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NOTICE.

This Fourth Part completes my work. It deals with ten processes—Imāla, Pause, the Oath, Alleviation of Hamza, Concurrence of Quiescents, Initials of Words, Augmentativeness of Letters, Substitution of Letters, Transformation of the Unsound, and Incorporation—not one of which, so far as I am aware, has received more than incidental and brief (not to say scanty) notice in the Arabic grammars of European authors. I venture, therefore, to hope that this novel presentment of them as separate and independent subjects, treated with a fulness commensurate with their importance, may prove useful and interesting to students of Arabic grammar.

The Index of References to the Kur‘ān is entirely the work of my friend, Mr. G. E. Ward, M. A. (Oxon.), a retired member of H. M.’s Indian Civil Service, to whom I am much indebted for this valuable compilation. And in the preparation of the remaining Indices I have been ably assisted by Mr. H. J. F. Arnold of the Theological College, Salisbury.

M. S. HOWELL.

7 March, 1911.
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO ABBREVIATIONS
OF REFERENCES.

At the end of the last prefatory note add

Whenever I say “Our Master”, my meaning is “the learned AlMadābighī”, [as to whom the present writer has no further information;] or, whenever I say “Our Master the Sayyid”, my meaning is “SBD”; or, whenever I say “AlBa‘d”, my meaning is “YH” (Sn. I. 3).

* A. After “printed in Egypt” insert “in 1288”.

AHD. ABū ḤANĪFA Aḥmad Ibn Dāwūd addīnawārī, the Grammarian, Lexicologist, Arithmetician, Astronomer, Botanist, and Historian (d. 281 or 282 or before 290), author of the Kitāb anNabāt and the Kitāb alAkhbār atTiwāl.

Am. Add

* Also his Exposition of the Evidentiary verses of the Book of S, cited from extracts printed by Jahn in his Notes on Sthawāhi’s Book.

ANI. The celebrated Ḥāfīz, and the Traditionist of the Age, ABū Nu‘aim Aḥmad Ibn ‘Abd Allāh alMihrānī alIsbāhānī asSuﬁ (b. 334 or 336, d. 430), author of the Ḥilyat alAuliya (Portraiture of the Saints) and the Tārikh Isbāhān (History of Isbāhān).

* ANJ. The Gloss (c. 1293) of ABU -NNAJA upon the CAJ, printed in Egypt in 1303.

AW. Read “ABU -IKĀSIM ‘ABD ALWĀRĪTH Ibn Sufyān Ibn Jubrūn, known as ALHARĪB, of the people of Kurītuba, the Lexicologist (b. 317, d. 395), one of the Masters of IAB”.

BB. After “Grammarians” add “Lexicologists, Philologists, or Readers”.
Bgh. The Ḥāfīz Muḥyī al-Sunna, or Rukn ad-Dīn, or Zākī Allāh, Abū Muḥammad Al-Husain Ibn Maṣūd, known as Al-Farrā', or Ibn Al-Farrā', Al-Baghawi (from Baghū or Baghshūr, a town in Khurāsān between Maṟv and Harāt), ash-Shāfī', the Jurist, Traditionist, and Commentator (d. 516, at, or past, 80 years of age), author of the Maṣāḥīḥ as-Sunna and other works.

* BK. The Burhān-i-Kāfī, a Persian Lexicon, by Maulānā Muḥammad Ḥusain Tabrizī, printed in Calcutta in 1274.

* CAj. The Commentary (c. 887) of Kh upon the Aj, printed in Egypt, with the Gloss of ANj, in 1303.

CHd. The celebrated Commentary, entitled the Kāfī (c. 654), on the Hd, by the author of the Text (see Hādī below), said by Syt in the BW to be much quoted by Jrb in his Commentary on the SH (see II. 1354, 1385, 1552, 1585, 1702, 1713, 1735).

[Syt's remark is applied in HKh. V. 860 (No. 11302) to Al-Hādī, a Commentary by the same author on another grammar of his, the Mabādī fi-Taṣrīf; but it properly belongs to the CHd mentioned in HKh. VI. 470-1 (No. 14334), as is clear from the description of the work in the Jrb and BW as "Sharḥ al-Hādī" (not Sharḥ al-Mabādī).

DAd. The Dīwān al-Adab, on Lexicology, by Frb.

DK. The Shaikh al-Islām Abu-l-Ḥasan 'Ali Ibn 'Umar al-Baghdādī, known as Ad-Dārākūṭnī (from Dārakūtn or Dār al-Kūtn, a large Ward in Baghdad), the celebrated Ḥāfīz and Shāfī' Jurist (b. 306, d. 385).

* Dm. For the second paragraph read "Also the Commentary entitled Ta'liḳ al-Fara'id 'alā Tashil al-Fawā'id (c. 820), by the same author upon the Tashil of IM, cited from extracts quoted in the SN, and latterly from an incomplete MS (copied in 1059) belonging to the India Office, Whitehall, London."
[This MS (No. 364 of Loth's Catalogue) contains an interesting passage in folios 8, 6, “The Shaikh TDT mentions, at the end of his Commentary on the syntactical Ḥājībiyya that IM sat in IH's class, and learnt from him, and profited by him; but I have not come upon this statement from any one else, nor do I know whence he took it, and God best knows the truth of the case". In the MS folios 8 and 5 are transposed, the proper order being 4, 8, 6, 7, 5, 9. The “syntactical Ḥājībiyya” is the Kāfiya of IH, on which TDT is said in HKh. V. 17 to have written “a great Commentary, like that of R.”.]

* Dn. The Shaikh al-Islām Abū 'Amr ʿUthmān Ibn Saʿīd al-Umawī (their freedman) al-Kurṭubi, known as ʿAd-Dānī (from his residence at Dāniya, a city in Spain, one of the governments of Balansiya), the Ḥāfiz, Reader, and Traditionist (d. 371, d. 444).


[On Abū Riyāsh see YR. I. 74.]

FB. The Faith al-Bārī, a great Commentary by IHjr upon the SB.

* Fhr. The Fihrista (Catalogue) of Books studied by its compiler, the Ḥāfiz Abū Bakr Muḥammad Ibn Khair al-ʿAmawī (with Faith of the Hamza) al-Iṣḥābīlī, the Reader, Grammarian, and Lexicologist (d. 502, d. 575 at age of 73), contemporary with IBshk, edited by Codera and Nībera from a MS written in 712.
[Pupil of IArb, IAt, ITr, and others. BM. 65 calls him “a Kurṭubi”, apparently because he conducted the service at the Cathedral of that city from 573 till his death there in 575.]

Fm. The Shaikh Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn ʿAlī al-Fawḍūmī, the Reader and Lexicologist (d. 770), author of the Msb.

Frbd. Abū Ibrāhīm ʿIshāq Ibn Ibrāhīm al-Fārābī, the Lexicologist and Philologist (d. about 350, under 70 years of age), maternal uncle of Jh.

Frđ. Al-Fāriḍī, about whom I have no information.


IAb. The Ḥāfīz of the West, Abū ʿUmar Yūsuf Ibn ʿAbd Allāh, known as Ibn ʿAbd al-Barāʾ, an-Namārī (from An-Namir Ibn Kāsīt, a well-known clan) al-Kurṭubī, the Jurist and Traditionist, the Doctor of Spain, and the Master of his Age in Tradition and Memorials of Antiquity (b. 368, d. 460 or 463, at the age of 95), author of the ʿIṣṭāb fi Maʿrifat al-ʿAṣlāb.

[Pupil of A.W.]

IAs. The Ḥāfīz of Syria, nay, of the World, Thiḳat ad-Dīn, or Nūr ad-Dīn, Abu-ʾI-Kāsim ʿAlī Ibn Abī Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ad-Dimashḵī ash-Shāfiʿī, known as Ibn ʿAṣḵār, the Traditionist of Syria in his time (b. 499, d. 571), author of the History of Damascus.

IAz. The learned Jamāl ad-Dīn Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn Ibn Badr Ibn Ayyāz Ibn ʿAbd Allāh, the Grammarian (d. 681), author of a Commentary on the Taṣrīf of IM.

IJzr. The Ḥāfīz Shams ad-Dīn Abu-ʾI-Khair Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad al-Kurashī ad-Dimashḵī ash-Shāfiʿī, known as Ibn al-Jazārī, the Reader and Traditionist (b. 751, d. 833).
IMH. Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad, known as Ibn AlMulla Al-Ḥalabi (d. about 990), author of a Commentary on the ML.

JDB. The Ẓādi-Kuḍāt Jalāl ad-Dīn Abu-l- Faḍl ʿAbd ArRahmān Ibn ʿUmar AlBukhārī, the Shāfiʿī Jurist (d. 763, d. 824).

Jhz. Abu ʿUthman ʿAmr Ibn Baḥr alKīnānī alLaithī (from Laith Ibn Bakr Ibn ʿAbd Manāt Ibn Kināna Ibn Khusayma) alBāṣrī, the celebrated Philologist of the Bāṣrī school, and one of the Masters of the Muʿtaṣīlīs, known as AlJāhiḍ, because his eyes were prominent, and also called AlHādākī, for the same reason (d. 255 at AlBāṣra, over 90 years old).

Kṣj. The Shaikh Muḥyi-d-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Sulaimān arRūmī AlKāfīyāṣī (so-called from the frequency of his reading and teaching the Kāfīya of 1H) AlHārāfī, the Jurist, Theologian, Commentator, Traditionist, Grammariand, Logician, and Philosopher (d. 788 or 790 or before 800, d. 879), one of Syt’s Masters.


KIM. The Ḥāfiz and Ẓādi Abū ʿAbd Allāh AlKāsim Ibn Maʿn Ibn ʿAbd ArRaḥmān alMasʿūdī AlKūfī, the Traditionist (d. 175).

KK. After “Grammarians” add “Lexicologists, Philologists, or Readers”.

Lṭh. AlLaith Ibn AlMuṣaffar (so named by Aʾz), or Ibn Naṣr (as the author of the KF says in the Bulḫa), or Ibn Rāfiʿ (as others say), or Ibn AlMuṣaffar Ibn Naṣr (as in Mr. 1. 46), Ibn Sayyār alLaithī alKhurāsānī, the Philologist, Lexicologist, and Grammariand, who was Secretary to the Baramika.


* MDh. After “alJauhar” insert “(c. 338–6)”.

[This is the year given in the BW. The TM (No. 9) has "about 403", which must be wrong, because IBshk. 89 says that he entered Spain "about 430", while HKh. II. 380, 384, 488 says, that he died "after 430".]

Msb. The Glossary entitled ALMiṣbah Al-Munīr (c. 734), by Fm.

Sbd. AṣSayyid ash-Sharif Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥāṣa-ṇī al-Maghrībī, the denizen of Egypt, al-Mālikī, known as AṣSayyid AḥBulaidī, the Reader, Commentator, and Grammarian (b. 1096, d. 1176) author of a Gloss on the A.

[Cited by Sn under the designation of "Our Master the Sayyid"].

Sim. The Ḥāfiz Abū 'Uthmān Sa'id Ibn Mansūr al-Khurāsānī, resident of Makka, the Traditionist (d. in, or after, 227), author of the Kitāb as-Sunan.

Sdj. The Sayyid Zain ad-Dīn Abū-l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥasanī al-Jurjānī al-Hanāfī, known as AṣSayyid AṣḥāṣShaṭīf and AṣSayyid AḥJurjānī, the Doctor of the East (b. 740, d. 814 or 816).

* Sn. After "AṣṢabbān" insert "(d. 1206)".

* TSh (as amended in Part I, Fasciculus III). After "Ritter- shausen" add "and latterly from the complete text edited by De Goeje".

* Tsr (in Part I, Fasciculus III). After "MS" add "and from a copy of the ed. lithographed in Persia in 1285-6".
* T.Khlf. The Tārīkh alKhulafā' (History of the Khalifas), by Syt, edited by Lees.

Wkd. The Қādī ʿAbū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn ʿUmar Ibn Wākid AlWākidī alAslamī alMadanī, freedman of the Banū Ḥāshim, or, as is said, of the Banū Sahm of Aslam, author of works on the Maghāzī (Campaigns) and other subjects (b. 130, d. 206 or 207 or 209).

[He moved from AlMadīna, and settled in Baghdād, where he served as Қādī for four years under AlMaʿmūn, dying in office.]

YH. The Shaikh Jamāl adDīn Abu-lMufaddal Yūsūf Ibn Sālim ashShāfiʿī alKāhīrī, known as AlḤanafī, the Philologist (d. 1176), author of a Gloss on the A.

[Pupil of SBl. Cited by Sn under the designation of "AlBaʿḍ".]

YIM. The celebrated Ḥāfīz ʿAbū Zakariyā Yaḥyā Ibn Maʿīn alMurri alGhaṭafānī (of the Murra of Ghaṭafān, their freedman) alBaghdādī, the Master of Tradition in his time (b. 158, d. 233 at age of 75, or 77, or 70 and odd, years).

