion simply by noting and postulating as the basis for indefinability the similarity to particles in outward form mentioned above. However, a full hearing of the arguments tends to make clear at least the theoretical validity of the categorization of similarity, though the case, on page 34, for similarity of demonstratives to a particle which "should" exist but does not, is certainly as abstract as any argument in the two sections presented here. Moreover, the categories of similarity to the particle given are able to account satisfactorily for the six categories of nouns (p. 36) considered by the grammarians to be indefinable. (It would be useful to note here that the term "indefinable", used here to translate النِّمَيُنِي, does not refer to the same class of nouns as in Part 2 of Elementary Modern Standard Arabic, by Peter F. Abboud et al., wherein the term is used for what Ibn Mālik calls the defective, which he considered to be an desinentially inflectional, or declinable, form.)

If those nouns are indefinable which possess one of the categorized types of similarity to the particle mentioned above, then it follows that desinentially inflectional nouns are those which bear no such
resemblance, and this is in fact the definition given for these nouns. The two subcategories of fully-declinable (triptote) and non-fully-declinable (diptote) are briefly introduced at this point, the discussion of defective and deficient (مَتَّى and مَمْتَى, respectively) occurring toward the end of the section.

The discussion next takes up the topic of the noninflectional and the inflectional in verbs after a brief mention of the Kufan-Basran dispute over the question of whether inflection is originally an attribute of nouns or of verbs. The grouping given below presents the forms in a different order from that found in the text (p. 38), the purpose being to eliminate some of the cumbersomeness characterizing the original grouping.

The noninflectional class of verbs is comprised of those with fatha or sukūn as non-inflectional vowels on the final radical. The first group includes the perfect of the third-person masculine and feminine singular and all forms of the imperfect in energetic modes I and II (with tashdīd and sukūn, respectively, on the ن) except the dual, the masculine plurals, and the second-person feminine singular; the inflectional long vowel in the first, and shortened vowels in the last two, prevent the verb from
ending noninflectionally in \textit{fathā} as it does in the remaining persons of the energetic. Stated differently, the intervening vowels of these three forms violate the condition given for noninflectionality of the energetics that the \text{n} must immediately follow the verb. Of interest are the two features distinguishing the dual from the other two forms: first, the dual takes kasra on the final nun, where the others take fathā; according to Wright\textsuperscript{10}, this is the result of a "weakening" of the normal Energetic I ending of fathā on the nun by the influence of the long \text{l} of the dual. Second, the elision of the long vowels of the other two forms due to consecutive consonants (p. 39) does not apply in the case of the dual; Ibn \text{"Aqīl} makes no attempt to explain this seeming inconsistence, though Wright\textsuperscript{11} mentions that, while the Arabs prefer to avoid "shut" syllables containing long vowels, those containing the long vowel with \text{l} are allowed to occur more frequently than the other two. This provides the only readily-available explanation for the fact that \text{تَضْسَرُ بَنٍّ} does not become \text{تَضْسَرُ بَنٍّ} by the phonological processes which shorten the corresponding long vowels in the other two forms.

The second group consists of the masculine singular imperative and
the imperfect forms of the feminine plural, which are considered to end noninflectionally in sukūn. The noninflectionality of the former is the subject of some dispute, with the Kufans and Basrans arguing in favor of inflectionality and noninflectionality, respectively. Ibn ʿAqīl finds that those holding the latter view are in the majority.

The class of inflectional verbs is shown to include all forms of the perfect except the third-person masculine and feminine singular, since they are made inflectional with the long vowel with َ, in the case of the third-person masculine plural, and with suffixed subject markers in all other persons, resulting in the placement of sukūn on the final radical of the verb. Also considered inflectional are all forms of the imperfect except those mentioned above (the energetics, which are considered to end noninflectionally in fātha, and the feminine plurals; the noninflectional ending occurring on the ِ in the case of the former, and before the ِ in the latter).

It is interesting that the feminine plurals, which have sukūn on the final radical of the verb followed by a vowelled suffix, are considered to end noninflectionally in the sukūn, and not inflectionally in the fātha of
the suffix; an investigation of the dispute to which Ibn Aqīl alludes (p. 41) regarding the noninflectionality of these forms would comprise an interesting line of inquiry.

A brief discussion of the archetypically-indeclinable particles themselves follows the treatment of the verbs; its chief features are a statement of indeclinability as an essential and integral characteristic of the particles, due to the fact that particles do not need inflection in order to perform their linguistic functions; a description of sukūn as the basic, original form of indeclinability; and a discussion of the distribution of occurrence of the three short vowels among the particles and the indeclinable noun and noninflectional verb forms mentioned above.

With regard to the above-mentioned status of sukūn, the text (p. 42) explains that the indeclinable takes short vowels only for the purpose of avoiding contiguity of consonants, as can be clearly seen in the case of such particles as ʻun and mīn when followed by wasla; and particles ending in alif maqṣūra are said to end indeclinably in fathā in place of sukūn, which returns in the appropriate cases, as before pronouns (عَلَيْك, etc.). But an original ending in sukūn is not so readily
perceptible in cases of some noninflectionally-ending verbs, or in adverbial particles made from the accusative case of nouns; more research will be needed in order to make an enquiry of the appropriate scope into this question.

The next major topic is that of the six nouns, referring to the group of biliteral masculine nouns inflected with the long vowels ı, ş, and ş. The conventional interpretation is given that these letters appear in substitution for the normal short vowels of inflection when the nouns are in construct, but Ibn ʿAqīl adds an interesting alternative view: the six nouns are not actually inflected with long vowels by substitution, but are rather inflected with regular short vowels implied in the three visible letters; by this view, the question of substitution need never arise.

The validity of this assertion that short vowels of inflection are implied in visible long vowels cannot be proved or disproved in the context of this work; however, the concept is used again in the subsequent discussions of other categories, and does serve to lend a sense of unity to the overall analysis.

Other anomalies in the discussion of the six nouns are infrequently-
seen variants of some of them: in the case of ُهَنِينَ, it is actually considered preferable to place the inflectional short vowels on the ن instead of implying them in the long vowels; that is, ُهَنِينَ is the preferred usage, though ُهَنُوَهُ is permissible.

The reverse is true in the cases of أُبِّاِرَى, أُخَرَى, and حَمَمْ; that is, it is permissible, if rare, for these three to take the short inflectional vowels on the second letter, instead of having them implied in long vowels as in the case of the well-known forms. Thus one may use أَخْنَةُ, أَبْنَهُ, and حَمَمْهُ instead of أَخْوَهُ, أَبْوَهُ, and حَمَمْهُ.

These last three nouns, however, have another unusual form, in which they end in long ِل in all three cases; as in the previous instances of long-vowel inflection, the normal short vowels are said to be implied in the alif, and Ibn ṣAqīl refers to this form as being actually more common than that with visible inflection on the second letter.

The discussion of the dual comes next and is quite conventional. Worthy of note, however, is the mention at the end of the section (p. 54) once again of implied short vowels; this time, the regular inflectional vowels are said to be implicit in the ِل, in the case of the nominative, and
in the ّ in the accusative and genitive.

The sound masculine plural is then introduced as the third and final category in which inflection takes place with long vowels; in this case, ٠ for the nominative and ُّ for the accusative and genitive.

Description of the characteristics of nouns and adjectives pluralized in this manner is followed by an enumeration of those which cannot take this plural owing to a lack of one or more of the required characteristics. Included in the second group is the masculine singular for colors and defects, of the pattern َأَفْتَعَلُونَ; it is specifically stated that this form cannot be pluralized as َأَفْتَعَلُونَ. Since it can, however, be made dual by the addition of the appropriate suffix, as in َأَحْمَرْانَ, one wonders whether its exclusion from the group taking the sound masculine plural is more due to the fact that it has its own dedicated form for the plural of both genders, ُّحَمْشَرُ, than to any semantic or morphological considerations.

In the discussion of those nouns, like ٍعِشْرَوَنَ, which are treated inflectionally like sound masculine plurals without actually being such, the situation is seen in which a noun may take either the inflection of the
sound masculine plural, or may be kept in the oblique form of that plural, with ی, and take conventional inflection on its final consonant. The example given is سِنّتْة; it may be pluralized as سِنْنُون, as is commonly seen, or it may take the second form mentioned above; that is, it may keep the سِنْنِي voweling in all cases, with normal inflection appearing on the final ن, giving سِنْنِا, سِنْنِين, سِنْنِين, and سِنْنِين. It is, incidentally, at this point in the narrative that tanwin is first mentioned; according to Ibn ٌٌَُٗٗ، this last form of the plural of سِنّتْة may also be used with the tanwin omitted, though there is doubt as to the frequency of its occurrence.

The discussion of the sound masculine plural finishes with a description of variation in the vowelling of the final ن, both of this plural form and of the previously-discussed dual. In essence, the fatha is the only correct vowel for the final ن of the sound masculine plural. In acknowledging that it may occasionally be found vowelled with kasra in poetry, Ibn ٌَٗ، steadfastly refuses to allow this as a legitimate dialectic variant.

The dual differs from the sound masculine plural in this regard. Its
normal final vowel is, of course, the kasra and not the fatha, but in the case of the dual, the alternative vowelling with fatha is allowed as a dialectic variant. There are divergent views, however, with regard to its permissibility, with some maintaining that only in the oblique may the dual take a final fatha, while others hold that it may be used in both cases.

In the case of the sound feminine plural, the discussion shifts from the phenomenon of replacement of short vowels with long, to the replacement of short vowels with other short vowels; specifically, the replacement of fatha with kasra in the accusative case. The discussion contains no explanation of the reason for this substitution; but in a footnote to the section titled “The Declension of Undefined Nouns”, Wright\textsuperscript{12} explains that the tanwin of the sound feminine plural is not that of full declension (الْتَنْوُينُ الدَّالُ عَلَى الْمَكَانَةِ), but is rather the “tanwin of correspondence” (الْتَنْوُينُ المُقابِلَةِ) to the tanwin of the sound masculine plural. Thus it becomes apparent that this correspondence of the two sound plural forms extends also to their number of case endings and to the vowelling of those endings: damma for the nominative, and
kasra for the oblique.

This substitution of one short vowel for another is also seen in the next class of nouns dealt with, the diptotes. With these, fatha takes the place of kasra in the genitive case when the nouns are not defined by the article lj or by idafa.