* YR. The Irshād alArīb īlā Maʿrifat alAdīb, commonly known as the Muʿjam, or Tabaḵāt, alUdabā, by Yāḥūt ArRūmī, also called AlḤamawī (see Mk), edited by Margoliouth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS.</th>
<th>PAGE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER XXVI.—THE AND OF PAUSE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 617. Affixed to the of the <em>fem.</em> in pause— substituted for the of the <em>fem.</em> in pause and continuity.</td>
<td>726-727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER XXVII.—THE PARTICLE OF DISAPPROVAL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 618. Definition—when affixed—with or without imitation.</td>
<td>728-730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 619. Its meanings</td>
<td>... 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 620. Its affixion to the expression mentioned—to after the expression.</td>
<td>730-732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 621. Its position in the sentence</td>
<td>... 732-733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 622. Its omission allowable or necessary—retention of the Tanwin in pause allowable with it—the of silence necessary.</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER XXVIII.—THE PARTICLE OF TRYING TO REMEMBER.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 623. Definition—it is inelegant—when used—how formed.</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 624. Like the augment of disapprobation—but not followed by the of silence.</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART IV.—The Common Processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER I.—COMMON PROCESSES IN GENERAL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 625. Last part of book—meaning of “common”—common processes—<em>exs.</em>—etymology—definition—conventional applications—syntax excluded—reason for exclusion.</td>
<td>736-737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II.—IMĀLA.

§ 626. Common to *n.* and *v.*—colloquial meaning—conventional meaning—an affection of Fatḥa with or without —classification—a dialectic peculiarity—not practised by Ḥijāzīs—but by Tamīm, *etc.*—variously named—its utility—employment optional—its causes, preventives, and preventive of preventives—classification of causes—enumeration and description—all reducible to َ and Kasra—which of the two stronger—more obviously Kasra.

§ 627. Kasra before *w* when effective—and when not—anomalies with َ —the َ disregarded—effect of disregarding it— َ َ َ their anomalousness—no Imāla when َ is preceeded by Damma.


§ 629. Final *w*—its Imāla in *v.*—and in *n.*—اَلْعَلِيِّ ...

§ 630. Intermediate *w*—its Imāla in *v.*—dispute as to cause—and in *n.*—dispute as to allowability.

§ 631. Imāla for consonance ...

§ 632. Imāla prevented by letters of elevation and by , not pronounced with Kasr—reason for such prevention—preventives enumerated—effective
in restraining expressed Kasra—and, according to IM, expressed ی—but, according to others, Kasra alone—ی why added by IM—not supplied Kasra or ی—theory that letter of elevation is not preventive in vs.—criticism on یs. cited—or in certain vs.—خائف condition of prevention by letter of elevation (1) preceding ی—(2) following ی—letter of elevation stronger as preventive after than before ی—cause of difference in strength.

§ 633. Letter of elevation treated as preventive when detached—its position یs.—made ineffective by some—cause not effective when detached— contrast between detached preventive and detached cause—language of IM and BD—objections to it.

§ 634. Conditions of prevention by ی—condition of contiguity to ی relaxed by some—preventive of preventive—its contiguity to ی—this condition relaxed by some یبادات less common than یحارک یبادر.

§ 635. Two other causes of Imāla—such Imāla anomalous—یعما باب ۰ هذًا ۰ مال ۰ العجمج ۰ etc.—۰ أربا ۰.

§ 636. Properly no Imāla in یفعل from reduplicated—۰ جرائد جدًا and ۰ قائم.
§ 637. Imāla for conformity...

§ 638. Fatha pronounced with Imāla before (1) ١—(2)
—conditions and predicaments of such Imāla
—(3) ُ of feminization in pause—quality of
such Imāla—ُ of intensiveness included, but
not ُ of silence—no Imāla of ١ before ُ—this
exception why inserted by IM—ّ ٹ, not ّ,
"of feminization" why said—dispute as to
Imāla of Fatha before ُ of silence.

§ 639. Imāla peculiar to ُ and decl. n.—irregular in
indecl. n., except ُ and ُ—heard in ُ،
ُ، and some ps. pronounced with
Imāla—ُ and ُ—Imāla not forbidden in
n. accidentally uninf.—allowable in pret. ُ, and
excellent in ُ—reason for not pro-
nouncing ps. with Imāla—their aplasticity a
reason—Imāla in ps. used as proper names—in
letters of monograms prefixed to chapters
of Kur—various reasons given—and in letters
of alphabet.

CHAPTER III.—PAUSE.

§ 640. Definition—criticism—another definition—the
latter preferable—classification—tentative
pause in ُ—in ٤ُإعسب ٢٤٤٤ ٢٤٤٤—and
in ُ٣٤٤٤ ٣٤٤٤—kind of pause meant in this
chapter—difference between pausal letter and
initial—objects of pause—pause common to n., v., and p.—its modes—its predicaments—meaning of "predicaments"—principal modes mentioned in IM and Aud.—remaining mode there mentioned—alterations in pause reducible to seven—reduplication virtually included—or to six—pause with no alteration—variability of modes—their inequality in effect—or equality—their allocation—detailed discussion—word paused upon—sometimes pronounced with Tanwin—pause upon word quiescent in final—upon n pronounced with Tanwin, and not fem. with ٣—most frequent dial.—upon إِذْن ٣—dispute about it—upon n. mobile in final—modes allowed when final is not ٣ of feminization—(1) quiescence—meaning of "mobile" here—exclusion of final in accusative pronounced with Tanwin—sense of "quiescence"—its applicability—its originality and prevalence—its sign—sometimes a circle—treatment of Tanwin—reasons for it—and of du. and sound pl. masc.—(2) Raum—explained—allowable with all vowels—its allowable with Fatha—its sign—(3) Ishmām—peculiar to Damma—explained—its name applied by some to Raum—alleged to be allowable with Kasra—its sign—its derivation—its object—question as to allowability of Raum or Ishmām with the ٣ of feminization, the ⏐ of the pl., and the
accidental vowel—reason for disallowance with the ɔ of feminization—with the ɔ of the pl.—
with the accidental vowel—(4) reduplication—
explained—its object—letter added—sign of
reduplication—its rarity—its dialectic peculiar-
arity—its conditions—extent of its occurrence
in nom., gen., and acc.—and with Ḍamma,
Kasra, or Fatha—ائز لقصصًا} anomalous—or merely
rare—reduplication not properly applicable to
acc. pronounced with Tauwin—(5) transfer of
vowel—this also rare—its object—its sign.

§ 411. Its conditions—cases where transfer is not allow-
able—two of these conditions peculiar to n.
whose final is not Hamza—transfer of Fatha—
of Kasra in١٨١٤—dial. of many of the Arabs
in case of n. whose final is Hamza—dials. of
some of Tamīm—their treatment of n. whose
final is not Hamza—dial. of Ḥijāzis—Hamza
elided by them—not by others—transfer in
nom. and gen.—exs.—in acc.—allowable by
common consent when its final is Hamza—
dispute as to whether transfer is peculiar to
inflectional vowel—Ḍamma transferable from
ɔ of pron.—exs.—۹۲۱۹۲۱
§ 642. Pause upon Hamza—this letter either lightened or sounded true—and, in the latter case, made plain—preceding letter quiescent or mobile—pause upon Hamza, when preceded by quiescent, (1) with elision of its vowel—(2) after transfer of its vowel to preceding quiescent—differences between Hamza and other letters in respect of transfer—cause of transfer—no Raum or Ishmām with transfer—alliteration sometimes substituted for transfer—in nom., gen., and acc.—Raum or Ishmām allowable with alliteration—further modes of pause—conversion of Hamza after (1) elision of its vowel in nom. and gen., and transfer of its vowel in acc.—(2) transfer in all three cases—such conversion not an alleviation—(3) alliteration—no Raum or Ishmām with conversion—foregoing modes applicable when preceding letter is quiescent—modes applicable when preceding letter is mobile—Hamza converted by some of the Arabs when vowel of preceding letter is Fatḥa—but retained when such vowel is Damma or Kasra—foregoing modes practised by those who sound Hamza true—modes adopted by those who alleviate—by people of AlḤijāz.

§ 643. Unsound n.—pause upon unsound n. whose penultimate is (1) quiescent—substitution of ّ for double عطاء—(2) mobile—expression of ى of defective when necessary—pause upon
defective in acc.—in nom. or gen.—elision of its
preferable in nom. or gen. pronounced with
Tanwín—opinion of S and moderns—but ex-
pression allowable—expression preferable in
nom. or gen. not pronounced with Tanwín—but
elision allowable—argument for expression in
defective pronounced with Tanwín—and for
elision in defective not pronounced with Tanwín.
—former argument; stronger—classification of
defective not pronounced with Tanwín—abbre-
viated triptote or diptote—pause upon (1) trip-
tote pronounced with Tanwín—l expressed in all
three cases—dispute about this —analysis of
opinions upon it—language of S—Sf's com-
ment upon it—its meaning explained by R—
fruit of this dispute—(2) triptote not pro-
nounced with Tanwín, and diptote—their l re-
tained—dial. vars. of pausal l—nature of l
converted in some of these dials.—
Hamza in א, a subst. for l, not for
Tanwín—conversion of into Hamza of weak
authority—as also into , or  such conver-
sion not found in continuity.

§ 644. Final of v.—pause upon v. whose final is (1)
sound—(2) unsound—(a) in ind. and subj.—
final not elided here, but quiescent—(b) in apoc.
and imp.—with s of silence—or without—
importation of ְ of silence—this ְ why so named—its positions—first position—ְ allowable here, not necessary—except in one case—another case added by IM—remaining positions to be found in § 648.

§ 645. Elision of final ֹ and ֵ in terminations of verses, and in rhymes—nearing of "terminations of verses"—such elision more suitable in ֵ than in ֵ—elision of quiescent ֵ and ְ in ind. of defective ֶ—likened to elision of quiescent ֵ in apoc. of ֶ—allowable in terminations of verses—and sometimes necessary—and frequent in rhymes—elision in these positions thus established—ex. in rhyme—elision of ֶ of defective ֶ in continuity—and in terminations of verses—in pause necessary—or allowable—i not elided in terminations of verses, or in rhymes—S's description of reason for elision of ַ, and ְ in rhymes—his meaning—1 not elided in rhymes—elision of pronominal ֶ and ְ (1) in rhymes—exa.—pronominal ֶ not elided—(2) in terminations of verses.

§ 646. Pause upon ֶ of feminization—ֶ (1) kept in (a) p. ֶֶֶֶ , ֶֶֶֶ , ֶֶֶֶ , ֶֶֶֶ , ֶֶֶֶ —(b) v.—ֶ why kept in p. and v.—pause upon ֶֶֶֶ —(c) n., after sound quiescent—(2)
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retained or changed into ş in n., after (a) vowel—(b) unsound quiescent—o. f. of verbal of feminization—of nominal ş—opinion of Ş, Fr, IK, and most GG—of Th—Tanwin in acc. of n. made fem. by ş why not converted into —pause with w preferable in sound pl. and what resembles it—why preferable—pause with ş here—as dial. var. or anomaly—dial. var. of —its number and pausal form in each dial.—opinion of Ks—of GG—of IH—mentioned among verbal n.s.—opinion of R—ş or s as proper name— —ş or s—analysis of this word—pause with ş preferable in other formations—pause with ş in such as —opinion of IJ— ş for ş sometimes found in Codex— —pause in such cases—pause upon ş how affected by orthography of Codex—pause with ş in such as —sometimes ş —pause upon ş when not for feminization.

§ 647. Continuity treated like pause—mostly in poetry—şş—sometimes in prose—pausal forms thus admissible in continuous speech—şş. in prose and poetry—şş and —explained as

847-852
instances of this treatment—
unusual quiescence of rhyme-letter—practice of Ḥijāsīs and Tamimīs.

§ 643. Second position of $\alpha$ of silence—interrog. $\text{۱}$. governed in gen., and not compounded with $\text{۱}$.—$\alpha$ here necessary or preferable—reason for this difference—third position—exs.—$\alpha$ when not affixed—dispute about its affixion to word ending in quasi-inflectional vowel of uninfluenced—pause upon uninf. n. (1)

positions of pause with $\text{۱}$—(2) $\text{۱}$ or $\text{۱}$.—this $\text{۱}$ or $\text{۱}$.

mostly $\text{۱}$ and $\text{۱}$.—seldom $\text{۱}$ and $\text{۱}$.

but never $\text{۱}$ and $\text{۱}$—sometimes only $\text{۱}$ and $\text{۱}$.

this $\alpha$—pause upon $\text{۱}$.

the only quiescent followed by this $\alpha$—(4) $\text{۱}$ or $\text{۱}$.

pause upon $\text{۱}$ of pron., masc. or fem.

$\text{۱}$ and $\text{۱}$.

$\text{۱}$ and $\text{۱}$—sometimes $\text{۱}$ and $\text{۱}$.

retention of $\alpha$ better than elision—elision in acc. better than in gen.—practice of some

Readers—(6) $\text{۱}$ and $\text{۱}$.
and هث in first four quiescent, and its conj. ۰, or ۱ omitted—dispute as to whether this ۰, or ۱ be part of ۹ —۲ in last two also quiescent—۶۴۴, and ۷۴۴ originated. ۶۴۴ and ۷۴۴ —discussion as to whether conj. after ۹ be part of word—in continuity, conj. (a) better elided when ۹ is preceded by quiescent—but ۳ of ۴۰ not elided—(b) indispensable when ۹ is preceded by mobile—but sometimes omitted, and ۹ even made quiescent—in pause, conj. always omitted, and ۹ quiescent.

—Raum and Ishmām disallowed by some in ۹ of pron., after ūamma or Kasra, ۰ or ۱ —allowable, without dispute, after Fā'—allowed by some after any consonant or vowel.