The discussion of inflection by substitution concludes with the mention of those cases in which it occurs in verbs: the duals, the masculine plurals, and the second-person feminine singular. All of these end in ع in the indicative mood; thus the ع is said to substitute for the damma. In the jussive and subjunctive moods, the ع is removed from these verbs; thus the elision of the ع takes the place of final vowelling with sukun and fatha, respectively, as the indicator of these moods.

The final topic in the first section is that of the defective and deficient declensions and inflections, and the discussion begins with the nouns.

In the discussion of the defective nouns, in which fatha precedes a final integral ١, reference is once again made to the principle of implied inflectional vowels. Since no short vowels can be placed on this final ١,
known as the alif maqṣūra, all of the noun's inflections must be implied in the ending.

This is not true, however, of the deficient nouns, which end in an integral ی preceded by kasra. In these, only the nominative and genitive cases require implied vowels; the accusative is visible, since it is possible to vowel with fatha a final ی preceded by kasra, as in the example رايتِ النخاضِی.

Verbs of defective inflection are those ending in any of the three long vowels. These are necessarily limited to the imperfect, since perfect forms ending in long vowels are either noninflectional, as in the third-person singular, or have normal inflection, as in the duals and the third-person masculine plural. The presentation of the various forms, with implicit and visible inflections, proceeds in the manner of a straightforward and conventional explanation.

* * *
The Indefinite and the Definite

In opening this section with a definition of the indefinite, the author has emphasized not the absence of the definite article, but the capacity to become definite by accepting the definite article. Specifically, the indefinite is defined as that which accepts 'al, which in turn produces or influences definiteness in the following noun, or as that which takes the place of that which accepts 'al. Use of this definition allows the avoidance of problems which might occur in the area of proper names, of which عبّاس is given as an example. Though lacking the definite article, it is nonetheless definite; furthermore, its definiteness is not affected by the prefixing of the definite article.

ذو is the example cited as that which takes the place of a word accepting 'ال, without itself accepting the article; the discussion proceeds to show that ذو, with the meaning of صاحب, or "possessor", is capable of replacing the latter as the indefinite first term of idāfa, as in صاحب ذو مال. (Though it is not mentioned in the text, ذو can, of course, also replace صاحب as the definite first term of idāfa, as in صاحب ذو النمال.)
After defining the definite as that which is "other than" (غَيْبَة) the indefinite, the author explains that there are six categories of definite nouns: personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, proper names, nouns prefixed with the definite article, relative pronouns, and that which is in construct with any definite noun. The remainder of the section is then devoted to a discussion of the first category, personal pronouns.

These are indeclinable by similarity to the particles, as with the other types of indeclinables dealt with thus far; in the case of the pronouns, however, the similarity is described in terms of simple unchangeability (جَمْعُود).

The various types of attached and independent pronouns are presented, along with the conditions of their use, after which the discussion turns to the topic of prominence and concealment of the pronouns contained in verbs, and of the instances in which concealment is and is not required.

Briefly, prominent pronouns, or subject markers, are those which are visible at the end of verbs, such as all inflections of the perfect, and the feminine singular and all dual and plural forms of the imperfect.
(Verbs with completely unambiguous prefixed subject markers, such as the ن and the ٰ of the imperfect first-person plural and singular, respectively, are nonetheless considered to contain "concealed" pronouns!)

In the case of concealed pronouns, concealment is termed "required" if the subject of the verb is incapable of following the verb in the form of an independent common or proper noun, which would then take the place of, and render unnecessary, the concealed pronominal subject. The example of the masculine singular imperative is given; it would be ungrammatical for its subject to appear after it, as in افْعَل زَيَّد. And the author is quick to point out that, while the pronoun may follow the imperative, as in افْعَل أَشْت, it is not in the capacity of subject, but merely as a reinforcement of the pronoun (أشت) necessarily concealed in the imperative. In similar fashion, the pronominal subjects of first-person singular and plural, and second-person masculine singular imperfects are necessarily concealed.

The pronominal subject whose concealment in the verb is not required, but "permissible" (جاهز), is that of the third-person masculine or feminine singular, an example of which is provided in the sentence زَيَّد.
the subject is a pronoun, هُوَ, which is concealed in the verb يَقْصُومُ، since a substantive, such as زَيْدُ, by strict classical interpretation cannot be the subject of a following verb (in Modern Standard Arabic, on the other hand, زَيْدُ would indeed be considered the subject of the nominal sentence جَزَاء يَقْصُومُ). This concealment of the subject pronoun is considered permissible, however, since the subject can follow the verb as an independent substantive, which is then considered to have replaced the concealed pronoun. The example given is زَيْدُ هُوَ يَقْصُومُ أَبُوُهُ، in which هُوَ, the concealed pronominal subject of يَقْصُومُ، is replaced by أَبُوُهُ.

Another point of divergence from Modern Standard Arabic grammar occurs in the discussion (p. 84) of the independent accusative pronouns, such as إِيَّاكُ; the classical grammarians consider the attached and independent accusatives to be separate categories of pronouns, whereas the interpretation in Modern Standard Arabic is that إِيَّاكُ is a particle prefixed to the attached pronoun in those cases in which it needs to stand detached from the verb.¹³

The independent accusative pronoun becomes important in the
discussion of verbs taking two direct objects (p. 86), where the cases in which it may or must be used in place of the attached form are thoroughly presented, along with some mention of the disputes existing between Ibn Mālik and Sībuwaih regarding the preferability of one form over the other in a variety of contexts.

The final topic brought up in the discussion of the pronouns is the "of protection" (ضَوْنَ الْوَقَائِئَةَ), which occurs between the first-person singular suffix ي and verbs and some particles. In the case of verbs, the function of this is said to be the "protection" of the verb from being vowelled with kasra; the question of why the ever-indeclinable particles, some of which are vowelled with kasra, should need such protection, is not addressed. (Not in this text, at any rate. Wright\textsuperscript{14}, however, offers the observation that two of the particles in question, لَيْتَ and لَمْ يُلْعَلَ, "seem to be...verbs"; this provides at least some explanation of their posited need for "protection" from the kasra.) However, it is pointed out that all of the particles taking the of protection with the first-person singular عَسْنَ, مَنَ, لَيْتَ, لَنَفَلْ-يَ, and لَدْنَ-يَ—may also dispense with the , though this is rare, particularly in the case of the last three, to which the
additional ن may originally have been added for euphonic, as opposed to grammatical, purposes.

* * *

In the following translation, parentheses are used to denote the translations of individual verses of Al-Alfiyya, which are located in each case immediately below the original Arabic version. Elsewhere in the text, parentheses are used for the conventional purpose of explanation and comment; in all cases, they are mine. Editorial comments of Professor Ḥāmid are enclosed within square brackets.
THE DESINENTIALLY INFLECTIONAL AND THE INDECLINABLE

(And of the noun there is the inflectional, and the indeclinable by a close similarity to the particles).

He is referring to the fact that the noun is divided into two groups: one is the desinentially inflectional*, that which is free of similarity to the particles; the second is the indeclinable, and it is that which resembles the particles, and which is meant by the words, (indeclinable) "by a close resemblance to the particles". The defectiveness of the indeclinable is, according to the author--may almighty God have mercy on him!-- contained in the similarity to the particle. The author then classifies the forms of the similarity in the two verses following this one, and this is close to the method of Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī (writer and philologer, died at Baghdad in 987 A.D.) 15 where the latter makes the indeclinable to be contained in the similarity to the particle, or in that which includes this meaning. And Sībuwaih--may God have mercy upon him--has stipulated

*Henceforth called simply "inflectional"--P.J.
that the defectiveness of the all indeclinables be attributed to the similarity to the particle, and among those who have mentioned this is Ibn Abī al-Rabī’i (grammarian and writer, 1202 - 1289 A.D.).

* * *

"Like the similarity {to particles} by placement of the two nouns in جَهْنَمَانَاء, the similarity of meaning in مَتِي وَفِي هَنَا and كَنِيَّة* عن الفِعْلِ بِبَعْضِهَا تَأْثِرُ، وَكَافِتَقْسَارَ أَصْلَهَا

(“Like the similarity {to particles} by placement of the two nouns in جَهْنَمَانَاء, the similarity of meaning in مَتِي وَفِي هَنَا, like standing in place of a verb without being affected {by a regent}, and like an established need {for a complement}”).

He mentions in these two verses the forms of the similarity of the noun to the particle in four situations, the first being its similarity to the particle in structure, as when the noun is placed on a [single] letter, such as the ضِرْبَتُ أَكْنُرُ مَنْنا, or on two letters, like مَنْنا in جَهْنَمَانَاء, referring to this with the words, "of the two nouns in جَهْنَمَانَاء". For the مَنْنا is a noun, since it is the subject, and it is indeclinable since it resembles a
particle in structure due to its consisting of one letter. Likewise, ل is a noun, since it is a direct object, and is indeclinable due to its resemblance in structure to a particle in consisting of two letters.

The second form is the similarity of the noun to the particle in meaning, and it is of two types: one resembles an existing particle, while the other resembles a non-existent particle. An example of the first is مكتى, indeclinable by its similarity in meaning to a particle, for it is used interrogatively, as in مكتى تقدم؟ and conditionally, as in أقتم. In both cases the indeclinable resembles an existing particle, since in the interrogative it is like hamza and in the conditional it is like إن. The example of the second type is هننا; it resembles a particle which should have been given but was not given, and that is because the demonstrative is a (category of) meaning, to which a particle should rightfully be given in order to indicate it, as was given for negation, ل; for prohibition, ل; for the optative, ليت; for the anticipatory, لعل; and so on. So the demonstrative pronouns are indeclinable by similarity in meaning to an implied particle.

The third type of similarity involves standing in place of a verb
without being affected (governed) by a regent, such as the nouns of verbs
(أسماء الأفعال, indeclinable forms on the pattern فعل, used as imperatives for some verbs. According to Wright, they correspond in both form and meaning to a category in Hebrew known as the “infinitive absolute”), as in دراك زيدا for 드راك is indeclinable by similarity to a particle in that it acts without anything else acting upon it, as is the case with particles.

And with the words, "without being affected", he excludes that which stands in place of the verb and is affected by the regent, as in ضرب زيدا; it takes the place of ضرب but is not indeclinable because it is governed by a regent, taking the accusative by an omitted verb. By contrast, دراك, even though standing in place of أدرك, is not governed by a regent.

The essence of what the author says is that the masdar which stands in place of a verb and the nouns of verbs have in common the function of replacing verbs, but the masdar is governed by a regent, and is inflected due to its lack of similarity to a particle, while the nouns of verbs are not governed by a regent, and are indeclinable by their similarity to particles
in that they stand in place of verbs without being affected by them.

And this which the author has mentioned is indeclinable although the nouns of verbs have no inflectional category. The issue is disputed, and we shall mention it in the chapter on the nouns of verbs.

The fourth type is the similarity to the particle in requirement of complement, to which he alludes with the words, "like an established need (for a complement)". This is exemplified by the relative pronoun, such as الذي, for it requires in all cases a syndetic relative clause; thus it resembles a particle in this requirement, and is indeclinable.

The essence of the two verses is that the indeclinable occurs in six categories: the personal pronouns, the conditional particles, the interrogative pronouns, the demonstrative pronouns, the nouns of verbs, and the relative pronouns.

* * *

(And the inflected nouns are those which are free of any resemblance to the particle, like الأرض and سمَّا (And the inflected nouns are those which are free of any resemblance to the particle, like الأرض and سمَّا).

He wants that the inflectional be in contrast with the indeclinable,
and it has already been stated that the indeclinable is that which resembles the particles; thus the inflectional is that which does not resemble the particles, and is divided into sound—which does not end in a weak letter, like أرض—and defective, which ends in a weak letter, like سما. سما. سما. سما. سما. سما. سما. سما. سما.

is one of six variants of with damma or kasra on the hamza; سم, with damma or kasra on the س; and سم, also with damma or kasra on the س.

The inflectional is also divided into fully declinable (triptote), such as أحمد and زيند; and non-fully declinable (diptote), such as مصابح, and مساجد. That which is not inflected is the indeclinable, and the declinable is the inflectional, which is of two types: fully declinable and non-fully declinable.

***

وفعل أمر ومضارعاً
واعترفوا مضارعاً: إن عريـا
من دون توكيد مباشر و من
دون إناث: كنـر عنـ من فتى.

(Verbs imperative and perfect are noninflectional, and one inflects
the imperfect if it is devoid of the nūn of the energetic immediately following or the nūn of the feminine, as in (بُرَ عَنْ مَنْ فُتْهَنَ).

When finished with the explanation of the inflectional and the indeclinable of nouns, he began with the explanation of the inflectional and the noninflectional of verbs. The method of the Basrans is that inflection has its origin in nouns, and branches to verbs, and for them verbs are originally noninflectional. The Kufans hold that inflection exists originally in both nouns and verbs, but the way of the Basrans is correct, and Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn ibn al-ʿIljī mentions in Al-Basīṭ that some grammarians have gone over to the view that inflection originates in verbs, and branches to nouns.

* * *

The noninflectional of verbs is of two kinds: the first, whose noninflectionality is agreed upon, is the perfect, ending noninflectionally in fatha, as in (بُضُرَب) و ضُرِّب, which do not have the of the plural affixed requiring the damma, nor the suffixed subject markers requiring sukūn.

The second, whose noninflectionality is disputed, though the
preponderance of opinion is that it is noninflectional, is the imperative, as in 

؛ ي ضِرْبٍ ْب. it is noninflectional according to the Basrans, and inflectional according to the Kufans.

The inflectional of verbs is the imperfect, and is not inflected unless not connected to the ن of the energetic or the ن of the feminine plural. An example of the immediately-following ن of the energetic is 

، هل، تضرُبَان، تضرِبَان، with the verb ending noninflectionally in fatha, and in that there is no difference between the heavy and light (forms of the energetic). If the ن is not connected to the verb, then it is not noninflectional, as is also the case if there is interposed between the two an ٍ of duality, as in 

، هل، تضرُبَان، which comes from هل، تضرُبَان، in which three ن's occur together, so that the first—and it is the ن of the indicative—is removed to avoid succession of like consonants, leaving هل، تضرَبَان.

Likewise, the imperfect verb is inflected if there is interposed between it and the ن of the energetic, the و of the masculine plural or the second-person feminine singular ي، as in هل، تضرِبَان، يا زيدون، and هل، تضرِبَان، comes from هل، تضرِبَان، يا هند، and the first ن
is again removed due to succession of like consonants, giving تضرَبُونَة; the و is elided due to consecutive consonants (the doubled ن), leaving تضرَبَنَة. Similarly، تضرَبَنَةً comes from تضرَبَنَة، and is modified by the same process as تضرَبَنَةً.

This is the intended meaning of the words، "One inflects the imperfect if it is devoid of the ن of the energetic immediately following"، with the stipulation for its inflection that it be free of that (ن)، and it is understood that if not devoid of this ن، the imperfect is noninflectional.

Thus it has been learned that، according to his method، the imperfect verb is not noninflectional unless the ن of the energetic immediately follows it، as in هل تضرَبَنَة يَا زَيْنَدً; if it does not immediately follow، then the verb is inflected، and this is the method of most grammarians.

Al-Akhfash (Basran grammarian، died 825 A.D.)¹⁹ has gone over to the view that the verb is noninflectional with the ن of the energetic، regardless of whether it immediately follows or not، while it has been quoted of some of them that the verb is inflected even if immediately followed by the ن of the energetic.
An example of the immediately-following ن of the feminine plural is whose verb ends noninflectionally in sukūn, and the author—may God almighty have mercy on him!—has said, in some of his books, that there is no dispute regarding the noninflectionality of the imperfect verb accompanied by the ن of the feminine plural; however, this is incorrect; the dispute exists, and among those recognizing it is Professor Abū al-Ḥassan ibn ʿUṣfūr (Andalusian philologer, 1200 - 1264 A.D.) in his commentary on Al-Īdāh.

* * *

وكل حرف مستحِق للفِینا
والاَصْل في البِنِي أن يَسکَنا
ومنه ذو فتح ذو كسر وضم
كأين، أمْس، حَینث، والساکین، كَم

(And each particle is rightfully indeclinable, and the origin of indeclinability is with sukūn; and among them are those with fatha, kasra, and damma, such as حَینث، أمْس، كَم، and, with sukūn, كَم).

All the particles are indeclinable, since nothing occurs which requires their inflection in order to be indicated by them. For example,
in أخذت من الدراهم، the concept of portioning is provided by the word مين without inflection.

The original essence of the indeclinable is that it occur with sukūn, since this is simpler (lighter) than a short vowel, and the indeclinable does not take a vowel except for the purpose of avoiding contiguity of consonants. This vowel may be fatha, as in إن قام أين, and kasra, as in أحمد and حين. or damma, as in حيث when the latter is functioning as a noun, and متن when the latter is a particle [taking a prepositional object]. As for sukūn, we have أصل, اضطراب, كم.

It has been learned from the examples quoted that the indeclinable which ends in kasra or damma does not occur in verbs, but rather in nouns and particles, while the indeclinable ending in fatha or sukūn may occur in nouns, verbs, and particles.

***

والرفع والنصب إجعلاً إعراباً
لا اسم وفعل تحتو: لن أهاي
ولا اسم قد خصص بالجر كما
قد خصص الفعل بأن ينجز مما
Make the nominative and the accusative inflections of nouns, as in لَنَّ أُهَابِي; while the genitive is peculiar to nouns, and the jussive to verbs; make the nominative with دَامِمَةٍ, the accusative with فَثَّا, and the genitive with كَسْرَا, as in ذَكُرُ اللَّهُ عَبْدُهُ يَسْرُرُ; and make the jussive with سُكُنٍ; any others are substitutes (for these mentioned), as in "...(the long vowels on أَخُو and بَنِي)...".

The types of inflection are four: the nominative(/indicative), the accusative(/subjunctive), the genitive, and the jussive. As for the nominative(/indicative) and the accusative(/subjunctive), they are shared by nouns and verbs, as in إِنَّ رَبِّي لَنْ يُقَومُ رَبِّي يُقَومُ; while the genitive is peculiar to nouns, as in بَيْنُهُ وَبَيْنُهُ, and the jussive to verbs, as in لَمْ يُضْرِبْ.

The nominative(/indicative) is indicated by دَامِمَةٍ, the accusative(/subjunctive) by فَثَّا, the genitive by كَسْرَا, and the jussive by سُكُنٍ.
sukūn; the exception occurs when substitutes for these are used. For example, the و substitutes for the damma in أَخُوٍ, and the ي for kasra in بَنِيٍ, as in the verse above. He will mention after this the circumstances of this substitution.

* * *

Wareq yaz-man-alif; wa-an-insin-man-alif;
wa-i-jent-r-biba'; ma min al-asmaa-asabin'  

(Make the nominative with و, the accusative with ٰ, and the genitive with ي in the nouns which I will describe).

He begins the explanation of that which is inflected by the substitution which was previously mentioned, and means, by the nouns which he will describe, the six nouns: وَفُوَّهُ, هَنُّ, حَمُّ, أَخُ, أَبُ, ذَوُّ. These are suffixed with و in the nominative, as in جَاءَ أَبُو; وَرَأَيْتُ أَبَاهُ; and with ي in the accusative, as in مَرْزَتُ بَابِيِهِ. It is well known that they are inflected with letters; the و substituting for the damma, the ٰ for the fatha, and the ي for the kasra; and it is to this that the author refers with the words "Make the nominative with و", etc. The truth is that they are inflected
with short vowels implied in the ُو, the ُل, and the ُي; that is, the
nominative occurs with a damma implied in the ُو, the accusative by a
fatha implied in the ُل, and the genitive by a kasra implied in the ُل. By
this correct method, we do not have the substitution previously mentioned
of one thing for another.

* * *

من ذاكَ "ذو"; إنَّ صاحبَة أبأطا والنَّذمَ حينَ الميمَ منهُ بادًاً
(Of these is ذو if possession is meant; and ذؤ when the م is
separated from it).