(7) ۷۴۴ in ۴۰ and ۴۰ —pronounced with Kasr and conjoined with ۱ —never pronounced with ۹amma—۱ sometimes elided from ۷۴۴ in continuity, with or without quiescence of ۷ —always elided in pause, with quiescence of ۷ —۱, فیل, حکام, and ۸۹, or ۸۹, فیل, حکام —preferably with ۷, sometimes without—۱ sometimes quiescent in continuity—۸۹, and ۸۹, مسیح and ۸۹, مسیح —always with ۷.
§ 649. Pause upon single ن of corroboration after (1) Fat'a—ezs.—additional exs.—(2) Damma or Kasra—this ن treated like Tanwin—restoration of 9 of pl.—and of ن of ind.—practice of ي—disallowed by S.

CHAPTER IV.—THE OATH.

§ 650. Common to n. and v.—definition—jurative prop.—
(1) verbal—its v. how attached to the sworn-by—quasi-jurative vs.—(2) nominal—opinion of S—improbabilities in it—opinion of KK—their argument—أَيْسِمِنَ—vowel of its of inception prefixed to أَيْسِمِنَ—vowel of its Hamza—meaning of إِمَانٌ إِلَّهِ—cath and correl. equivalent to one prop.
—suppression of (1) the correl.—when indicated by (a) the prop. enclosing or preceding the cath.—this prop. a quasi-compensation for suppressed correl.—not the correl. itself—(b) a context following the cath.—suppression of correl. necessary or allowable—(2) the jurative prop.—sometimes because indicated by an adv. to the v. of the correl.—عَضُ عَرْضٌ quasi-jurative—sometimes not so—جَعَلُ also quasi-jurative—sometimes not so—pronunciation of its final—(3) the sworn-by—(4) the cath whose correl.
is corroborated by the ن—ن—ن, etc., used in place of oath—and so ن—ن—ن—and expressions denoting a vow or covenant—object of oath—three things involved by it—(1) the oath—(2) the sworn-to—what part of it is corroborated by the oath—(3) the sworn-by—not always God.

§ 651. Liberties taken with oath—(1) suppression of jurative v.—(b) sworn-by—illustration—
(c) enunci in nominal jurative prop.—this suppression necessary or allowable—theory of Fr —(d) ن and Hamza of میس—dispute as to whether elision of its Hamza be a liberty—
میس or میس، and میس or میس and میس
—these contractions used only with میس
Hamza of میس or میس of میس—میس—میس
—(f) jurative p.—(2) substitution of م for jurative م—(3) preference of Fatha over دامما in م—dial. var., of this word—
only م used in oath.

§ 652. Oath adjurator or not—correl. (1) of adjurator—sometimes headed by م or م—or by م.
red. م—sometimes a mandatory enunciation
—(2) of non-adjurator—four م. used to connect it with oath—these four why chosen—
not used—correl. a nominal or verbal prop., aff. or neg.—nominal attended, (1) if aff., by ُ or ُ or both— ُ uncontracted or contracted—nature of ُ—wha it is prefixed to— ُ in ُ (2) if neg., by ُ or ُ—this ُ op. or inop.— ُ exemptive—or by ُ—verbal attended, (1) if aff., (a) when its v. is a pret., by ُ with or without ُ, or by ُ alone—ُ best—except with splastic vs.— ُ alone, or ُ alone, allowable—nature of ُ prefixed to correl. separated from oath by condition headed by ُ—(b) when its v. is an aor., by ُ with or without ُ of corroboration—omission of ُ—or of ُ—opinions of BB and KK—aor., in sense of present, allowable as correl. of oath—and then corroborated by ُ without ُ—(2) if neg., (a) when its v. is a pret., by ُ or ُ—if pret. in sense, by ُ—if future, by ُ or ُ—(b) when its v. is an aor., by ُ or ُ, the latter with or without ُ of corroboration—or by ُ—ex. of ُ—ُ and ُ disallowed by MB—ُ or ُ not allowable—or very rare—subsidiary ُ often prefixed to cond. instrument preceded by oath—especially if oath be suppressed—neg. p. allowably suppressed, (1) in correl. of oath.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from aor.—not from nominal prop., nor from pret.—(2) otherwise than in correl. of oath, from ٌٍ ٌٍ etc., and, in poetry, from other aors.—explanation of apparent suppression of neg. p. from pret. in correl. of oath—anomaly said to be involved in it—opinion of IHsh—of IMH—of R.—of Fr.—sign of affirmation not suppressed from aor.—suppressed neg. p. always ٌٍ, not ٌٍ—IU and IUK on suppression of ٌٍ—none of the four ps. suppressed except ٌٍ.</td>
<td>905-910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 653. Jurative instruments—five ps.—preps., but named “jurative ps.”—(1) بـ—original jurative p.—suppression of v. with it—substitution of the other four ps. for it—(2) و—its government —(3, 4) مـٍ (5) ل ت ل ت—dispute as to its origin—not a contraction of امسٍ or من الله مي إله and ودٍ يمحٍ—الله—and all three vars. said to be contractions of امسٍ—theory of contraction possible in مي إله—not in مي إله or من الله مي إله since it would imply occurrence of مي إله in gen. or acc.—يمهٍ إلهٍ a possible contraction of مي إلهٍ, but not مي إلهٍ—مي إله theories as to their origin.
§ 654. Exclusive privileges of ب—mnemonic verses—exs of ب in adjuration—adjuration not an oath—apparent evidence to contrary—but held by IM and B to be an oath—language of AH—and of IJ—IU's definition of oath—exclusion of what does not admit of being pronounced true or false—assertion that adjuration is not an oath—proofs—his opinion correct—language of IHsh—correl. of non-adjuratory oath enunciatory, and of adjuratory oath originative.

§ 655. Jurative p. sometimes suppressed—then inop. or op.—ب (1) suppressed—together with v.—p. first, then v.—sworn-by governed in (a) acc. by jurative v. understood—exs.—or by trans. v. understood—opinion of IS—(b) nom.—(2) understood—like ل in مَرْوَّةٌ لِّيَوْكَ and لَأَنَّ أَيُّنَ عَنْكَ—dispute as to whether prep. ل be suppressed here—لَأَنَّ أَيُّنَ ابْوُكَ—acc. preferable—gen. allowable in كَلِلْلَّي—ex.—and allowed by KK in other ns.—ncm. necessary in certain phrases—acc. or nom. allowable in كَلِلْلَّي—ex. of all three cases.

§ 656. ن suppressed with compensation—لاَّ يَنِى فَا إِلَى اللَّهِ—sworn-by then كَلِلْلَّي exclusively, and compensation the premonitory كَلِلْلَّي or interrog.
Hamza—different opinions on \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) —or the disjunction of Hamza in \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) —suppressed \( p \). why held to be \( \text{\textasciitilde} \text{\textasciitilde} \) necessary after \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) when compensation is \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) —this \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) transferred from \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) —pronunciations of \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) — (1) \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) — (2) \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) — (3) \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) — (4) \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) — \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) — how parsed by Khāl —and by Akh—sense of interrog. Hamza—treatment of Hamza in \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) on prefixion of interrog. Hamza—ex. of \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) — disjunction of Hamza peculiar to \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) after \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) with or without interrog. Hamza—compensation here the disjunction of Hamza in \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) —not the preceding interrog. Hamza—\( \text{\textasciitilde} \) said to be red.—proof that the \( \text{\textasciitilde} \), the interrog. Hamza, and the disjunction of Hamza in \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) are subs. for jurative \( p \).

§ 657. Nature of \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) repeated after jurative \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) — conflicting opinions—which stronger—objection to it—Z’s reply—IH’s criticism—R’s suggestion—sense of \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) after oath—what governs it in acc.
CHAPTER V.—THE ALLEVIATION OF HAMZA.

§ 658. Hamza heavy—produced with difficulty—alleviated by some—by most Ḥijāzis, especially Kuraish—remarks of ‘Ali—but sounded true by others—by Tamīm and Ḥais—sounding true the o. f., and alleviation an improvement—alleviation common to all parts of speech—its three modes—their evolution—(1) change—Hamza omitted by Mib from letters of alphabet—(2) elision—(3) betwixt-and-between—two kinds of last mode—"strange" kind confined to certain positions—Hamza of betwixt-and-between quiescent or nearly so—not found in beginning of sentence—condition of alleviation that Hamza be not inceptive—meaning of "inceptive"—inceptive Hamza too light for alleviation—but sometimes converted into —Hamza one or two—if one, quiescent or mobile—quiescent Hamza preceded only by mobile—in same word or another—in either case, quiescent Hamza alleviated by change—not by betwixt-and-between—nor by elision—exs.—mobile Hamza—preceded by quiescent or mobile—predicament of preceding quiescent—mobile Hamza preceded by quiescent alleviated, (1) when quiescent is a non-coordinative aug. ɔ or ɔ̂, by conversion—i.e., change—no other mode possible—its alleviation not obligatory—opinion of S on ɔ̂, ɔ̂̄, and
and of IH—(2) when quiescent is й, by well-known betwixt-and-between—elision and change disallowed, and strange betwixt-and-between impossible—(3) when quiescent is a sound letter, or a rad. or ى, or a coordinative aug. or ى, by elision after transfer of vowel to quiescent—not by betwixt-and-between or change—نُبْتُ and رَفَتُ and قَرَيْتَ and َخَبيطَ and كَماةُ مَنِياءٍ —andconj. of —exs. of alleviation where quiescent is not in same word as Hamza—سُمُ ى and alleviation obligatory in cat. of ى، and of pret. أرَتَ and aor. أرَي—i. e., in certain derivs. of أرَتُ and frequent in cat. of سُلُ —more so in إسالٍ than in إجَارٍ —cause of its frequency—consequent elision of conj. I hamza—سلُ —distinguished from —explanation of mode of pausing upon final mobile Hamza—no explanation needed for quiescent Hamza—two methods of pausing upon final mobile Hamza—the first explained in chapter on Pause—the second begun by alleviating Hamza—modes of alleviating, and then pausing, when Hamza is (1) not preceded by й—(2) preceded by й —Hamza
usually converted into | in latter case——treatment of the two | s—and of acc. pronounced with Tanwín—mobile Hamza continued—of nine kinds when preceded by mobile—whether in same word or not——regular mode of alleviation——this mode impossible in two kinds——these kinds alleviated by conversion——and remaining seven by softening with well-known between—between——meaning of "softening"——Hamza not softened when preceded by quiescent—softened Hamza held by KK to be quiescent—but proved by S to be mobile—opinion of Akh on two of the seven kinds——another opinion on these two——reason for latter opinion——no dispute as to remaining five kinds——Hamza sometimes changed into | or quiescent | or ل——this change confined to hearsay——بِسْلَا——but regular in metric exigency——exs. of it not explicable as dial. vars.—أَلْلَسْتَ | aor. | أَلْلَسْتَ | أَلْلَسْتَ | أَلْلَسْتَ | أَلْلَسْتَ | أَلْلَسْتَ and أَلْلَسْتَ or أَلْلَسْتَ said to be dial. vars.—أَلْلَسْتَ for أَلْلَسْتَ cited by S as end of verse as ex. of this change——but not really so——though in continuity أَلْلَسْتَ for أَلْلَسْتَ would be——this change restricted to case where Hamza and preceding mobile are both pronounced with فُتْحٍ، دَمَّم، or كَسْر، respectively——ل and ل
quiescent when thus substituted for Hamza—cases where this change is not allowable—anomalies in connection with initial Hamza—irregular elision of Hamza in استناد and لسوري or فل رَبْتُ—elision of Hamza sometimes avoided by transposition.

§ 659. *Imp. of v. whose لِف* is Hamza quiescent in aor.—

—their rad. Hamza elided, and conj. Hamza then dispensed with—their measure—elision obligatory in خذِّلُ and خذُورُ and خذُّلُ and خذُّلُ, not in خذُّلُ and خذُّلُ and خذُّلُ and خذُّلُ, and not said, but خذُّلُ—regular form of these three imps.—irregular form always used in خذُّلُ and خذُّلُ and خذُّلُ and خذُّلُ, but either allowed in خذُّلُ—i.e., when inceptive—in interior of sentence retention of Hamza more frequent—but elision allowable—this subject why discussed here.

§ 660. Transfer of *vowel* from initial mobile Hamza to preceding لُفُ of art.— with conj. Hamza expressed— لُفُ being constructively quiescent— with conj. Hamza elided— لُفُ being actually mobile—لُفُ more frequent than لُفُ and لُفُ and لُفُ and لُفُ treated like لُفُ or لُفُ or لُفُ.
§ 661. Two Hamzas combined—in one word or two—when in one word, alleviation necessary—only second Hamza changed—their quiescence or mobility—if first mobile, and second quiescent, then second changed into (1) ʿ after Fatha—ءُزْرُ 1st pers. sing. of aor. subj. from ِنْزَرُ a mispronunciation ُنْزَرُ aor. ُنْزَرُ allowed by some—but disallowed in KF—(2) ى after Kasra—ِنْزَتُ (3) ى after Damma—ِنْزَتُ—if first quiescent, and second mobile, which never occurs in position of َ ف ، then, (1) in position of ُ خ، first incorporated into second (2) in position of ُ ل، second changed into ِنْزَرُ—incorporation—why not adopted here—ُبْنُو ُأْيَا if both mobile, then second changed, (1)
if final, or non-final but pronounced with Kasr, into ی — (2) if non-final and pronounced with Damm, into ی — (3) if non-final and pronounced with Fath, into ی if first be pronounced with Fath or Damm, and into ی if first be pronounced with Kasr — thus second mobile Hamza either final or not — final of three sorts, and non-final of nine — final changed into ی in all three sorts — non-final into ی in four, and ی in five sorts — e.g., of (1) final — (2) non-final pronounced with (a) Kasr — prescribed action necessary — ام — pl. of ام — not ام — ام — in IX. 12 — or ام — its second Hamza converted into ی or sounded true — how pronounced by Readers — softening or sounding true allowed in reading the Qur'an, but not conversion into ی — two former pronunciations not peculiar to ام — conversion best according to GG — (b) Damm — (c) Fath, when first is pronounced with (a) Fath or Damm — pl. and dim. of ام — doubt as to whether ام be Arabic — (b) Kasr — opinion of Alkh on two of the nine sorts — ام — ام or ام — ام — ام — second changed, or sounded true, when first is aoristic — even if second be pronounced with Fath — this sounding true regular in five vs. — but change necessary when first is not aoristic —
doctrine of GG that second must be converted
— prep orig — its second Hamza not put
betwixt and between— not a case of two
Hamzas according to Khl—a case of
two Hamzas according to S—and therefore
mentioned here by IH—but not according to
Kh—opinion of S approved—occurrence of
sounding true and softening—interpolation of
between the two Hamzas—no conversion
when Hamzas are separated by original —
alleviation preventible by interpolated —
and therefore prevented by existing —combination of two separate Hamzas ineffective in
causing alleviation— Hamza of
elided in cat. of — o.f. of —
elision adopted here instead of conversion—and
extended to its variations—Hamza converted
into pronounced with Fath in cat. of —
— and — whether word contain two
Hamzas or one—treatment of more than two
consecutive Hamzas—predicament of two
Hamzas combined in two words, if first Hamza
be (1) inceptive—first not alleviated—mode
of alleviating second—interpolation of —
aux.—treatment of two Hamzas after entry of
—treatment of conj. Hamza after interrog.
Hamza—(2) not inceptive—unusual to sound two consecutive Hamzas true—treatment of two Hamzas if both be mobile—mode of alleviating (a) first alone—(b) second alone—\textit{ex.}—(c) one of two Hamzas whose vowels are of the same kind—(d) both Hamzas together.

§ 662. Treatment of two Hamzas (1) if first be quiescent—additional method transmitted by A'Z—mode of alleviating (a) first alone—(b) second alone—(c) both together—(2) if second be quiescent—(3) if both be quiescent.

CHAPTER VI.—THE CONCURRENCE OF TWO QUIESCENTS.

§ 663. Common to \textit{n}, \textit{r}, and \textit{p}.—(1) impossible—i. e., when first is a sound letter—two quiescents then often supposed to concur—explanation of such concurrence—and of supposed quiescent at beginning of sentence—Kasra naturally employed as means for removing difficulty of articulating quiescent—instances of its employment—(2) possible, though heavy, when first is a letter of softness—why possible with unsound letters—lightest when first is \textit{l}—least light when first is \textit{r} or \textit{y} preceded by Damma or Kasra, respectively—least light when first is \textit{r} or \textit{y} preceded by Fatha—last combination peculiar to \textit{dim}.—\textit{ض} and \textit{ض}—incorporation or pause prescribed for second
quiescent—pause constitutional or accidental—
concurrency of two quiescents pardonable (1)
in pause—concurrency why allowable here—
not real unless first be a letter of softness—
when pardonable in continuous speech—(2) in
incorporated letter preceded by letter of soft-
ness, provided that both be in one word—mean-
ing of "letter of softness" and "letter of
prolongation"—\( \text{l} \) a letter of prolongation—
\( \text{r} \) letters of softness or prolongation or
neither—these letters loosely termed "letters
of prolongation and softness"—concurrency
why allowable here—concurrency of three
quiescents—of four—(3) in \( n.s. \) uninf. from
want of construction—not from existence of
preventive of inflection—theory that quiescence
of their finals, even in continuity, is pausal—
classification of such \( n.s. \)—concurrency why
allowable here—reason for quiescence of their
finals—opinion of Z—of R—predicament of
pause how far made applicable to them—
\( \text{m} \) and \( \text{n} \) disallowed by
Mz—Ishmām allowed by S in nom. of \( n. \) acci-
dentally, not constitutionally, quiescent in final
—but disallowed by Akh—Ishmām allowable
in pre. \( n. \)—\( \text{m} \) and \( \text{n} \)—Fat\( ^\circ \) of the \( r \)—dispute
about \( \text{m} \) and \( \text{n} \)——(4) words that
begin with conj. Hamza pronounced with \( F.t. \),
and are preceded by *interrog.* Hamza—this combination, found in two cases—concurrency why permitted here—*conj.* Hamza not elided—but converted or softened—conversion more appropriate—but productive of irregular concurrency—I converted from Hamza why not elided—(5) in such as ُلِّلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِّلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ—combination of two quiescents optional here, necessary in preceding cases—concurrency of two quiescents not pardonable in other cases—

*حلقنا انْيَمَان* anomalous—this remark premature here—first quiescent either a letter of prolongation or not—if first be a letter of prolongation, then (1) second is mobilized if elision of first would lead to confusion—

ْيَسْلَامُونَ, ُيْسَلَامُانَ—(2) first is elided if its elision do not lead to confusion—concurrency avoided by elision or mobilization of first rather than second—letter of prolongation not mobilized when ُو or ُو —nor when ُو —elided in ُءَرْسُنَ and ُعَزْنُ and ُنَأْغْزَنَ and ُءَبْنَ —but not in ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ of *apoc.* and *imp.* in defective *v.* how treated upon affixion of *nom. prons.*—why not converted into ُو in ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ and ُلِلَهَۡ مَا ُعِلِّي إِلَّهُ.
respectively—why treated differently in
and why not elided—vowel of and as also in and
quasi-original—and permanent—hence return of their s inevitable—why retained in—first quiescent why converted into or and mobilized, in and —elided of not restored in and —its restoration allowed by some—if first quiescent be not a letter of prolongation, then it is mobilized—reason for its mobilization—except (1) single corrob. (2) —(3) Tanwin of proper name qualified by pre. to proper name—elision of Tanwin, on account of concurrence of two quiescents, anomalous in other cases—of determination mobilized with Kasr when prefixed to conj. Hamza—transfer of vowel from conj. Hamza to preceding quiescent—aet. with Fatha—and Kasra—and Damma—transfer disapproved—second quiescent mobilized (1) when
mobilization of first is avoided for alleviation—
second then pronounced with Fat'ı, not Kasra—Damma not used, with some exceptions, for aveting concurrence of two quiescents—incorporation practised by some in a'or. and imp. of reduplicated r.—omitted by all in ٩٣١ when a r. of wonder—
(2) sometimes when second is final of uninfl. word—٢٢١٥، and ٢٣١٩ not a case in point—opinion of Z—its refutation.

§ 664. General rule for mobilization in concurrence of two quiescents—original vowel Kasra—reasons for choosing it—variations from it—(1) Damma necessary in (a) ḫ of pl.—vowel of this ḫ after (a) Kasra on ʕ—(b) Damma on any letter—(b) ָו—Damma here not necessary, but usual—(a) ָו—(2) Faḥa preferable in אִזְבַּמַּק—Kasra not accepted by Readers—question whether אִזְבַּמַּק is relevant here—Fat'ı on final of v. in אִזְבַּמַּק and אִזְבַּמַּק—(3) Damma allowable on first quiescent when second is followed by original Damma in same word—not when Damma after second is accidental, or in another word—reason for disallowance in latter case—
Kasra allowable in all of this—Damma not approved by Mā after Kasra—

any vowel allowed by IJ in of ِ

here—it ُ

—(4) Damma preferable in

(a) ِ of pron. of pl. before Fā'tā, in (a)

—reason for Damma according to

Kahl—and to others—(b) ُ—possible explanation of Damma here—(b) ِ of pl., after Fā'tā, in explicit n.—in other cases ُ pronounced with Kasr after Fā'tā—ُ of pl. sometimes pronounced with Kasr—and ُ of ُ and ُ with Damm—ُ of pron. pronounced with Kasr after Fā'tā—and similarly ُ of pl. in explicit n.—(c) ُ كث —(5) Damma or Fā'tā allowable, besides Kasra, in ُ and ُ—

Kasra preferred in ُ—Fā'tā sometimes found—Damma rarely—all of this applicable when aor. is pronounced with Damm of ُ—Kasra or Fā'tā allowable when aor. is pronounced with Fāt or Kasr—three methods of mobilizing second quiescent in such imp. and apocs.—(a) Fāt;—(b) alliteration—(c) Kasr

—Kasra adopted by most in apoc. or imp. before quiescent—Fāt, by some—Damma

none—IH and Jrb mistaken in allowing it—
(6) Fatḥa necessary before fem. pron. and Ḍamma before masc. pron. — Kasra, in latter position, a weak dial. var. — Fatḥa considered erroneous — reason for Ḍamma — this vowel chastest here — Kasra explicable — Fatḥa not forbidden by analogy — Fatḥa necessary in م م before art.

§ 665. Pardonable concurrence of two quiescents disliked by some Arabs — first quiescent therefore mobilized in two cases — (1) where second is quiescent on account of pause, and first not a letter of softness — vowel of first when second is م of masc. — (2) where second is incorporated, and first an س — exs. of this case not accepted by Mz as precedents — opinion of Z and IH on reason for conversion of س into Hamza pronounced with Fatḥa — alternative theory — vowel of Hamza if o. f. of س be mobile — or س, not converted into Hamza — reason for not altering س — modes of avoiding concurrence of two quiescents in م م.

§ 666. Vowel of final in (1) س, (a) before ل of art. — Fatḥa not caused by transfer from conj. Hamza — opinion of Kṣ — (b) before any other quiescent — Fatḥa sometimes used in latter case — and Kasra in forms: — (2) س
and 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS.</th>
<th>PAGE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and حيث (3) — كيف</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Kasra here — (4) عن</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Damma bad — feebly explained — and, if correct, restricted to certain positions — Fatha not allowable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CHAPTER VII.—THE PREDICAMENT OF THE INITIALS OF WORDS. | |
| --- | |
| § 667. Common to n., v., and p. — one begins with mobile, and pauses upon quiescent — inceptive letter mobile — proof of this — beginning with quiescent allowed by some — answer to their argument — such beginning said to occur in Persian — explanation of this occurrence — pausing upon mobile not impossible — meaning of "pausing" here — initials of words generally mobile — sometimes quiescent — conj. Hamza then needed — quiescence of initial found in (1) ns., (a) non-inf. — (b) inf. — initial of these inf. ns. why quiescent — their formations — incorporative quiescence of initial in inf. ns. on measure of حعل (2) vs., (a) pret. and imp. in vs. of inf. ns. before mentioned — (b) imp. of 2nd pers. in unaugmented tril. sound in ف and ع — (3) ps., ج and ل of art. — quiescence of initial generally found in vs. and inf. ns. — not in pure ns., except ten irregular ns. — nor in ps., except ل and ل of art. — Hamza in these ten ns. a compensation for actual or virtual elision of ل | 1047—1066 |
not found in all trils. whose ل is elided—
why prefixed to these نس.—finals not actually
elided in أبكم, أسرر, إبلم, and أبسن—
—but virtually
in إبلم and إسرر—actually in إبلم if م be con-
sidered aug.—and virtually in أبكم also—o.f.
of (1) ف—proof of Fath of (a) its بذو—
(b) its ع—evolution from o.f.—elided ل—no
evidence in بذو—opinion of Zj—(2)
إبكم—(3) إبكم—not to be copied—its م—
evolution—(4)
إور—(6) إمرز—(5) إمثالي
— ل not elided from إمرز or إمرز—
their evolution—conj. Hamza why combined with
ل—fems. of إنسان, إنسان, إنسان
according to (a) BB—vowel of س in o. f.
—derivation—measure—evolution—م—
(b)
KK—evolution—objections to their opinion—
BB’s opinion preferable—(9)
— evolution—dial. vars.—proof of Fath of ع في
in o. f.—(10) يمين—held by BB to be sing.
—Hamza why prefixed—dial. vars.—vowel of
م—language of BD—two more dial. vars.—
modification in vowel of م—total number
fourteen—twenty-two in FB and KF—conj.
Hamza in these ten ns. a compensation for actual, imaginary, or potential elision of ꞌ —
Hamza in their dad.—Hamza of ꞌ —-according to S, aug.—but, according to Khl, rad.—
and orig. disj.—opinion of IM— allocations — these initials quiescent— and therefore proceeded by mobile aug. Hamzas in inceptive positions—impracticability of beginning with quiescent not peculiar to Arabic.