That is, of the nouns nominative by ُو, accusative by ُل, and genitive
by ُي, we have ذو ذو and ذو ذو; however, he stipulates for ذو that it be with
the meaning of "possessor", as in جاءني ذو مال, that is, صاحبَة مال,
and this is the intended meaning of the words "if possession is
meant"; that is, if possession is signified. And with that he excludes the
ذو of the Tayy tribe; for it does not indicate possession, but has the
meaning of (the relative pronoun) "that", and does not take any form
like ذي, with the meaning of possessor; on the contrary, it is indeclinable
and takes a final ُو for the nominative, accusative, and genitive, as
في 13 جل، كلا، وهم، والنكتة في هذا الأخير أحسنون وقري أبو، وثيابيه، ينذّرها وقصّرها من تنتصبين أشنّه. (حم، أبو، هن) هنّ، and the incompleteness (biliterality) is preferable in this last; in أبو وأب and the two following it, incompleteness is rare; their ending in weak letters is better known).

This means that أبو، أخ، and حم have the same vowel pattern as and، which were mentioned previously: they take و in the nominative، and ي in the accusative، and حم in the genitive، as in هذا أبوه مرن، يأه، وأخيم، رأيت، أباه، وأخاه، وحماه، وأخوه وحموه． These are the well-known forms of the three، and the author will mention two other forms of them.

As for هن، it is considered better Arabic for it to be inflected with actual short vowels appearing on the ن، without final weak letters، as
It is this to which he refers with the words, "incompleteness is preferable in this last"; that is, incompleteness in هن is preferable to its completion (ending in a weak letter), which is permissible but very rare, as in هذا هنوه، رأيت هناء، and Al-Farra' (Kufan grammarian, 757 - 822 A.D.) has disputed the permissibility of the completion, but he is refuted by Sibuwaih's narrative of the completion as being (found in the speech) of the Arabs, and he who has first-hand knowledge is more reliable than he who does not.

And the author indicates, with the words "in أب and the two following it, incompleteness is rare", the two remaining forms of أب and the other two nouns (خ and حم): one is with incompleteness, that is, the elision of the و, the ل, and the ي, and inflection with actual short vowels appearing on the ب, the خ, and the م, as in هذا أبَهَ وأَخَهَ وَحَمَهَ، رأيت أبَهَ وأَخَهَ وَحَمَهَ, and مورتُ بأبي وأخي وحمنه, and this is seen in the verse:

ياهو يقنتدي عندي في الكرم، ومن ينشابه أبَهَ فما ظلَّم

This form of أب is rare, as he has said: "It is rare in أب and in the
two following nouns"; that is, the form with incompleteness is rare.

The other form of أب and the two nouns following it is with ٰ for the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive, as in

\[
\text{هذا أباه وأخاه}.
\]

We find this form in the words of the poet:

\[
\text{إن أباه وأب أباه}.
\]

The sign of the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive (in these nouns) is a short vowel implied in the ٰ as it is in the case of the alif maqṣura; this form is more common than the incomplete (biliteral).

The gist of what he mentions is that there are three forms for each of أب, أخ, and حم: the best known of them takes final و, ٰ, or ي; the second takes ٰ in all three cases; the third has the three (weak) letters elided, and is rare. He also mentions that there are two forms of هن: one with incompleteness, and it is the better known; and one with completion (with final weak letters), and it is rare.
(The condition of this inflection is that it not be followed by the possessive ي of the first person, as in جا أحْوَ أَبْيك...).

The grammarians have mentioned that there are four conditions upon the inflection of these nouns with letters:

The first condition is that they be the first terms of idāfa; this excludes those nouns not in construct, which are inflected with actual short vowels, as in مَرْزَةُ بَأْبِي، رَأْيَتْ أَبَا، and مَراْئَةُ بَأْبِي، وهذا أَبِي.

The second condition is that they be in construct with something other than the possessive ي of the first person, as in هذَا أَبُو زَيْنِد، وَاَخْوَهُ وَحُمْوَهُ; for if they were in construct with the first-person possessive ي they would be inflected with implied short vowels, as in مَرْزَةُ بَأْبِي، رَأْيَتْ أَبِي، وهذا أَبِي. The discussion of that with which they would then be inflected will follow.

The third condition is that they be non-diminutive, excluding thereby the diminutive; for the latter are inflected with actual short vowels, as in رَأْيَتْ أَبْنِيّ زَيْنِد وَذْوَيِّ وَذاَكِ بَأْبِيّ، وهذا أَبِيّ زَيْنِد وَذْوَيِّ مَا لِيّ. 

And the fourth condition is that they be singular in number, thereby excluding both plurals and duals; for if they were plural, then they would be inflected with actual short vowels, as in 

\[ \text{مَرْتُ بَابُي، زِيّدُ وَذَوُّيُ مَالٍ} \]

\[ \text{مَرْتُ بَابُي، زِيّدُ وَذَوُّيُ مَالٍ} \]

And if they were dual, then they would take the inflection of the dual: ٓ in the nominative, and ٓ in the accusative and genitive, as in 

\[ \text{مَرْتُ بَابُي، زِيّدُ وَذَوُّيُ مَالٍ} \]

The author—may God almighty grant him mercy!—mentioned none of these four except the first two conditions, then referred to them with the words, “And the condition for this inflection is that it not be followed by the possessive ٌ of the first person”; that is, the condition for inflection of these nouns with (weak) letters is that they be followed in construct by something other than this ٌ. Thus it has been learned that they must be in construct, and that this must be with something other than the first-person possessive ٌ.

And know that ٓٓ is not used except in construct, and then not with a pronoun but with an actual substantive, non-adjectival noun, as
in جاءني ذو قائم; جاءني ذو مال, is not a permissible construction.

* * *

بالألف ارْفِعَ المُفْتَنَى, وكَاَلا

إذا بِمُصْنِمْن مَضَافَا وَصَيْلا

كَبَنْتَا كَذَاكَ, ائْنَان, وَايَنْتَان

كُبْنَان, وَابْنَان يَجْنُر يَان

وَتَخْلَفْ النُّيَا فِي جَمِيُّهَا الأَلْفَ

جرًا وَحَضْنًا بعَدَّ فَتَحٍّ قَدْ آلِفُ

(Make with ل the nominative of the dual, and of لا if connected in construct with a pronoun, and of كاَلا if connected in the dual, and of ائْنَان, ائْنَان, and كَبَنْتَا likewise; and of كَبَنْتَا كَذَاكَ, ائْنَان, and كُبْنَان, وَابْنَان يَجْنُر يَان, and in all of them the y takes the place of ل in the genitive and the accusative after the usual fatha).

The author--may God almighty grant him mercy!--has mentioned that the six nouns are among those in which the (weak) letters take the place of short vowels, and the discussion of them has preceded. Then he mentioned the dual, which is inflected with (weak) letters.
And its definition: "a word indicating duality in number by a final letter of increase, lending itself to reduction, and to the conjunction of like things". Thus we include by "a word indicating duality in number" the dual, such as الزيدان, or other words indicating duality such as شَتْمَسْع; yet we exclude شَتْمَسْع with the condition of (indicating duality) "by (final) increase"; we also exclude, by the condition "lends itself to reduction", words such as ائشَنَان; for the increase cannot be dropped, and one cannot say "ائشَنَان". We exclude, by the requirement "lending itself to the conjunction of like things", that which is capable of reduction but which involves the conjunction of dissimilar things, as in القَمْرَان; for it is capable of reduction, giving قَمْر, yet there can also be joined to it a dissimilar thing, as in قَمْر وشَتْمَسْع, which is meant by the expression القَمْرِ وشَتْمَسْع.

The author referred with his words, "make the nominative of the dual and of كِلَا with ٰ", to the fact that the dual is made nominative with ٰ, likewise those things which resemble the dual, which include anything (indicating duality) for which the definition of the dual does not hold true. The author refers to them with the words "and of كِلَا"; for that which
indicates duality with a final increase or the like, and which does not conform to the definition, is nevertheless inflected like the dual. Such are اثنان, كلا, and which does not conform to the definition. But كلا and كلا are not inflected like the dual except when in construct with pronouns, as in: مترجم كلية، جاءو كلاهما، رأيت كلية، جاءو كلاهما، also, رأيت كليتهما، جاءو كلاهما, and مرت بكتيتهم. If in construct with an actual noun, they end in كلا for the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive, as in جاءو كلا الرجلين، وكلنا المرأتين، الرجلين وكلنا المرأتين, and مرت بكتيتهم, of this the author said, "and كلا' if joined in construct to a pronoun."

Then he explained that اثنان and اثنان have the same [previously-mentioned] inflectional vowel pattern as اثنان and اثنان, since the former are inflected like the dual, and the latter are actual duals. Then the author--may God almighty grant him mercy!--mentions that the ي takes the place of كلا in the dual and in those elements agreeing with it in the accusative and genitive cases, and that the vowel preceding the ي cannot be other than فتحة, as in مترجم الرجلين كليتهما, and
he thus draws a distinction from the plural, which cannot be preceded by other than kasra, as in 

The gist of what he mentions is that the dual and that which is inflected like it take ِ in the nominative, and ُ in the accusative and genitive, as is well known; the correct interpretation is that inflection in the dual and its like occurs with short vowels implied in the ِ of the nominative and in the ُ of the accusative and genitive.

And that which the author mentioned of the dual and its like taking ِ in the nominative and ُ in the accusative and genitive, is well known in the speech of the Arabs; yet there are among the Arabs those who make the dual and its like with ِ in all cases: nominative, accusative, and genitive. Thus they say:

"مَرَّتُ بَالْزَِيْنِدَانْ كِلاهَمَا" and "جِيَاءُ الْزَِيْنِدَانْ كِلاهَمَا."

***

وَأَرَفَّعِ الْبَوَارِ وَبِيْنَا أَجْرَرْتُ وَأَنْصَبْتُ
سَالِمُ جَمِيعُ عَامِرِ وَمُدْنِبِ

(And make the nominative of the sound plurals of عَامِرِ and
The author mentioned two categories inflected with (weak) letters: one is the six nouns, and the other is the dual; both have already been discussed. Then he mentions in this verse the third category, which is the sound masculine plural and those elements in agreement with it. Its inflection is with ٰو in the nominative, and with ی in the accusative and genitive.

And he indicates, with the words "عُمانِر و مَدَّنَبِب", that which takes this form of the plural, and it is of two types: concrete noun (جَامِد) and adjective. He stipulates, in the case of the substantive, that it be a proper name, masculine, rational, devoid of the feminine ئ, and devoid of composite construction (تُرَكَبِب); for if it were not a proper name, it would not be pluralized with the ٰو and the ن; thus one does not say, with رُجَّلُون*, رُجَّل, though that would be permissible if it were diminutive, as in رُجَّل/رُجَّلُون, since this is adjectival. And if it were a proper name other than masculine, it would likewise not be pluralized with ٰو and ن; for one cannot say, with رَيْبُون, رَيْب. The same is true if it were a masculine proper name, but not of a rational
being; for one cannot say, with لا حِيَق--as the name of a female horse--لا حِيَق: If the masculine proper name had the feminine ـح, it could likewise not take the sound masculine plural; for one cannot say, with طلّحُون, طلّحَة, though the Kufans permitted it. And finally, it cannot be of composite construction, since one does not say, with سَيِّبُوْيْهُون, سَيِّبُوْيْه, though some grammarians allowed it.

In the case of the adjectival, he stipulates that it be an adjective, masculine, rational, devoid of the feminine ـح, not of the form فَعَّالِن فَعَّالِ, or of the form فَعَّالِن فَعَّالِ, and not of that in which the masculine and feminine take the same form. This excludes "masculine adjectives" which are really feminine (i.e., masculine in form, but feminine in meaning); for with حائص ("menstruating"), one cannot say "حائصُون". And the stipulation "rational" excludes those masculine adjectives describing other than rational beings, since one cannot say of حائصُون---with the meaning of "female horse"--"سابقُون". The condition "devoid of the feminine ـح" excludes those adjectives which refer to masculine rational beings, but which contain the feminine ـح, such as عَلاْ مُون; for one cannot say "علاْ مُون". And with the condition, "not
of the form 
"أَفْعَلْ/فَعَلَاءٌ", we exclude those adjectives which are of this form, such as ْحَمْرَاءٌ, whose feminine form is ْحَمْرَأَتٌ, and of which one cannot say "ْحَمْرَأَتٌ.  We likewise exclude those adjectives of the form سَكَرَانٌ/سَكَرَانِ, such as سَكَرَانٌ and سَكَرَانِ, for one cannot say "سَكَرَانِ.  Also excluded are those adjectives in which the masculine and the feminine take the same form, as in صَبْرُورٍ and جَرْجِيحٌ, since one says "أمَّرَ آ صَبْرُورٍ" and "رَجْل صَبْرُورٍ", and "أمَّرَ آ جَرْجِيحٍ" and "رَجْل جَرْجِيحٍ"; thus they cannot be pluralized by the sound forms جَرْجِيحُونٍ/صَبْرُورُونٍ.  

So the author—may God grant him mercy!--has indicated those substantives pluralized according to the previously-mentioned conditions, and عامِرٍ is among them, since it is the proper name of a masculine being endowed with reason, and is devoid of the feminine ُه and of composite construction; thus one may pluralize it with عامِرونٍ.  He also indicated the adjectival first mentioned with his words "وَمَدْنَبٍ"; for it refers to a masculine being endowed with reason, is devoid of the feminine ُه, is not of the patterns فَعَلُونٍ/فَعَلَاءٌ أَفْعَلْ/فَعَلَاءٌ, and is not among those in which the masculine and the feminine take the
same form; thus it is pluralized with the form مَذْدَخِبُونَ.

* * *

وَشَيْءٌ ذِينَ، وَبَعْضُ عَشَرُونَا
وَبَابِهَ اللَّحْقِ، والَّذِينَ
أَوَّلُونَ، وَعَالِمُونَ، عَلَّبَتِيْدُونَ
وَأَرْضَانَ شَجُّدَ، والَّذِيْدُونَ
وَبَابِهَ، وَمِثْلُ حُبْنِ قُدْمَ يَتْرَدُدُ
ذَا الْبَابِ، وَهُنَّ عَدُدُ قُوْمٍ يَتْرَدُدُ

(Like these two, عَشْرُونَ and its like are treated this way, as are أَرْضُونَ عَالِمُونَ أَوَّلُونَ، أَوَّلُونَ عَالِمُونَ; and أَرْضُونَ is irregular, as is سَبْنُونَ and its like; the type which is like حُبْنِ may be encountered, and it is common with some).

The author--may God grant him mercy!--refers, with the words "Like these two", to that which resembles عَامِرٌ, i.e., all proper names possessing the required characteristics previously mentioned; names such as مُحْمَدُونَ and إِبْرَاهِيمُ مُحْمَدُ, of which one can say "مُحْمَدُونَ" and "إِبْرَاهِيمُونَ".

He also refers to that which resembles مَذْدَخُبٌ, i.e., all adjectivals
possessing the required characteristics, like the ضرَّاب الأفاضل, of which one says "الضرَّاب الأفاضل". And with the words "Like these two, عشْرُون", he refers to that which is treated like the sound masculine plural in its inflection; that is, with و in the nominative, and ي in the accusative and genitive.

The sound masculine plural is that which allows the construction of a singular, and in which is found the previously-mentioned conditions. For that which has no singular form, or has a singular not meeting all the conditions, is not a sound masculine plural, but is treated as one; thus عشْرُون and its class—the numbers ثلاثون تسعون—to are treated inflectionally like sound masculine plurals, while not actually being sound masculine plurals, since they have no singular forms; that is, one cannot say "عُشْرَ". Likewise, أهَلْون is treated as a sound masculine plural, since it has a singular—Aceptar—which does not conform to the given conditions; that is, it is a common noun like أهَلْ. Rَجُل is treated in like fashion, since it has no singular form, as well as عَالِمُون, the plural of which, like Rَجُل, is a common noun. Also عَالِمُون, the name of highest heaven, since it does not conform to the conditions in not
referring to a rational being, and أرْضُون, the plural of أرْض, which is a feminine common noun. Finally, we have سنة, plural of سنة, also a feminine common noun. All of these are treated inflectionally like sound masculine plurals without being such, since, as mentioned, they do not possess all the required characteristics.

And with the words "سنون and its like", the author referred to the class of nouns like سنة, which is all those triliteral nouns whose third radical has been elided and replaced with the feminine ا, and which had no broken plural, like مئون/ماثة and مـبـان/ثـبـة. This usage is widespread in these nouns, and if they are given broken plurals like شـبـاء/شـبـاء, these are not used except as an abnormality, as in ظـبـة; for they have given it a broken plural in the form of ظـبـة, and also pluralized it with و in the nominative and with ي in the accusative and genitive, giving ظـبـن و ظـبـن. And with the words "the type like حـبِين may be encountered", he refers to the fact that ي سنين and the like may retain the رأـيْت, هذه سنين, and مررت بسنين, and may remove the tanwin if you desire,
but there is disagreement as to the frequency of this usage; the correct view is that it is not frequently used, and (knowledge of) it is restricted to having been heard (spoken by the early Arabs). Among the examples of it are the words of the prophet (peace be upon him): "للهم اجعل عليهم سنيناً كسينين يوسف" in one of the two versions, and likewise the poet has said:

[The (quoted) evidence indicates treating like in inflection with short vowels, and the keeping of ن in idāfa].

* * *

ودون مجموع ومما بتضخم
فاقتت وقدل من بكسره تطه
ودون ما تأتي والملحق بببه
بعكس ذلك استعملوه فاقتتيبه

(Make with fatha the ن of the plural and that which is treated like it; for few are those who pronounce it with kasra; but they used in the opposite manner the ن of the dual and of that which is treated as dual, so take note).
The *fatha* is correct for the ن of the plural and of that which is treated like the plural, though it may take *kasra* as an abnormality, as in the verse:

وفيما زعمت عائشة، وأذكر ذلك إلمان أخر

and also in:

أكل الدهن حبل وارتحال
أما يشبه علي ولا يشبه؟
وماذا تبنتي الشكْر**اء** منتي
وقد جاوزت حنفية الأربعين؟

And this *kasra* on the ن is not a dialectic variant, regardless of whoever may assert such.

And the *kasra* is correct for the ن of the dual and of those things treated as duals, though it may take the *fatha* as a dialectic variant, as in the verse:

على أحنان ذي نين استفلكت عيني
فما هي إلا لمحنة وتغيب

So the meaning of the words of the author--may God almighty grant him mercy!--is that the *fatha* on the ن of the dual is like the *kasra*
on the ن of the plural in terms of rarity, but this is not correct; rather, the kasra on the ن of the plural is an abnormality while the fatha on the ن of the dual is a dialectic variant, as we have previously presented. And in the case of the latter, is the fatha limited (in occurrence) to (the case of) the ي (of the dual oblique), or does it belong both to it and to the ٰ (of the dual nominative)? These are the two views, and the words of the author are indicative of the latter.

As an example of the fatha following the ٰ, we have the words of the poet:

of which it has been said that it is contrived, though no argument has been advanced to support this.

* * *

(And that which has been pluralized with ت and ٰ takes kasra in both the genitive and the accusative).

When finished speaking of that in which the (weak) letters take the
place of short vowels, he began to mention that in which one short vowel takes the place of another, and it has two categories: the first is the sound feminine plural, as in "مَسْلُوبَاتٍ"; and in specifying "sound", we have excluded the broken plural, or that which does not contain its singular form within itself, as in هُنُود. The author--may God almighty grant him mercy!-- refers to the sound feminine plural with the words "and that which has been pluralized with ت and ل", that is, which has been pluralized with the ل and the ت as letters of increase, and thus excludes plurals such as قَضَاة, whose ل is not a letter of increase, but has taken the place of a radical which is ي, since the original form is قَضَيْنَة; it also excludes plurals such as أُبْنِيَات, for its ت is a radical, and the intended reference is to that in which the ل and the ت are the cause for indication of plurality, as in هِنَدَات; it thus excludes such plurals as أُبْنِيَات and قَضَاة. And it is clear that there was no need for him to say "with ل and ت as letters of increase"; for the ب in بَيْتا is connected with the word "جَمِيع".

The regimen of this plural is that it take دَامَمَا in the nominative, and كَسْرَا in the accusative and the genitive, as in جَاهِني هِنَدَات.
Morōt, bēndat, and ra'īt, ḥandaṭ. The kasra stands in place of the fatha (in the accusative), and there are some who claim that this plural form is indeclinable in the accusative case; however, this is groundless, since there is nothing which would dictate its indeclinability.

* * *

Kāda aʿlāt, wa-lādhi aš-ṣammā qaḍ jāmiʿ.

- Kāḍurraṭ - fīhi ḏa ʿainā waʿaṣma ḍabbāl.