§ 668. These Hamzas named "conj." — initial Hamzas disj. and conj.—also called "disj. and conj.
\(\text{ṣ} \) — disj. Hamza — why so named—conj. Hamza — why so named—definition of conj. Hamza—and of disj.—conj. Hamza orig. a Hamza—possibly an ꞌ — always prosthetic—its property—not expressed in interior of sentence, except by poetic license—how defined by IHsh and Fk—dispute about cause of its name "conj. Hamza"—causes variously assigned—its positions—prefixed to n., v., and p.—not found in (1) aor. — ꞌ — (2) p. other than determinative or red ꞌ — with determinative ꞌ and conjunct ꞌ — but conjunct ꞌ properly a n.—
Khl on Hamza of ꞌ — (3) tril. or numerically quad. pret.—but found in quin. or sex. pret—and in their īmzs.—and in īmp. of tril. whose aor. has its second letter literally quiescent—
(4) n. other than (a) inf. ns. of quin. and sex.
v.—formula for them—(b) ten ns. mentioned
in § 667—with conjunct ُلَّا and ُذَلِكَ—ؤُم
as worthy of separate mention as ُذَلِكَ،—dis-
tinction between them possible—but immaterial
—ُذَلِكَ، not specified here—ُذَلِكَ، dial. var. of
ُلَّا، should be mentioned—rule in case of
doubt—conjunct ُلَّا — conj. Hamza why put
—dispensed with when quiescent initial becomes
mobile—ُلَّا بَلَّلَرُ لَلَّمَوْرُ،—but ُلَّا بَلَّلَرُ لَلَّمَوْرُ،
rather than ُلَّا بَلَّلَرُ لَلَّمَوْرُ،—dispute among BB
as to whether conj. Hamza be orig. quiescent
or mobile—opinion of majority—and of S—its
vowel, according to latter opinion—and to
former—opinion of BB—and of KK—objection
to latter—rules for determining vowel—(1)
Fatha necessary in ُلَّا — (2) Damma neces-
sary in (a) pret. pass.—(b) imp. of tril. when
such imp. is orig. pronounced with Damm of
ع—Kasra sometimes found before original
Damma—causes of these two vars.—Kasra
said to be corrupt—(3) Damma preponderant
over Kasra in 2nd pers. sing. fem. of imp. of
tril. when Damma of ع is accidentally replaced
by Kasra—opinion of F on Ishmām of first
and third letters here—and of IM—(4) Fatha
preponderant over Kasra in ٌ and َ 

(5) Kasra preponderant over Damma in ً

(6) Damma, Kasra, or Ishmām allowable in pass. of such pret. as ەنەدۆر and ەخۆر —

(7) Kasra necessary in remaining cases—vowels allowable on sound or quasi-sound quiescent final before quiescent initial which, at beginning of sentence, would be preceded by conj. Hamza pronounced with Damm—exs.—meaning of “quasi-sound”.

§ 669. Expression of conj. Hamza, in interior of sentence, a gross solecism—except in poetry—elision necessary, in case of choice, except after pause or interruption—stop at beginning of hemistich—٘، ٘، ٙ، etc., not said—

٘٘٘ a poetic license—٘٘! at beginning of second hemistich—Hamza of art., after interrog. Hamza, not elided, but (1) converted into | —and thus retained, though in modified form—contrary to general rule—(2) softened betwixt and between—this treatment extended to every conj. Hamza pronounced with Fath—change into | the only method mentioned by F and many—dispute about this | —softening agreeable with analogy—used by Readers, though less approved—easy in comparison with change—no difference here between Hamzas
of āl and ālīnī—a 'aez.—both methods used among the Seven—conj. Hamza not elided when pronounced with Fat', as when pronounced with Kasr or Damm—nor sounded true.

§ 670. 3 of āhū and āhī when preceded by ف or ل, or by ل of inception, often quiescent—sometimes mobile—similarly imp. ل with ف and conj. quiescence accidental, but elegant, in 8—and in imp. ل and ل and ل and ل—absence of conj. Hamza before these initials how explained by IH—his meaning—objections to his theory—what he ought to say—initials here why assimilated to medials—comparative frequency of 8 and 8, 8 and 8, and 8 and 8—and quiescence allowable in imp. ل—not in ل of كي—quiescence of 8 after 8—and of imp. ل analogous to ل and ل—ل inelegant, and ل superior to it—quiescence an accidental alleviation—and mobilization the o. f.—words of S.

CHAPTER VIII.—THE AUGMENTATIVENESS OF LETTERS.

§ 671. Common to n. and v.—no augmentation in ps.

of KK preferred by BD—non-repetitive aug.—

ṣ omitted by Mb from

letters of augmentation—these ten letters why
peculiar to augmentation—ي، و، and l—
remaining seven letters—measurement or
exemplification—its use—م constituted as
measure—its crude-form, not its actual con-
formation, here intended—rads. how represented
in measure—this representation explained—
ex. with three rads.—and with more—mea-
surement of tril. agreed upon—but of non-tril.
disputed between BB and KK—three opinions
among KK—thus four measures possible for

augs. how represented in measure—
representation of repetitive aug. disputed—
aug. when repetitive, and when not—incor-
poration or conversion in measured not to be
reproduced in measure—but transfer or elision
to be reproduced—some words not measurable—
IM's definitions of rad. and aug.—his defini-
tions (1) explained and exemplified—إحترذي
(2) criticized—neither definition
inclusive or exclusive—accurate formula for
recognizing aug.—(3) defended by IUK—im-
proved definition of aug.—indications of aug-
mentativeness—conditions of augmentation—
these letters previously discussed in Parts I and II—what remains to be mentioned here.

§ 672. Hamza judged to be (1) aug., when initial and followed by three rads.—why so judged—such augmentativeness disputed in words whose derivation is unknown—exceptional cases, where Hamza is rad., necessarily—or allowably —language of IY and IM— (2) rad., (a) when initial but followed by too rads., or by four— (b) when non-initial, unless irresistibly indicated as aug.—medial or final Hamza when judged to be aug.—exception to this rule—two conditions for augmentativeness of final Hamza—IM’s version of second condition—alternatives allowable in final Hamza after | separated from the | by a double letter, or by two letters one of which is a soft letter—exs.—alternative strengthened by indication to be adopted—correction of IM’s version—positions of aug. Hamza in n.

§ 673. | when judged to be aug.—soft | here meant— soft | not initial—aug. with three or more rads.—but not with only two—this rule true only of vs. and Arabic decl. ns.—positions of aug. | in n. and v.— | not aug. at end of reduplicated quad.—alternatives allowable in | with two rads. and a third letter admissibly rad. or aug.—coordinative | always final—nature of
aug. 1 when medial—and when final—1 of

dma's, 1 of کتاب—meaning of

this.

§ 674. ی and و when judged to be aug.—their three
states—مذین and and مَيِم —أَيْطَلَ and لَق
Arabic—opinion of IAl on its measure—
said to be foreign—Yes—or یَلْعَب—its first
ی—why decided to be aug.—both ی is not
rad. or aug., nor second aug.—its
و rad., and ی and ت aug.—its ی is not imagined
by any one to be rad.—ی aug. with (1) three
rads.—(2) four or more rads., when it is (a)
non-initial—(b) initial, if word be a v.—posi-
tions of aug. ی in n. and v.—additional
exs.—ی how known to be aug. in these exs.—
both ی is rad. in حکیم—also ی in میثاق
and ی فَرْأَت and ی عَائِث—ک*i تَرْرَت
not aug. in last two formations—nor و —initial
یwhen aug., and when rad.—ی استَعْرَز
rad. in ی جذب—aug. in ی جذب.

§ 675. ی not aug. when initial—opinion of majority—
of ی and ی always aug. when medial with
three or more rads.—its positions in such cases
—positions of aug. ی in n. and v.
§ 676. exactly like Hamza in augmentativeness—
aug. م and Hamza mostly initial—non-
initial not aug., except when so indicated—
Hamza aug. in n. and v., but م only in n.—
why not in v.—initial م aug. oftener than
initial Hamza—universally aug. in certain
formations—derivation the test—made
to accord with م—م. and م.
and م—م. exceptional—derivation of م—م.
of م—م. conditions of aug. م—م. addi-
tional condition—م. fulfilling conditions judged
to be aug. in absence of contrary indication—
such indication decisive—م. opinion of
AAMr—م. مغفور—م. non-initial م. not
judged to be aug., except on plain indication—
\( \text{د.م.} \) and its var.—opinion of Mz—م.
and its cat.—predicament of م before three letters, one of which may be
rad. or aug.—and before four or more rads.
—opinion of S and
Mz—and of others—positions of aug. م.

§ 677. ن aug., (1) when final, upon two conditions—
additional condition—apparently applicable to
final Hamza also—ن and ن as a termination—
judged to be *aug.* unless otherwise indicated—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>خبان</td>
<td>خبان</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 derivation and declension of خبان — and of

 تبان — predicament of ن when a double letter, or a sound and a soft letter, are interposed between the / and the ف — another condition

 added by some — of رمان — (2) when medial, upon three conditions—for three reasons—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>عرند</td>
<td>عرند</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— but 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>رد.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in (a) نهشل, though *aug.* in (b) نرهش | نرهش |

— and 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>خنربس</td>
<td>خنربس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— though *aug.* in (c) خنربس, خنربس, خنربس, خنربس, خنربس |

and 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نانبل</td>
<td>نانبل</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) — explanation of its double ن —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>عنجنس</td>
<td>عنجنس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— its measure—(3) when initial, in aor.— ن regularly *aug.* in certain formations omitted by IM—other *aug.* ن s not mentioned by him—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>positions of <em>aug.</em> ن — in other cases ن</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— in other cases ن | ن |

with some exceptions.

§ 678. ت aug. in (1) *fem.,* (a) ضرَّبت and and ضرَّبت — but not ضرَّبت — "*fem.* explained — sing. or pl. — quiescent ت of femininization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مَرّبان</td>
<td>مَرّبان</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1159-1166
not reckoned by IHsh—nor mobile $ by R—(b)
and its variations—contrary opinions—(2)
aor.—no other aoristic letter reckoned by IM
among augs.—aoristic letters held by R to be ps.
—(3) certain inf. ns. with their derivs.—and
without—(4) quasi-pass.—— in other positions $ not judged to be aug., unless so
indicated—توجمان aug. when (1) initial
—فعلتى —فعلت —فعلعل —(2) final
—فعلت —فعلت —فعلت —언각بوت —언각بوت —언각بوت —expression of $ on final
—and after aug. ى preceded by three or more rads.
—and after aug. ى preceded by three rads.—
—سمرت —سمرت —سمرت —(3) medial
—كلما وسعت —كلما وسعت —كلما وسعت —in other cases $ rad., unless
otherwise indicated.

§ 679. $ aug. in pause—$ and ل rarely aug.—exs. of
$ 25 $ امات and $ امات $ for $ امات and $ امات $ for $ ارات $ —ex. of ل—neither $ of
silence, nor ل of distance, really aug.—$ a
letter of augmentation—regular only in pause
—necessary there, or allowable—its augmenta-
tiveness denied by Mb—but genuine, though
rare—proved by (1) for $ امات $ pl. of
verse combining both dial. vars.—distinction between مات and مهات in use—रा
for مأ—its measure—theory that it is rad.
-م and م then two different o. fs.—
weakness of this theory—no argument from
transmission of م in the ‘Ain—authority
of the ‘Ain not admitted by F—(2) for
-م—Mb’s only answer to ط in
, and in—هبار in بار
rightly held to be aug.—similarly in—
s of silence not really a letter
of augmentation.

§ 680. س aug., (1) regularly—س of گئر
of گئر—refutation of Z on former—(2) by
hearsay—theory of S—loss of mobility in
of ط—anomalous use of ط
and ط in ط as compensation for
it—aor. of ط according to S—criticism of
Mb on his theory—theory of Fr—aor. according
to him—objection to his theory—س neglected
by IM and his son—only nine letters of aug-
mentation mentioned in Alfiya—excuse for
omission of س.
§ 681. ι aug. in (1) dems.—added there to indicate distance—generally mobile, and pronounced with Kasr—(2) فَحْجَلِ، عُبَدِل̣ (2)
— ambiguous—ι used as a letter of augmentation—but rarely—being the least aug.
letter—regular only in dem.—but heard in other words—opinion of Akh on ι of عَبَدِل̣—
contrary opinion expressed by him—remaining instances dubious—augmentativeness of ι
denied by Jr—no evidence of it in ι of dem.
—this ι rightly not a letter of augmentation
—ι explained by him as rad. in three other words—but apparently aug. in all.

§ 681 A. Letters of augmentation when judged to be rad.

CHAPTER IX. THE SUBSTITUTION OF LETTERS.

§ 682. Found in all three parts of speech—definition given (1) in SH—incorporative substitution not meant—compensation excluded—and restoration—and conversion—(2) in IKn—difference between these two definitions—conversion included by IV—less comprehensive than substitution—peculiar to unsound letters and Hamza—compensation different from both—meaning of "original" and "substituted" or "subst."
—classification of substituted letters—IM's object in this chapter—incorporative substitution
for Hamza—these substitutions rare and anomalous—origins of substituted letters—substitution recognizable by reversion to original—
and—conclusion to be drawn from absence of reversion—subst. said by IH to be recognizable by (1) "the paradigms of its derivation"—meaning of this phrase—

and 


(2) "the paucity of its usage"—meaning of this phrase— subst. here recognizable by first test also—
this pl. not from —(3) "the fact that it is a deriv., while the letter is an aug."—

—(4) "the fact that it is a deriv., while it is a rad."— meaning of last two phrases—mode of determining whether subst. be in deriv. or in o. f.—obscenity of IH's expressions here—(5) "the fact that an unknown formation would be entailed"—

and not unknown—subst. how recognizable in them—causes of substitution.