(Like aʿlāt, and that which has been made into a name, such as aḍurraṭ; in them it is also accepted).

He indicates, with the words "like aʿlāt", that aʿlāt takes the same vowel pattern as the sound feminine plural in that its accusative is with kasra; however, it is not a sound feminine plural, since it contains no singular form, but is treated inflectionally as a sound feminine plural.

He then refers, with the words "and that which has been made a name", to those names which have been made from this plural form, and which follow its inflectional pattern, such as aḍurraṭ; it takes kasra in the accusative as it did before having been used as a name, and the tanwīn does not leave it; thus we have aḍurraṭ. Aḍurraṭ, 'aḍurraṭ, 'aḍurraṭ.
and 

\[ مَرْتَبَذَرُعَاتٍ \]

This is the correct view, though there are two others: one is that it takes \textit{damma} in the nominative and \textit{kasra} in the accusative and genitive, with the \textit{tanwin} removed, as in 

\[ هذَهُ أَذْرَعَاتٍ رَأِيَنَتْ أَذْرَعَاتٍ مُرْتَبَذَرُعَاتٍ \]

and the other is that it takes \textit{damma} in the nominative and \textit{fatha} in the accusative and genitive, again without \textit{tanwin}, as in 

\[ مَرْتَبَذَرُعَاتٍ رَأِيَنَتْ أَذْرَعَاتٍ هذَهُ أَذْرَعَاتٍ مُرْتَبَذَرُعَاتٍ \]

It is seen in the verse:

\[
\text{بَيْنَتْ رَنْتُهَا مِنَ أَذْرَعَاتٍ أَهْلَكُهَا}
\]

that is, with \textit{kasra} and \textit{tanwin} on the \textit{ت} as per the first view; with \textit{kasra} and no \textit{tanwin} as per the second; and with \textit{fatha} and no \textit{tanwin} as per the third.

***

\[
	ext{وَجَرُّ بالفُتْحَةِ مَسْلَأَةٌ لا يُنفَّضُ نَدْرَفْ}
\]

\[
	ext{ما لم يُضَفْ أَوْ يَنْكُ بَعْدَ "ال" رَدْرَفْ}
\]

(And make with \textit{fatha} the genitive of that which is not fully inflected when it is not in \textit{idāfa}, or when it does not follow the definite article).
With this verse he makes reference to the second category of that in which one short vowel takes the place of another: the non-fully-inflected (diptote) nouns, whose regimen calls for the dama in the nominative, as in جاء أحمد; the fatha in the accusative, as in رأيت أحمد; and the fatha in the genitive as well, as in مرت بأحمد، in which the fatha takes the place of the kasra. This occurs if the noun is not in idäfa or does not come after the definite article; for if in idäfa, it takes kasra in the genitive, as in جاء أحمد كنم. This is likewise the case if the ل (of the definite article) are connected with the noun, as in مرت بالأحمد; then it takes kasra in the genitive.

* * *

واجمل ليتحو فيتملсан النوثا رقماً وتدعين وتستتعلانون وحدفتها للجزم والنصب سببه كلم تكوني ليهر ومي مظلمة

(And make with ن فيتملسان in the indicative, as well as تدعين تستتعلانون; and their elision is the mark of the jussive and the subjunctive, as in لم تكوني...).
When he had finished talking about those nouns inflected with substitution (of short vowels), he began the discussion of verbs which are inflected by substitution, of which there are five examples. He indicated, with “the likes of بَلَغَنَان”, each verb containing the ِل of duality, regardless of whether it begins with ي, as in بَلَغَنَان, or with بَلَغَرَان, as in بَلَغَرَان; with “as well as عليه”, he referred to each verb to which is joined the ي of the second-person feminine singular, as in أَلْحَنْ تَذْرِبِينَ; and with “and as he referred to each verb to which is joined the ِن of the plural, as in أَلْحَنْ تَذْرِبُونَ, whether it begins with ي, as just given, or with بَلَغَنَان, as in بَلَغَنَان.

Thus these five examples—and they are بَلَغَنَان, تَذْرِبَان, تَذْرِبُونَ, تَذْرِبِينَ, and بَلَغَنَان—are made indicative with retention of the ِن, and are made jussive and subjunctive with its elision; thus in them the ِن takes the place of the short vowel which is دَامِمة as in الزُّيَّدَان, for بَلَغَنَان is an imperfect indicative verb, and the sign of its indicativeness is the retention of the ِن. It is made jussive and subjunctive by the elision of the ِن, as in الزُّيَّدَان لن يَبُثَوْما و لَم يَخْتَرَجا, and the sign of the jussive and the subjunctive is the dropping of the ِن from
And as in His words (be He exalted): "I and those who call those nouns defective which are like مُصَنَّعٍ and مَرَثَّةٍ;

for in the first all of the inflections have been implied, and it is that which has been shortened {مَقْصُورٍ}; and the second is deficient, and its accusative is visible, while its nominative is implied, likewise its genitive.

He begins the discussion of the defective declension in nouns and verbs, and mentioned that those given as examples--مُصَنَّعٍ and مَرَثَّةٍ--are called defective, and indicated with مُصَنَّعٍ that which has a final integral ٰل preceded by فِثْعٍ, such as فَحَّاً and عِصْصاً and
with the referred to that which has a final ی preceded by kasra, such as الداعية القاضي.

He then pointed to the fact that that which ends in ی preceded by fatha has implied in it all the inflectional vowels: the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive; and that it is called maqsūr (shortened), which is the inflected noun having a final integral ی. By specifying the noun, he has drawn a distinction from verbs like يُنفَع; by mentioning inflection, he excludes the indeclinable, such as إذا; in specifying the ی, he eliminates the deficient, such as النور gripped by لا أفـ یدن; whose discussion will follow; and with the condition “integral”, he excludes the dual in the nominative case, as in الزیـ ينن; for its ی is not integral, since it changes to ی in the genitive and the accusative, as in زیـ ينن. 

And with the words “and the second is deficient”, he referred to المـ تنقـ; for the deficient is the noun with a final integral ی preceded by kasra, such as المـ تنقـ ی. In specifying the noun, he has drawn a distinction from verbs such as يُفـ ير; with the mention of inflection, he has excluded indeclinables such as اللَـ تنقـ; by specifying the preceding kasra he has eliminated that which has a preceding sukūn, such as
and رَمَيَةٌ طَبْنُيٌّ; for this type of defective (noun) has the same final vowel pattern as the sound (noun) in that it takes damma in the nominative, fatha in the accusative, and kasra in the genitive.

And the regimen of this deficient noun is that the accusative is visible in it, as in رَأَيْنَتْ القاضِبِي. And God (be He exalted) has said: يا فَخُوُّ مَنَا أَجْبِيَّكَ دَاوُيٌّ اللَّهُ. The nominative and the genitive are implied in it due to their weight (difficulty of pronunciation) on the ي, as in مَرْتُ بالقاضِبِي. And جاء القاضِبِي. Thus the sign of the nominative is an implied damma on the ي, while that of the genitive is an implied kasra on it.

And it has been learned from what the author has mentioned that in nouns there is no final و preceded by damma, though this is found in the case of the indeclinable, as in هَوُّ; but it has not been found in inflectional nouns except in the six nouns in the nominative case, as in جاء أبُو. The Kufans have allowed this in two other situations; the first is that of verbs which have been used as names, such as يُدَعَ عَوَّ and يُعَفَّرَ و; and the second is that of words not of Arabic origin, such as قَمِّسَدَ و سَمِّسَدَ و.
(And any verb with a final ِ, ِّ, or ِّي is known as defective).

He refers here to the fact that the defective of verbs is that with a final ِ or ِّ preceded by damma, as in ِّيُغْفِزُو; a final ِّي preceded by kasra, as in ِّيُرُمِى; or a final ِّ preceded by fatha, as in ِّيُخْنِشَى.

(In the alif imply those other than the jussive; and show the subjunctive in the likes of ِّيُرُمِى and ِّيُدْعَو; and in the two (verbs) imply the indicative, and elide in the jussive the three of them, performing a required regimen).

He mentions in these two verses the manner of inflection in the defective verb; thus he mentions that (the moods) other than the jussive--
and they are the indicative and the subjunctive--are implied in the ۸, as in ۸۸۸۸; for ۸۸۸۸ ۸۸۸۸ ۸۸۸۸ is an indicative, and the sign of its indicativeness is a damma implied on the ۸. Also in ۸۸۸۸; for ۸۸۸۸ ۸۸۸۸ is a subjunctive, the sign of which is a fatha implied on the ۸.

As for the jussive, it is visible, since in it the final letter is elided, as in ۸۸۸۸.

And with the words “show the subjunctive in the likes of ۸۸۸۸ and ۸۸۸۸, he points out that the subjunctive is visible in verbs having final ۸۸ or ۸۸, as in ۸۸۸۸ ۸۸۸۸ and ۸۸۸۸.

With the words “imply the indicative in the two of them”, he shows that the indicative is implied in the ۸۸ and the ۸۸, as in ۸۸۸۸ and ۸۸۸۸; and the sign of the indicative is a damma implied on the ۸۸ and the ۸۸.

With “and elide in the jussive the three of them”, he indicates that the three--and they are the ۸, the ۸۸, and the ۸۸--are elided in the jussive, as in ۸۸۸۸ ۸۸۸۸, and the sign of the jussive being the elision of the ۸, the ۸۸, and the ۸۸.

And the gist of what he has said is that the indicative is implied in
the ٰ, the ٰ, and the ِ; the jussive is visible in the three of them by their elision; and that the subjunctive is visible in the ٰ and the ِ, and is implied in the ٰ.

* * *
THE INDEFINITE AND THE DEFINITE

(Indefinite is: accepting ل الإال inducing (definiteness); or that which is standing in the place of the aforementioned).

The indefinite is that which accepts ل الإال, which then induces its definiteness, or that which stands for something which accepts ل الإال. An example of that which accepts the ل الإال inducing definiteness is ر جل, since one says "ر جل ي جل"; and with the condition "inducing in it definiteness", he draws a distinction from that which accepts ل الإال without the latter inducing definiteness in it: for example, عبّاس, ال عبّاس as a proper name. Indeed, you say "ال عبّاس", prefixing it with ل الإال; yet this does not induce definiteness in it since it is already definite before the prefixing of ل الإال to it. An example of that taking the place of something which accepts ل الإال is ذو, with the meaning of "possessor" (صاحب), as in جاهني ذو مال, that is, a possessor of wealth; for ذو is indefinite and does not accept ل الإال, but stands for صاحب, which does accept ل الإال, as in الصاحب.

***
That is, what is not indefinite is definite, and the latter is of six varieties: the personal pronouns, like هم; the demonstrative pronouns, like ذي; proper names, like هند; nouns prefixed with the, such as النَّفَلَام; the relative pronouns, such as الذي; and that which is in construct with one of them (وَمَا أَضِيفَ إِلَى وَاحِدٍ مِنْهَا), as in ابنني. We will speak about these varieties.

* * *

(And that which is of absence (third person) or presence (first or second person)—like هَوَأَدْتَ and هَوَأَدْتَ call them with pronouns).

He mentions that the pronoun is that which refers to the absent (third person), like هَوَأَدْتَ, or to the present, which is of two types: one which refers to the second person, like أَدْتَ, and the other which refers to the first person, such as أنا.)
(And of those having connection is that which does not come at the beginning, and which never follows إلاً by {the writer's or speaker's} choice, such as the بِي and the ك in الدِّينَ أَكْرَمُ مَنْ, and the هِي and the شِّبْهِ مَا مَلَّكُ).

The visible pronoun is divided into the attached and the independent. The attached is that which does not come at the beginning, such as the ك in أَكْرَمُ مَنْ and its like, and which does not occur after إلاً by one's choosing; for one does not say مَنْ أَكْرَمُ إِلاَّ ك, "though this has occurred as an anomaly in poetry, as in the verse:

أَعُوذُ بِرَبِّي عَزَّ النَّعْرِ شَرِّ مِنْ هَيْبَةِ نُفَضَّت

عليٌّ; فِي لِي عَوْضٌ إِلاَّ هُدْيُ نَحْصِرُرَ

and also in:

وَمَا عَلَيْنَا—إِذَا ما كَتَبَتْ جَارٌ تَنا
(For every pronoun indeclinability is necessary, and the form of that made genitive is like the form of that made accusative).

All the pronouns are indeclinable by their similarity to the particles in terms of invariability; thus they are not made diminutive, dual, or plural. And if it is established that they are indeclinable, then there are of them those in which the accusative and the genitive have a common form; and those are all the accusative and genitive attached pronouns, as in الَّذِي and the final يُحَبَّب. For the (final) كَ in أَكْرِمْتُكَ is in an accusative position, while that in بَلُكَ is in a genitive position; likewise, the هُ in إِنَّكَ is in an accusative position, while that in لَهُ is in a genitive position.

There is also that which has a common form for the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive, and it is (the attached pronoun) مَا، to which he refers in the verse:
(For the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive, "نا" is proper; as in لنا {genitive}, لى {accusative}, and لى {nominative}).

That is, the element ل is correctly used as for the nominative, as in لى; for the accusative, as in لى; and for the genitive, as in لى.

And among those (pronouns) used for the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive alike is لى; an example of it in the nominative is لى; in the accusative, مبى; and in the genitive, مبى.

Also used in all three cases is هم, an example of which in the nominative is هم; in the accusative, هم; and in the genitive, هم.

The author, however, did not mention هم and the لى since they do not correspond to ل in every respect; for ل is used for each of the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive with no change in meaning, and is an attached pronoun in each case. By contrast, the لى, though used as an attached pronoun in all three cases, does not have the same meaning in each case; rather, it indicates second person in the nominative, and first
person in the accusative and genitive. Likewise َهُمُّ, though having the same meaning in all three cases, is unlike َهُنُّ since it is an independent pronoun in the nominative case, but attached in the accusative and the genitive.

** ***

والَأَلْفِ وَٰلَّاَ وَٰلَّاَوْاَ وَٰلَّاَوْنُ لِمَا غَابُ وَغَيْرِهِمْ كَتَابًا وَآْوَلِهِمْ

(And the َل, the َو, and the َن are for the absent {third person} and others, as in َقَامَا and َعَلِمَهَا).

The َل, the َو, and the َن are among the nominative attached pronouns (subject markers), and indicate the third and second persons; examples of (their use in) the third person are َزَيَّدُونَ, َزَيَّدَانَ َقَامَأ, and َكَتَابًا َقَامُوا. Examples of (their use in) the second person are َأَعْلَمُوا َعَلِمَها, and َأَعْلَمُوا َعَلِمَهَا. With the words "and others" (وَغَيْرِهِمْ), the author allows the inclusion, in the category of "other than third person", of the first person in addition to the second person, and this is not good; for these three (letters) are the basis not of the first person, but rather of the second and third persons, as we have shown.
The pronoun is divided into the concealed and the prominent, and the concealed is further divided into that whose concealment is required, and that whose concealment is permissible. And what is meant by that whose concealment is required, is that which cannot be replaced by a substantive; while the meaning of that whose concealment is permissible, is that which can be replaced by a substantive.

The author mentions in this verse four of the situations in which concealment is required:

The first is that of the imperative verb addressed to the second person singular, such as ḍāl, whose implied subject is. But this pronoun may not be made prominent, since it cannot be replaced by a substantive; that is, one cannot say "". As for "", the acts to reinforce the implied pronominal subject in , and is not the subject of , the latter being complete.
without prominence of the pronoun; thus one says "إفْتَخَلَتْ". If the
imperative were addressed to a feminine singular, a dual, or a plural, the
pronoun would be prominent, as in إضْرَّبَوا إضْرَّبِنا إضْرَّبِينَ
and إضْرَّبِينَ.

The second is in the imperfect verb beginning with hamza, as in
أَوْفِقْ أَنَا; the implied subject is أَنَا, and if one said "أَوْفِقَ أَنَا", then the
أَنَا would serve to reinforce the concealed pronominal subject.

The third is in the imperfect verb beginning with ن, as in
دَخَّلْتُهُ; that is, (the concealed pronoun stands for) دَخْلَتْنِ.

The fourth is in the imperfect verb beginning with the الت of the
second person masculine singular, such as تَشْتَكِرُ أَنْتُ; that is, (the
concealed pronoun stands for) أَنْتِ. For if it were the second person
feminine singular, the dual, or the plural, then the pronoun would be
prominent, as in أَنْتَ تَفْتَخَلْلُونَ أَنْتَمَا تَفْتَخَلَّلُونَ أَنْتُمَا تَفْتَخَلَّلُوْنَ أَنْتُمُ تَفْتَخَلَّلُوْنَ.

This is what the author has mentioned regarding the situations in
which concealment of the pronoun is required.

An example of permissible concealment is زَيْبُ تَفْتَخَلْنِ.
that is, (the concealed pronoun stands for) ٰهوُ; and this pronoun
may be concealed, since it is replaceable by a substantive, as
in زِنْدَ تَقْصُومُ أبُوهُ, as well as in any verb acting as the predicate of
a masculine or feminine third-person singular, as in ٰعَدَ تَقْصُومُ, or in
that which has the equivalent meaning, as in ٰقَدِمُ; that is, (the
concealed pronoun stands for) ٰهوُ.

* * *

ودَوُ أَرْتَبَعَ وَآشَٰثُ، أَنا، ٰهوُ،
وآشَٰثُ، وَالْمَفْرَعُ لا تَشْتَبِيٰهُ
(The nominative and independent is أَنا، ٰهوُ، and the
branches do not resemble each other).

It has been previously mentioned that the pronoun is divided into
the concealed and the prominent, and the discussion of the concealed
variety has taken place. As for the prominent, it is divided into attached
and independent; the attached is nominative, accusative, and genitive, and
the discussion about that has taken place; while the independent is
nominative and accusative, but is not genitive.

The author has mentioned in this verse the independent nominative
pronouns, and they are twelve: أَنَا, the first person singular; أَنْنَ, the first person, plural or self-aggrandizing; أَنْتَ, the second person masculine singular; أَنْتِ, the second person feminine singular; أَنْتَمَا, the second person masculine and feminine dual; أَنْتُمْ, the second person masculine plural; أَنْتُنَّ, the second person feminine plural; هُوَ, the third person masculine singular; هِيَ, the third person feminine singular; هُمَا, the third person masculine and feminine dual; هُمُّ, the third person masculine plural; and هُنَّ, the third person feminine plural.

***

وَذَّ أَنْتَصَّابُ في أَنْتَصَّال، جَمِيلًا
إِيَّاَيُّ، والتَّحْتِيرُ لَنِس، مَشْكِبَّلًا.

(And that which is accusative in the independent was made like إِيَّاَيُّ, and the derivation {of the other forms} is not a problem).

He refers in this verse to the accusative independent pronouns, and they are twelve: إِيَّاَيُّ, the first person singular; إِيَّاكَا, the first person, plural or self-aggrandizing; إِيَّاكُ, the second person masculine singular; إِيَّاكِ, the second person feminine singular; إِيَّاكَمَا, the second person masculine and feminine dual; إِيَّاكُمُّ, the second person masculine plural;
* * *

(And by choice the independent does not occur if it is feasible for the attached to occur).

In each situation in which it is possible for the attached pronoun to be used, it is not permissible to refrain from using it in favor of the independent form, except in the cases which the author shall mention; for one does not say, for "أَكْنِ مَنْتَ إِيْتِاكَ" أَكْنِ مَنْتَ إِيْتِاكَ، since it is possible to use the attached form; thus one says "أَكْنِ مَنْتَ إِيْتِاكَ".

But if it is not possible to use the attached form, then the independent form is obligatory, as in "إِيْتِاكَ أَكْنِ مَنْتَ"; however, the pronoun has occurred in poetry in its independent form even though it is possible for the attached form to be used, as in the verse:
(And join or separate the of , and of that which resembles it; and in the case of , disagreement exists; likewise in I choose attachment, but others choose separation {of pronouns}).

He refers in these two verses to the situations in which it is permissible to use the pronoun in its independent form even though it is possible to use it in its attached form.

With "", he makes reference to that which takes two direct objects, the second of which was not originally (an equational) predicate, when they are both pronouns, as in ; so you may choose for the of either its connected form, as in , or
its independent form, as in سَلَتْنِي إِيَّاهُ; and this is likewise valid for all verbs resembling this one, as in أُعْطِينَتْكَ إِيَّاهُ أُعْطِينَتْكِهَا.