§ 683. Hamza substituted for seven letters—its substitution for letters of softness regular and
irregular—regular necessary and allowable—necessary found in ل، خ، and ف—order of mention—substitution for و and ي necessary in four cases, where و or ي is (1) final after aug. و — و — و — و associated with و and ي—substitution retained with adventitious ی of femininization, but disallowed with unadventitious—converse case—predicament of two augs. of دو.—no substitution in س ا curtailed form of یق. د ل — or د ل — ل considered final—amendments suggested by A and IUK in IM’s rule for this case, and objections to them—manner of substitution—(2) خ of act. part. from و. whose خ is transformed—this substitution extended to ی ف and ی ل when not act. parts.—dispute as to whether act. part. be subordinate to و. in transformation and sounding true—manner of substitution—و or ي disregarded in act. part. by Mb—Hamza in both س و and د ل ب ن and written as ي—but not changed into pure ي in either—rad. ي. not sounded true in ب ن، any more than rad. و in ی ت ل—rotting of ي in ت ل and ب ن disallowed—(3) after ی of م ف ل in pl., when
such ج or ى is an *aug.* letter of prolongation third in *sing.*—1 associated with ج and ى—*IM's* rule for third case—reason given by *IJ* for converting this letter of prolongation into *Hamza*—and by *Khi*—no conversion when ج or ى in *sing.* is (a) not a letter of prolongation—(b) not *aug.*—

and تُطعِمُ anomaly—as also مَعَاكِشُ—(c) not third—(d) second of two soft letters having ل of عمَل between them—reason for changing soft letter after ل of *pl.* into *Hamza*—dispute as to whether this substitution be peculiar to *pl.*—this *Hamza* also written as undotted ى—fifth case peculiar to ى—*IHsh's* rule for it—two cases included under this rule—

ًأُورَى ىوُرَى ىورُي substitution in these *exs.* not necessary, but allowable—rule given by ز and يَب—by ب—by ي. . . —four cases excluded by A’s rule—change in them not necessary, but allowable—dispute about fourth—opinion preferred by *IM*—two cases included, where change is necessary—condition requisite in second ج—change of first necessary where condition is fulfilled, and allowable elsewhere—restriction as to initiality of first ج—theory of *IM* that conjunction of the two ج should
not be accidental—opinion of others—allowable substitution of Hamza for letter of softness when (1) a permanentlly pronounced with Damm—R.'s formula for it—this substitution good, regular—no substitution when  is (a) accidentally pronounced with Damm—(b) doubled—(2) a  pronounced with Kaer between  and double  —irregular substitution of Hamza for letter of softness when (1) an , (a) to avoid concurrence of two quiescents—(b) from proximity of outlets—(2) a  when (a) an initial, pronounced with (a) Kaer—cause of this substitution—its irregularity disputed— of طَرِيق. not converted—(b) Fath—(b) a letter of prolongation—reason for substitution here—(3) a  when (a) an initial pronounced with Fath— for  دَى —dispute as to whether it is a dial. var.—تَلَف for  —(b) a letter of prolongation—substitution of Hamza for  and  rare, irregular—substitution for  in (1)  and —evolution of  —its pl. of paucity—and of multitude—substitution, though anomalous, obligatory in , not in —Hamza a subst. for  in —not in —substitution for  —
§ 684. [substituted for four letters—or five—its substitution for, and regular and irregular situations why not mentioned here by IM—substitution of Hama for ξ—very strange.
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that neither of them be of word-ending in augment peculiar to ܪь—this condition indicated by IM — ܘܒܝܐ ܪь. CONTENT.
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§. 685. ی most extensive subst.—substituted for nine letters—its substitution why so frequent—regular and anomalous—regular for three letters—for ی in two cases, where preceding letter is (1) pronounced with Kasr—

and ی—why then converted into ی—(2) ی of dim.—for ی in ten cases, where ی is (1) preceded by Kasra, and (a) final—ی why then converted into ی—(b) before ی of feminization—ی why then converted into ی—no distinction here between separable and inseparable ی—two anomalies—(a) سوْرَسُ ی—its measure and other peculiarities—(b)
no third anomaly—

—IBr's explanation of

before \ of feminization, abbreviated or prolonged—(d) before \ and (2) \ of inf. \ having the of its \ transformed, and its own \ preceded by Kasra and followed by \ and \ and —transformation rare where \ is lacking—anomalous to sound

true when conditions of transformation are fulfilled—no counterpart of it—

not an inf. \—(3) \ of pl. having its \ sound, and its \ preceded by Kasra, and, in sing., either (a) transformed—\; then overpowered by Kasra in pl.—no necessity for \ after it here—or (b) quiescent, provided that in pl. it be followed by \ —\; then overpowered by Kasra in pl.—five conditions of conversion here—\; sounded true if \ be missing—explained as expanded from \—on contracted from —or transformed from \ to distinguish pl. of bull
from pl. of لورُ slab (of dried curd)—أ also sounded true if mobile in sing.—طوال and \( \mathfrak{c} \) ل—or if ل be unsound—(4) final, fourth or upwards, and after Fat: a— why changed into ی in pret. and pass. part.—pret. here conformable to aor., and pass. part. to act. part.—یشایان—ندازیئنا and يشایان—(5) quiescent, single, and immediately after Kasra—سوار and خوان and لدنیا—فعلی (6) ل—ICALIAR and لدنیا— 발견 of ep. ل—ICALIAR and لدنیا— 발견 of substantive—

not altered—conflict of opinion—(7) combined with ی in single, or virtually single, word, while first of them is quiescent, original in nature and quiescence—سید and یهی their measure فعال not فعال and لی to فعال and L—dim. of n. whose third is a mobile and whose broken pl. is on measure of
—treatment of this in dim. how accounted for—dim. of اسود when an ep. of اسو and عمود—pl. and dim. of دُخُل—(8)

L of مفعول from v. whose خ is pronounced with Kasr in pret.—this ل why converted into ۳۹۹۹ زل—sounded true if خ of v. be pronounced with فاث—۲۹۹۹—reason for either treatment of ,—different versions of ex. cited in Aud—(9) ل of pl. تِقْرَی عَصِی—نَعْوَل, and ۳۹۹۹ دِان—sounding ل true anomalous in pl.—necessary in sing.—۲۹۹۹ عَصِی and قَسِی—IM's language in Alfiya—(10) ل of pl. وَعَل sound in ۳۹۹۹ and ۳۹۹۹ صُم and ۳۹۹۹ ل more frequent—sounded true if ل be unsound—or be separated from خ by ۲۹۹۹ نِمَم—anomalous—substitution of ۲۹۹۹ for ل and ۳۹۹۹ in gen. and acc. of دَعَو and perf. pl. masc.—its substitution (1) for ل (a) regular—(b) anomalous or weak—(2) for ۳۹۹۹ (a) regular—(b) anomalous—dispute as to regularity of ۳۹۹۹—and of مَعْطِل, صِدِیق, یِسِلِم, and ۲۹۹۹—its substitution for Hamza (1) regular, but not obligatory—(2) necessary—substitution of ۲۹۹۹ for Hamza necessary in two

substitutions weak—and for ج — ج ى substituted for eighteen letters in all.

§ 686. ج substituted for three letters—for ج in one case, where preceding letter is pronounced with a "د."

Damm—ج in four cases, where ج occurs (1) quiescent, single, in a sing., and after Damma—ج unchanged if mobile—or incorporated—or in a pl., preceding Damma being then converted into Kasra—(2) after Damma as ج of (a) فعل ج—(b) a n. ending in fundamental, inseparable, گ of femininization—رُمِّيْن——(c) a n. ending in aug. گ and ج—(3) as ج of ج فعل گ when a substantive—سُعْيَا ج، گ، and ج said to be anomalous—meaning of "anomalous"—spellings of ج طَفْيَا—(4) as ج of ج فعل ج when (a) a substantive—طَلَّوِيْ لُك ج—(b) an ep. acting as a substantive—indication of its so acting—o. خ of خَلْوَسِ ج، خَلْوَيِ ج، ج خُوْرِي ج. Daamma of ج، when a pure ep., said by GG to be converted into Kasra—دَجْنِي ج and چَجْكِي ج—opinion of IM and his son—its differences from saying of GG—language of Shl—طَبَيْي ج as a substantive—substitution of و (1) for ج (a) obligatory in such as (a) ضُوْرُب گ.
and ضویرک — cause of conversion in dim. — and in broken pl. — (b) ضویرک (c) — ضویرک and رحوی (d) — تصور ضوری (e) — ضوری and دو ۲ لوا (f) — عصری — ۲ لوا (g) — etc., and ۲ لوا, etc., etc., cause of conversion — is here assumed to be orig. و s — (b) weak in such as حبلو انجر and — every final ۲ converted by Fazāra and some of Kais into ۲ in pause — reason for such conversion — heaviness of ۲ — why tolerated in pause — similar excuse for conversion of ۲ into Hamza ۲ retained by Tayyi in continuity — ۲ converted by some of Tayyi into ۲ in pause — ۲ more frequent then ۲ in dial. of Tayyi — ۲ retained in continuity — reason for conversion of ۲ into ۲ or — (2) for ۲ (a) obligatory in such as (a) طویب، موسر مورن and and مونیف، موسر، موقن — بوطر and بقوق (b) ضوری and تقوی (c) — (b) anomalous, weak, in such as (a) معرض (b) مشو and — reason for change of ۲ into here — (c) — dispute as to reality of change in معرض and جبا — dim. of ۲ and ۲ — of ضعیف and
§ 687. م substituted for four letters, (1) م , necessarily, in مم alone—evolution of مم from مم — vowel of its مم — مم ، generally restored in prefixion— م in مم said by Akh to be a subst. for م — مم (a) aprotetic—(b) pre. to مم of 1st pers.— مم فم — مم فم — مم فم — (c) pre. to explicit مم , or to pron. other than مم of 1st pers.— مم combined with مم in مم — explanation suggested by M—opinion of S—another explanation reported by M—opinion of M—dial. vars. of مم —(2) م of art., in dial. of some—(3) م م , (a) regularly before م , when م is quiescent—language of M—reason of conversion—inmaterial whether م and م be in one word or two— م written as م , though pronounced as م —change of م into م not properly termed "conversion" —(b) anomalously
without ب, when ن is (a) quiescent—(b) mobile—converse substitution of م for ن in (a) قتال مختر (4) ب in (a) بذات مختر —opinions of IS and IJ—sometimes pronounced with undotted ح—(b) زاي (9)—opinions of AASh and IJ—(c) نغم—(d) نغم —why used as subst. for these four letters.

§. 688. ن substituted for four letters, (1) صناعيي and (2) صناعيي—opinion of S—of Mb—of others—that of S preferable—ن here why not a subst. for Hamza of feminization—(2) ل ن لع——ل نر لع——or a separate dial. var.——and نارانيي لف and characterized by IH as anomalous, and ن ف as weak—(3) م —(4) Hamza—alleged substitution of ن in فُلَان, masc. of فُلَانى, for Hamza of سُلَان——"substitution" here merely alternation—this application of "alternation" tropical.

§. 689. و substituted for seven letters, (1, 2) و and (3) و, when (a) ف—such substitution (a) regular in فُنُعِل and its variations—meaning of IH 's language—this substitution how indicated by IM—reason for change of ف into ت—theory that substitution here is
always for — not included with، and dialectic peculiarities — (b) irregular in numerous expressions — (b) necessary in default of توراة and ل توراة and نورات — their rad. — meaning of "rad." — the sign of feminization in them — their استمرار — used oftener than بنت — Sf's opinion on or in and كلا — بنت (b) — اخت الين and its ت a subst. for، or، and its ت a subst. for — its formation — its كوت — دينان and their dial. vars. — their not a subst. for — possible o. f. of دينات — its rel. u. — (3) — said by Fr to be a dial. var. — its why not original — regarded by IH as sole instance of unincorporative substition for س — (b) س — its formation —
§ 690. $8$ substituted for six letters, (1) Hamza, (a) aug., in (a) — Hammah (b) — Hammah (c) — Hammah (d) — Hammah — aors. — all four exs. transmitted by ISk—(b) rad., in (a) — Lannak (b) — Lannak — or or — Lannak — Hamza here why altered into $8$ (e) (f) — Hammah (g) — Hammah — Hammah in these cases why changed into $8$ — substitution of $8$ for Hamza confined to hearsay—(2) i., in (a) — opinions on its $8$ — (h) — opinions on its last $8$ (i) — and $8$ — opinions on its $8$ in former case—
(d) هَا — dispute about its last s — opinion of BB — of Z and IH — of AZ, Akh, and KK — of others — substitution of s for l anomalous — (3)

ل — dispute as to whether its last s be substituted for l or for l converted from s — meaning of l here — (4) ى in (a) هَا for دَا — its last s a subst. for دَا in pause — or in pause and continuity alike — such substitution not regular — subsidiary to introduction of conj. ى in continuity — conj. ى elided in pause — last s of هَا quiescent in pause; rarely in continuity — mostly pronounced with Kasr in continuity, with or without conj. ى — proof that s is not for feminization — (b) فُسِّي ى — (5) ى، in (a) طُلَّتْ —ر، حَا، etc., in pause — continuity sometimes treated like pause, and pause like continuity — (b) فُسِّي ى and دَا — (c) یَا! — regarded by many as a dial. var. — measure of دَا! — like that of طُلَّتْ — its o. f. — measure of دَا! — (d) ى، ىـ — (e) ى — (6) حـ، in (a) طُلَّتْ — (b) مُكَأْثَة — (c) مُدْقَح distinguished by some from مُدْقَح.