The meaning of the author's words is that the attached and independent forms of the pronoun are equally permissible in this case, and this is the meaning of the words of most grammarians; but the meaning of the words of Sībuwaih is that the attached form is obligatory in this case, and that the independent form is limited to poetic usage.

And with the words "in the case of disagreement exists", he refers to the fact that if the predicate of كان or its sisters is a pronoun, then its attached form and its independent form are both permissible, and that there has been disagreement about the choice between the two; the author has chosen the use of the attached form, while Sībuwaih chooses the independent, as in كُنْتَ إِيَّاهُ [as when you say, مَنْ كُنْتُ إِيَّاهُ "كُنْتَ إِيَّاهُ"].

The author likewise prefers the choice of the attached form in a case like that of خَلِيلُنِيَّهُ; that is, in the case of any verb taking two direct objects, the second of which was originally (an equational) predicate, when both are pronouns; but the method of Sībuwaih is that the
independent form is preferable in this case as well, as in حُجَّةٌ خَلَالٌ. The method of Sībuwaih is preponderant since, according to what he tells, it is the more commonly used by the Arabs, and he is the one who has spoken directly with them. Or as the poet has said (referring to the veracity generally ascribed to the accounts of Sībuwaih):

إِذَا قَالَتْ حَدَّامٌ فَتَصَدَّقَّوْهَا فَإِنْ تُقُولُ ما قَالَتْ حَدَّامٌ

(If Hadhām speaks, then believe her; for verily the [true] speech is what Hadhām speaks).

* * *

وَقَدْ مَنْ الأَخْصَصْ فِي آتِ الصَّالِ

وَقَدْ مَنْ مَا شَبَّتْ فِي آثَّ الصَّالِ

(And put first that which is more private in the attached, but put first whatever you like in the independent).

The pronoun of the first person is more private than that of the second person, and the pronoun of the second person is more private than that of the third person; and if there occur together two accusative pronouns, one of which is more private than the other, and if they are of the attached variety, then the more private of the two must be placed first.
Thus one says "أَعْطِيَتِيْنِيْهِمْ" and "الدُّرَّةِ هُمْ أَعْطِيَتْنِيْكَهُمْ", placing the ك and the ي, respectively, before the أ, since they are more private than the أ; that is, the ك is of the second person, the ي is of the first person, and the أ is of the third person, thus it is not permissible to place the third person first in the case of attached pronouns. One does not say, for instance, "أَعْطِيَتِهِمْ" or "أَعْطِيَتْهُونَ", though some have allowed this, and an example of it is found in Gharīb al-Hadīth of Ibn al-Athīr (Algerian-born grammarian, 1149 - 1209 A.D.)\(^22\), in which he relates the words of "Uthmān (may God be pleased with him): أَرَاحُمْنَا النِّبَاطِيلَ شَيْيَطانًا."

But if one of the pronouns is independent, then you have a choice: you may place the more private first if you wish, as in أَعْطِيَتِيْنِيْهِمْ إِيَاهُ and الدُّرَّةِ هُمْ أَعْطِيَتْنِيْكَهُمْ; or, if you wish, you may place first that which is not the more private, thus saying أَعْطِيَتْهُ إِيَاهُ or أَعْطِيَتْهُ إِيَاهُ. And he referred to this with the words "put first whatever you want in the independent", but what he has mentioned is not absolute, the prior placement of what is not the more private of independent pronouns being permissible only when there is no danger of confusion; if such confusion is feared, then such prior
placement is not permissible. For if one says "زید أعْطَتْكَ إِبَاه"،
the prior placement of the third person is not permissible, and one thus
cannot say "زید أعْطَتْهُ إِبَاه"، since it would then not be known
whether زِيد were the taker or the taken.

***

وفي آتِحاد الرُّتبة آنَزَم، فقسَّلَا
وَقَدْ يُبِيحُ النَّفَبِ فِيهِ وُقَسَّلَا

(And in the union of pronouns of the same person, separation is
necessary, though the third person may allow in it the attached).

If two pronouns occur together, and they are accusative and of the
same person--first person, second person, or third--then it is necessary that
one of them take the independent form, as in إِبَاهُ إِبَاهُ إِبَاه،
أَعْطَتْهُ إِبَاهُ، and أَعْطَتْكَ إِبَاهُ. The two pronouns may not
be connected, and one thus cannot say "أَعْطَتْشَبِينِي"،
"أَعْطَتْتَهُوْه"، or "أَعْطَتْكَكَّكَ". They may be connected, though,
in the third person provided they vary in form, as in الزُّبَيْدَانُ الْدُّرُّهُمُ،
أَعْطَتْشَهُمُهُ، and he referred to this (phenomenon in which one form
of the pronoun appears in a situation where the other form is actually
called for) in Al-Kāfiya with the words:

مَعَ أَخْتِلَافٍ مَا، وَشَحَوْتُ “ضَمَّتْنَتْ”

إِيَّاهُمُ الْأَرْضُ “الْضَّرْورَةُ، أَقْطَضَتْنَتْ”

(Though there be some controversy, necessity requires the likes of

“ضَمَّتْنَتْ إِيَّاهُمُ الْأَرْضُ”)

This verse may have been included in some printings of Al-Alfiyya, but does not belong to it; and with the words “requires the likes of ضَمَّتْنَتْ, etc.”, he refers to the fact that the use of the pronoun in its independent form is (sometimes) necessary (in verse) in an instance where the attached form would normally be called for, as in the verse previously discussed:

بالْبَاعِثِ النَّوَارِثِ الْأَمْوَاتِ فَدَدْ ضَمَّتْنَتْ

إِيَّاهُمُ الْأَرْضُ فِي دَهْرِ الدَّهْرِ يَارِبِ

***

وَقُبْلَ يَا السَّجَنَسَ مَعَ النَّفْعِ الْأَنْتَزَرِ

قُبْلَ وَقَائِتَهُ وَ “لَنْسِي” قد نَطَحَبُ

(And before the ي of the first person, with verbs the ن of protection is affixed; but "لَنْسِي” has occurred in poetry).
If the first-person ي is connected with the verb, then it is necessary to affix a ن which is called the of protection, and which is so called because it protects (separates) the verb from the kasra, as in أَكْرَمَ مَنِّي يَكُرُ مَنِّي. Its omission has occurred with as an anomaly in poetry, as in the verse:

عَدَّدَتْ قَوَّمِي كَعْبِدُ الْطَلَّبِ
إِذْ ذَهَبَ الْقَوَّمُ الْكَبَّارُ لَيْسِي

And there is disagreement with regard to the verb of wonder (أَفْتَنِى فِي التَّمَجِّب): does the ن of protection attach to it or not? Thus one says "ما أَفْتَنَرُ بِنِي إِلَى عَنْصُوٍ الله" , and among those who do not attach the ن أَفْتَنَرُ بِنِي إِلَى عَنْصُوٍ الله" ; its attachment, however, is correct.

***

وَ"لَيْتِي" فَنَشْأَ وَ"لَيْتِي" حَدَرًا
وعَمَّ "لَعَلَّ" آَمَنَّكُمْ وَكَنْ مُخْتَلِفُوا
في الْبَاقِيَاتِ وَآَضْطَرَرُوا خَتَنَّنَا
مَنْي بَعْضُ بَعْضٍ مَنْ قد سَلَفَنَا
(And "لَيْتِي" is widespread, while "لَيْتِي" is rare; and with
..."the reverse is true." And take your choice with the remainder; when necessary, some of those who have gone before have lightened عَدْنَى مَنْتَى and عَدْنَى مَنْتَى.

He mentions in these two verses the regimen of the نَّ of protection with the particles; thus he mentions لَيْتِنْ, and the fact that the نَّ of protection is not omitted from it except as an anomaly, as in the verse:

جَابَرَة إِذْ قَالَ لَيْتِنِي أَصَادِفَهُ وَتَلَبَّسَ جَلَّ مَالِي

And it is more common for it to be retained in the speech of the Arabs, and the Qur'an shows it with God almighty saying يَا لَيْتِنِي، كَنَّهُ مَعْهُمْ.

As for لَعَلَّ, he mentions that for it the reverse is correct; thus good Arabic requires that it be stripped of the نَّ, as in the words of the Almighty--speaking of Pharaoh--"لَعَلَّ أَبْتَغُ الْأَسْبَابَ". Indeed, the affixing of the نَّ is rare, as in the words of the poet:

فَتَعَلَّتْ أُعْبُرُ وَيْلُ وَمَعْلُوَبَي

أَخَذْتُ بِهَا قَبْرًا لَأَبْنِيَضَ مَاجِيـِضَ

Then he mentions that you have a choice with the remainder; that is, with the rest of the sisters of لَعَلَّ and لَيْتِنْ, and they are: أَنَّ، إِنَّ،
Thus you may say either of or or or

Finally, he mentions that and take the of protection; thus one says "" and "", with tashdid. But there are those who remove the and say "" and "", without tashdid. This is unusual, and is found in the words of the poet:

لاست من قيس ولا قيس مني

* * *

وفي لد كنتي لد نبي قلت، و ف قند النبي وقطنبي 오늘 الف أيضا قد ينبي

(And for is seldom used; but for قند النبي and قطنبي, the elision may also suffice).

He shows with this verse that, for لد كنتي, good Arabic calls for the affixing of the ن, as in the words of the Almighty: "" ""; and its omission is rare, occurring in the reading of those who read لد كنتي without tashdid on the ن.

And the more frequently-occurring forms of قند and have
the ن affixed, as in قَدْنَبي, while its omission is rare, as in حَسْنَبي, with the meaning of قَدْر. The forms with ن affixed and with ن omitted have occurred together in the following verse:

قدُنِي من نَصْر الْحَمْبِيْبَين قَدْرِي
ليَسُ الإِمَامُ بالشَّحَبِيج المُلْحِبَين

***
NOTES

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Though in Arabic the grammatical term مثبت, generally translated as “indeclinable”, is used for both nouns and verbs, “indeclinability” cannot be properly used in English as an attribute of verbs, for which “noninflectionality” will henceforth be used in this paper.
11. Ibid., p. 15.
12. Ibid., p. 235
13. Peter F. Abboud, et al., Elementary Modern Standard Arabic, vol. 2,
pp. 290-291.


18. No biographical information available.
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