§. 691. ل substituted for two letters, (1) أَمِيلُ — ن (1) أَمِيلُ — dim. of أَمِيلُ — or a sing. n. peculiar
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to the *dim.*—effect of *dim.* formation on its

sense—(1) أَقَ A

§. 692.  the substituted for two letters, (1) ت، (a)

regularly in فَتَمَّ after a letter of covering—

reason of substitution—(b) anomalously in

attached nom. pron. of every pret. v. of 1st or

2nd pers. after a letter of covering—in dial.

of Banū Tamīm—ل of v., if ل، then incorp-

orated into ل of pron.—substitution why

anomalous—(2) د و ل and ل و ل

§. 693.  the substituted for three letters, (1) و in (a)

، (a) regularly after د، ل، or ج—

and mostly ق then incorporated into it—

causes of conversion and incorporation—

incorporative conversion not relevant here—

after د conversion necessary, and incorporation

usual—(b) anomalously after ج —conversion

why anomalous—exs.—confined to hearsay—

(b) some anomalous formations, (a) ج and

د ل ج—(b) د ل ج —reason for supposing its

to be a subst. for و —this substitution not

to be copied—contrasted with cases (a، a) and
§ 694. ج substituted for و when (1) double, (a) in pause—cause of substitution—and of its employment in pause—(b) in continuity when treated like pause—(2) single, (a) in pause—dialectic peculiarity—object of substitution—
(b) not in pause—أمسى and أمسى for أمست which أمست—vocalization of ج—substitution more anomalous here than in cases (1, a), (1, b), and (2, a)—أمسى ج in possibly a subst. for أمسى of كذ‘أ.

§ 695. ص substituted for س before ق, خ, ر, غ, and ظ—substitution how accounted for—similar to cảmة—not allowable after these letters—but not prevented by separation from them—regular, but not necessary—زئر — زئر.

§ 696. ج substituted for two letters, س and ص, when quiescent before د—(1) for سـمـل and سـدـر of what conjugs.—cause of substitution—simulation not allowable here—(2) for ص—quiescent ص, before د, pronounceable (1) as pure ج—cause of change—(2) as ص simulating
sound of j—simulation why not allowable in س
—exs.—meaning of IH's words on this subject
—mobile ص before د not changed into pure j—but sometimes made to simulate j—
though more rarely than quiescent ص—conversion into j allowable only when heard—
simulation similarly restricted in ص separated from د by more than a vowel—mobile س
converted into j before ق in dial. of Kalb—
simulation by ج and ش—its cause—its rarity disputed—meaning put by Jrb upon "simulation" in case of ج and ش—these two letters not
made into pure j—summary of previous discussion—(3) as pure ص—simulation more frequent than substitution, and sounding plain than both—meaning of "sounding plain"—comparative frequency of such pronunciations as are allowable in quiescent ص—and in quiescent س
—end of what Z, IH, and IM mention in this chapter.

§. 696A. Substitution of other letters—of all letters in order of outlets—(1) Hamza—(2) ج —
(3) د—(4) خ for two letters, ج and Hamza—(5) گ for two letters, خ and د—(6) د خ for خ—(7) خ for
گ—reciprocity between them—(8) ق for for ك—
(9) ك for two letters, (a) ق—reciprocity between them—(b) ت—(10) ج for three letters, (a) ك—(b) ج—observation by IU—(a) س—(13) ض
for ض wrongly put here, instead of ض by some MSS—ض، given by lexicologists for جَمَد for ر (14) ل (15) for ت (19) د (18) ط (17) ن (16) ل—ل س (22) ز (21) ص (20) for three letters, (a) اسْتَخْدَمَ—ت (b) adduced by Z as evidence that س is a letter of substitution—(b) ش (23) ل—ل—ل (24) ن ذ for two letters, د and س—ل ذ for two letters, and ط ذ ف (26) ف (25) ذ ف for two letters, (a) م (29) ف م (28) ف for two letters, (b) ب (27) م (29) ف م

CHAPTER X.—TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNSOUND.

§ 697. Unsoundness—transformation—definition of it as a technical term—alleviation of Hamza and some cases of substitution excluded—degrees of dissimilarity between these two processes and transformation—alteration of Hamza not a transformation—nor substitution, elision, or quiescence, of sound letters other than Hamza—nor inflectional alteration of unsound letters—three modes of transformation—(1) conversion—(2) elision—(a) regular—(b) euphonic
---(c) curtailing or arbitrary---(3) transfer of vowel—subsequent treatment of unsound letter
—transfer subsidiary to quiescence—letters of transformation—also named "unsound letters"

—Hamza included by some—أ، أ، and ى why
subject to alteration—vowels really parts of them—consonant when termed "mobile" or "quiescent"—vowel of mobile consonant pronounced after, not with, it—impletion of vowel into letter of prolongation—number and description of vowels—أ، أ، and ى found in ىن،
ىن، and ىن—أ not ىن in ىنل ىن. or in ىن—
ىن. in ىن، ىن. ىن، imitative ىن.، and foreign names—formations sound or unsound—
ىن. ىن. or ىن. ىن. condition of reduplication in ىن. ىن. definition of unsound formation—its unsound constituent—Hamza not technically termed "unsound"—formations divisible into (1) formed, and not formed, with Hamza—both being sound and unsound—(2) reduplicated and unreduplicated—both being sound and unsound—these two divisions omitted by ىن. ىن. reduplicated also formed, and not formed, with Hamza—definition of "formed with Hamza"—and of "reduplicated"—such formations as ىن. ىن. not named "reduplicated"—seven divisions of unsound formations—their names.
§ 698. Positions of unsound letters—\(\text{غ} \), \(\text{ه} \), and \(\text{ع} \)—agreement between unaug. \(\text{غ} \) and \(\text{ه} \) in occurrence of either as \((a) \text{ف} \), \((b) \text{ح} \), \((c) \text{ك} \) or \((d) \text{ح} \) and \(\text{ل} \)—double \(\text{غ} \) or \(\text{ه} \) as rare here as double guttural—double Hamza not used—double \(\text{غ} \) extraordinary—\((2)\) precedence of either before the other as \(\text{ف} \) and \(\text{ع} \) respectively—precedence of \(\text{غ} \) more frequent—only instances of either—difference between them in \((\text{ح})\) precedence of \(\text{غ} \) before \(\text{ف} \) or \(\text{ع} \) and respectively—converse precedence not found—\(\text{ل} \) and \(\text{ه} \) as \(\text{غ} \) and \(\text{ع} \) respectively, more frequent than double \(\text{غ} \) in \(\text{ح} \) and \(\text{ع} \) held by \(\text{س} \) to be a subst. for second \(\text{غ} \) in \(\text{ح} \) why not converted into —or incorporated into second—\(\text{م} \) held by \(\text{م} \) to be original—opinion of \(\text{س} \) correct—his remarks on why substituted for its last \(\text{غ} \) —\((2)\) occurrence of \(\text{غ} \) as \((a) \text{ف} \) and \(\text{ع} \) like \(\text{k}\) and \(\text{ل} \) \(\text{د} \) and —not so used in either case, except in \((a) \text{أ} \) —opinion of \(\text{ر} \)—homogeneity of \(\text{غ} \) and \(\text{ع} \) rare—less disagreeable with separation or incorporation —\((b) \text{و} \) —its if—its component letters—reasons for considering its \(\text{غ} \) —its dim. — \(\text{ع} \) more often than a \(\text{غ} \)
THE AND في AS في S.

§. 699. (1) retained unaltered - why so treated - (2) elided in (a) aors. - o. f. of يَأْتَى and it - their - why elided - elision desirable for alleviation - their - why not elided - or their - Kaera - why not elided - theory of KK on reason for elision - retained if letter after it be pronounced with Fath - يَتَّع - يُبْعَس - يَبْعَس and - بَلَّا and بَسُع - يَبْعَس and - elision extended to remaining variations of aor., and to imp. - (b) inf. ns. - o. f. of - said to be (a) - its - why elided - two qualifications necessary for elision - one not sufficient - no elision in simple substantive -
transfer of vowel the intended mode of transformation in inf. n., and elision merely consequential—or elision intended, and transfer subsidiary—(b) ـعـد in ـعـد a compensation for elided ـ in ـعـد and ـعـد why combined with ـ—elision of ـ(c) ـعـد—its.

why pronounced with Kasr in ـعـد— ـعـد
and ـعـد— ـعـد— ـعـد and ـعـد or ـعـد— ـعـد
and ـعـد— ـعـد— ـعـد— ـعـد (3) converted— ـ. like ـ, except in elision—not elided in aor.—

exs.—why not elided— ـيـس and ـيـس—only

instances of elision—conversion of ـ, converted into Hamza, (1) necessarily, when initial and followed by a mobile ـ, or rather by a ـ, not a letter of prolongation converted from an aug.—conversion of first necessary if second be (a) not a letter of prolongation—(b) a letter of prolongation unconverted, or converted from a rad.—opinion of KK on ـأـلـى—dispute as to necessity for conversion when second is alleviated form of Hamza—(c) original—discussion of condition that second be mobile—conclusions based on it—first ـ, why not converted into ـ(2) allowably in such as ـأـلـى.
and, according to Mz, 

invariably in 

irregularly in 

etc. — rarity of initial 

pronounced with Kasr—initial, sometimes converted into 

— substitution of 

for not regular, except in 

and in regularly converted into 

when not converted from Hamza—conversion of quiescent 

and into and, respectively.

§ 700. Fathā of 

original in , but adventitious in — antagonism of these two Fathās—latter likened to Kasra in — this Kasra adventitious—therefore not diptote—former likened to Kasra in .

§ 701. Conversion of or into in aor. of — and their variations—this mode of conjugating universal among some Hijāṣīs—and practised by Shf— and four dial. vars. in aor. of whose is a — three anomalous, and one chaste—Kasra in distinguished from Kasra in and .
peculiar to dial. of Banū Asad—imp. of ٌبِثَجْلُ
—indication that conversion of ٌ in ٌبِثَجْلُ and
ٌبِثَجْلُ into ٌ or ٌ is regular—language of Sf,
F, and others—of IH—ٌبِثَجْلُ ٌبُبَسُ and ٌبُبَسُ—
this conversion of ٌ into ٌ found only in aor.
whose ٌ is pronounced with Fāth, and said by
S not to be regular—aoristic ٌ not pro-
nounced with Kasr here.

§. 702. Substitution of ٌ for ٌ when a
ٌبِثَجْلُ—ٌبِثَجْلُ ٌبُبَسُ and ٌبُبَسُ—wrong—ٌبُبَسُ and ٌبُبَسُ anomalous or
rare—ٌ in act., or ٌ in pass., not changed
into ٌ in chaste dial.—ٌ not from
ٌبُبَسُ—but from ٌبُبَسُ—so said by F—existence of
ٌبُبَسُ contested by Zj—F's opinion verified—
or from ٌبُبَسُ—this derivation better—some
Bdd reported to allow conversion of ٌ into
ٌبِثَجْلُ ٌبُبَسُ and ٌb bald and vulgar.

THE AND ى AS ى.

§. 703. Transformed, elided, or preserved—transfor-
mation—three modes of transformation in
ى—(1) conversion—into ى—precluded in
and جوزات — reasons for conversion into 1 — its cause not very substantial—operative only on ل or ع, and easily restrained from action—principally effective in v.—this transformation original in pret. act. of unaugmented tril.—and conformable to original in aor., act. or pass., of unaugmented tril., and in pret. act., and aor. pass., of two augmented trils., —but not found in aor. whose ع is orig. pronounced with دamm or kasr—classification of ns. subjected to this transformation—conversion into 1 found in (a) tril. n.—(b) v. (a) tril.—(b) conformable to tril.— إسْتَلَانَ — (c) n. conformable to (b, a) or (b, b)— contrary to (a) قول and ينام—to (b, a) or (b, b)— contrary to (a) قول and ينام—anomalous—or regular, but weak—fell 1 — يَتَسُرُّ and يَتَأَمَّد— رضاً—conditions of conversion in two last— نَازِرٌ (b) — بادِعُ and 8 تَأَمَّد — بَنَتَ and تَنُّ ٌ and تَبِيعُ and تَقَارِلُ, بَنَٰبُ and تَبِيعُ —these formations disqualified for conversion of ع into 1 — contrary to تَأَلِلُ and
and to qualification needed for such transformation in deriv.—
additional disability in and and —omission of conversion anomalous—its anomalousness disputed in and when they have no tril. v.—transformation also heard in most of these anomalies—(2) quiescence by transfer of vowel—reason for such transformation—this quiescence principally in v.—in unaugmented tril.—and augmented—treatment of and after transfer of vowel—nature and extent of alteration—why not transformed in same way as their pret.— and similar—classification of ns. conformable to v. in this respect—transfer adopted for observance of mode of formation—by mobilization of quiescent with vowel of —other exs.—confusion between cats. of and not heeded here—conditions of transfer—another added in Tashil—(3) elision, (a) necessary, (a) where quiescence of final is necessitated, by (∞) attachment of pron.—vowel of initial—(β) apocope or quasi-apocope—(b) in such as and —dispute as to elided here—this mention of
and not a superfluous repetition—

(b) allowable in such as (a) میدت سید and 

(b) Cafalate كهنوتة—elision necessary in latter cat.—nature of alteration in it disputed—opinion of S on both cats.—theory that former is orig.—refuted by S—or that former is orig.—transformation of فعل into فعل being regular in assimilate cp.—and latter orig.—فعل and orig. فعل—opinion of S preferable—elision why necessary in latter cat.—

(c) rare in فیعلان—preservation of، and 

reasons for it in such as (1) حوری صوری and —حوری ونی، حوریان، خیوان (2) —additional reason in latter cat.—(3) نوبۃ и

§ 704. Tril. vs. whose غ is unsound—و—formations of غ in cats. of، and غ—no دی عمل in cat. of، nor دی عمل in cat. of غ and دی عمل غ— غ said to be (1) دی عمل from (a) دی عمل in cat. of، —their pret.—and o. f.—(b) دی عمل in cat. of (a) غ—(b) غ، anomalously—(2) intermixtures of two dial. vars.—refutation of (2)—

and of (1, b, b)—식.
§ 705. Transmutation of َقَلْلٌ, when its َعٍ is or َيٍ, َعِلْلٍ into َعِلْلٍ on attachment of mobile nom. pron.— َقَلْلٌ and not orig. َقَلْلٌ—dispute on manner of transition from َعِلْلٌ to َعِلْلٌ—theory (1) of many that َعِلْلٌ is transmuted into َعِلْلٍ—this opinion adopted by Z and IM—(2) of IH that َذَامٌ and َكَسَرٌ are for explanation of the v. as a scion of َوٍ and َى respectively—meaning of "scion"—his argument—reason given by earlier authorities for suggesting transmutation—his argument in reply—(3) of R—alleged transmutation of َذَلٌ وَ َدَدٌ َقَلٌ and َقَلٌ َبَعٍ and َقَلٌ َبَعٍ and َقَلٌ َبَعٍ—no transmutation without mobile nom. pron., except in َذَلٌ and َذَلٌ—explanation of these two.

§ 706. Vocalization of letter preceding unsound َع in pass. of pret., tril. or on measure of َقَلْلٌ or َقَلْلٌ—dial. vars. in cat. of َقَلٌ and َقَلٌ—(a) pure َيٍ—evolution of َيٍ—and َقَلٌ—opinion of S in § 710 strengthened—(b) Ishmām—this dial. var. chaste—(c) pure َوٍ—evolution of َذَلٌ—and َذَلٌ—opinion of Akh in § 710 strengthened—this dial. var. of
no account—fuller explanations—pure.$ and
; explained by IH—and by Js—latter expla-
nation more probable—Ishmām—different
from Ishmām in pause—how pronounced—its
essence—so understood by Fr and GG—said
by some to be like Ishmām in pause—how
described by others—really Raam—its object
—vocalization of their
ن—ambiguous forms avoided—and replaced
by unambiguous—but not disallowed by Wes-
terns—nor noticed by S—ambiguity disregarded
by him—and pardoned by Sf—possible
meaning of "avoided"—avoidance preferable—but not necessary with distinctive con-
text—(8)
إِنْ تَيْمُ ُإِخْتَرُ and
—vocalization of
their conj. Hamza.

§. 707. ُ sounded true in (1) ُ of wonder—(2)
ْ نَعْلُ ُإِخْتَرُ of superiority—two causes assigned by IH—
only second by S—no reason for first—(3)
إِخْتَرُ and ُإِزَّة— ُتَفَاعَل—i. q. ُإِتَّعَلُ
(4) ُإِفَعَالُ—(5) ُإِفَعَالُ ِنَوْعُ no reason for assigning
any cause—distinction between ُإِفَعَالُ ِنَوْعُ and ُإِفَعَالُ
(6) such ُ as ُسُوْدُ and ُسُوْدُ—ُليِسُ ُصَدٍّدُ
، ُلَسُتُ، etc.—its ُ orig. pronounced with Kaar
(7) variations of ُ ُas whose ُ is sounded
true—عين sometimes (1) transformed in فعل denoting defects—and in its derive.—(2)
anomalously sounded true and فعل استفعال and فعل
—to notify o. f. of conjug.

§ 708. Additional cause requisite for conversion of و or ي into ل in penultimate after الع. ل —
nature of such cause—no conversion in ante-
penultimate—Hamza in تاَلُّ، كِسَآَةَ، رَدَّ دًا إِنَّ AND
كنَّمُ عَمَّا، نِبَ أَلَّا إِنَّ AND باَنَع
why substituted for ل —first ل why not
elided—Hamza in مآَلِل، AND ي، in act.
part, of unaugmented tril., said to be converted
into Hamza when transformed in ع.—really
converted into ل, and from ل into Hamza—
elision of ع impossible—cause of its conversion
into ل—and from ل into Hamza—this Hamza
written as undotted دل —عين sounded true in
act. part. when so sounded in ع.—عين and ل
sometimes transposed in act. part. of hollow
ع.—and always by Khl when its ل is Hamza—
his argument—similar transposition by him
in شواَءَة and خطاِيا and جُورَه and مًطاَيا
—answer to his argument—دلاَح and لَاك
anomalous—its derivation—and forms—دلاَك.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td>1498-1505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 709. **Pass. part. of tril. v. whose ḫ is unsound**—evolution of مَبِعَ and مَبِعَ—why not مَبِعَ—dispute between S and Akh on letter elided—each disputant contravening a rule of his own—argument in support of each—effect of dispute on measure of مَحَوْنَ—and on alleviation of مَسِحُأ—anomalies in cat. of and of مَحَوْنَ—cat. of مَحَوْنَ treated as sound by Banū Tamīm—exs. in poetry—مَدُورُنَ and مَدُورُنَ anomalous according to H—his opinion controverted—مَبِعَ said—and مَبِعَ—complete form allowed by Mb as a poetic license—but regarded by A as a Tamīnī dial. var.—opinion of Ish on pass. part. in cat. of مَحَوْنَ—and of مَحَوْنَ—pass. part. in latter cat. sometimes treated as sound—such treatment regularly allowed by Mb—but not by A.
§ 710. Opinion of S on treatment of ُع when a quiescent ُع preceded by Damma—and of Akh—reason for treatment advocated by S—and by Akh—reply to letter—eza.—measure of ُمْلَل and ُمْلَاك—and of ُمْلِىة—Akh's rule (1) contravened by himself in pass. part.—measure of ُمْلَع or ُمْلَع—(2) inconsistent with hearsay—ُمْلِع—its measure and derivation—ُمْلِع and ُمْلِع.

§ 711. Transformation a property of ُع.—imparted to ُع. only by conformity to ُع.—unaugmented tril. n. (1) transformed when modelled on ُع, i.e. when on measure of ُمْلَل or ُمْلَل—conversion of ُع necessary here—but sometimes omitted—such forms anomalous—no ُمْلَل in hollow n.—(2) treated as sound when not modelled on ُع—ُمْلِم—transformability of inf. n. determined by that of ُع—treatment of ُمْلِم.

§ 712. Condition of transformation in augmented tril. n. not conformable to ُع.—difference from ُع. not prescribed in unaugmented tril.—why prescribed in augmented, and not in unaugmented—meaning of "conformable"—
applicability of condition to ns. hitherto mentioned—nature of prescribed difference—peculiar difference in بابع and بابع —exs. of augmented tril. with, and without, prescribed difference—rule as stated by A—two sorts of n. covered by it—(1) مقدم and مقدم from بابع —(2) of feminization no obstacle to agreement with v. in measure—anomalies—their object—مقدم and مقدم and تبليغ or تبليغ —this sort of n. how distinguishable from v.—another condition prescribed by Mb—مقدم and مقدم and تبليغ or تبليغ —n. resembling or differing from, aor. in both measure and augment—first sort like إدوان and إدوان and إباع —شيوع and إباع and إباع —دورة and إباع —اعلała and إباع —اعلała and إباع —عذبة and إباع —عذبة and إباع —عذبة —transfer here anomalous—

this the obvious conclusion, according to A—opinion of IM and his son—objection to it—their reasoning applicable only to particular dial.—second sort how indicated by IM—opinion of Khl—A’s conclusion shared
by many etymologists—جذبٌ، خروجٌ، جذورٌ، and علَبٌ.

§ 713. Non-final mobile، and ی * generally impervious to conversion, by preceding Kasra and ؤمما، into ی and ، respectively—and still stronger when doubled، and sometimes so converted for conformity—but not ی—such conversion found in (1) the inf. n. whose ی is transformed in the v.—though not necessarily in this way— Giov reformated with ی Giov—with جول ی طفران and ی Giov—(2) the pl. whose ی is transformed in the sing.—ی of ذر— and of ی نورآ ی رواط—طالِی ی ذرم—and ی ذرم the pl. whose ی is quiescent in the sing., and followed by ی in the pl.— ی ذرم* and ی ذرم*—انخوار* anomalous—| needed here—effective as element in cause of conversion—and powerful as auxiliary in (1) and (2)—| ذرم allowable for conformity—ی ذرم خوار* and ی ذرم ذرم—and ی ذرم said to be contracted from ذرم.

1525—1530

* See Note on p. 1525, l. 18.
§ 714. Augmented tril. ns., when not like °قامة and °قامة, debared from transformation by quiescent before, or after, its or ی—such ns. of three kinds—reason for absence of transformation in (1) these ns. generally—

§ 715. Second of two unsound letters enclosing °ل of ultimate pl. is converted into —and this into Hamza — °خوار anomalous, like °خوار —such conformity of pl. to sing. not universal—nor °خوار to be taken as a precedent—conversion actually heard only
in case of two $v$ or $s$ as enclosing letters—but extended by Khl and $S$ to case of two $\text{ح}$ or $\text{ح}$—this extension disallowed by Akh—pl. of act. part. from حتي and شوي—reason for Akh's doubt—sound opinion that of $S$—further authority for it—second unsound letter not converted when far from end—$\text{صر}$ and $\text{صر}$—so $\text{صار}$ and $\text{صر}$, but نما صيغة—$\text{م}$ and $\text{م}$ anomalous—similar conflict of opinion on conversion of second of two unsound letters enclosing antepenultimate | in non-pl.

§ 716. Treatment of $\text{ة}$ and $\text{ة}$ combined, when their first is quiescent—cause of incorporation—$\text{ة}$ and $\text{ة}$ treated as likes—incorporation encouraged by quiescence of their first—$\text{ة}$ converted, whether first or second—no incorporation in $\text{ة}$ and $\text{ة}$ (1)—nor in $\text{ة}$ and $\text{ة}$ (2)—$\text{ة}$ and $\text{ة}$ (3)—measure of $\text{ة}$ and $\text{ة}$—conversion and incorporation sometimes found in (3)—never allowable in (1)—$\text{ة}$, $\text{ة}$, and $\text{ة}$—dispute about of $\text{ة}$—preceding Damma changed into
Kasra—either vowel allowable in مل of مل and in some other forms—conversion (1) in ملم and ملم anomalous—for want of م in their o. f.—or of finality in their double م—reason of its conversion—(2) in مل more anomalous.

§ 717. Treatment of م and م after ا of ultimate pl. not preceded by م or م—opinion of S on last—of Jh—regular form—of Zj—of IH—confirmation of his opinion—Hamza in all three pls. anomalous.

§ 718. م، when of م، فل، (1) converted into م، in substantive—طبري—virtually, when not actually, a substantive—كسي طبري and فلًا فلًا treated as substantives—anarhythous not a qual.—but treated as a substantive—small sense of qualification in م، of superiority—(2) not converted in ت—but ذamma before it converted into Kasra—so in pl. يض فل —its ذamma converted into Kasra—but sometimes left, and م then converted into م.
S. 719. More unsound than as ع s—the nearer to the end, the more subject to transformation—
transformation lighter than use of o. j.—
predicament of ٰ and ٰ as finals—modes of
transformation—these letters (1) converted
into ٰعٰزٰن and ٰعٰزٰن and ٰعٰزٰن and ٰعٰزٰن
and ٰعٰزٰن—measure of last two
ٰعٰزٰن and ٰعٰزٰن and ٰعٰزٰن and ٰعٰزٰن
ٰعٰزٰن and ٰعٰزٰن—objection to IH's explanation of
non-conversion in last—better opinion on
last two—non-conversion of their ٰل not
attributed to accidental character of its
vowel—ٰخٰشٰن and ٰخٰشٰن and ٰخٰشٰن
ٰخٰشٰن—one condition of conversion that
vowel of ٰ or ٰ be permanent—conformability,
or affinity, of n. to v. not a condition of
conversion in its ٰل and ٰنٰزٰن—ٰلٰغٰلٰان
conversion not prevented by ٰ of femininization
after the ٰل—nor by aug. ٰ before it—
restoration of ٰ to its o. j. (a) from fear
of ambiguity—exs. in v.—and n.—ٰل elided
in ٰعٰزٰن and ٰعٰزٰن how treated in rel. n.—
restored and not reconverted into | —
(b) for conformity — restoration of ل to its place | ی then not converted into | in
ترضین | ی | ترضین — elision of ی in sing.
masc. after Kasra or Fatha — ی and ی in
ترضین | ی | ترضین ی not converted — but ی sometimes elided — in absence of ambiguity,
ل not restored [to its o.f.] for avoidance of elision on account of two quiescents — (2)
made quiescent — 

(üşr) — ی | ی | ی | ی

(nom.) — similarly 

(şg.) and

(3) elided — sometimes arbitrarily — from frequency of usage — ل not elided in

(4) preserved.

§. 720. Capacity of ل and ی for bearing inflectional vowels after (1) a quiescent — (2) a mobile
— meaning of "mobile" — kind of vowel found before each — ی and ی sometimes quiescent in subj. and acc. — explanations of

such quiescence found in prose — ل and ی quiescent in ind. and nom. — ی sometimes mobile — catalogue of anomalies in treatment of unsound letter as seat of
inflection—，not found in gen.—predication of ى—sometimes mobile—this pronunciation said to be a poetic license—opinion of R—，and ى elided in apoc.—sometimes retained—I retained, except in apoc.—and sometimes even there.

§. 721. No decl. n. ending in ى preceded by a vowel—cause of that—treatment of ى when a ج،final or virtually final, after original دامما،in decl. n.—ةزس.—ى converted into ى،and then دامما into كسرة—ى not so converted when (1) not a ج—تَيَلِلْ—(2) followed by inseparable termination—exception when preceding دامما is upon another ى—(3) after accidental دامما—(4) in a م—(5) in a م،but invariably pronounced with فاث—ى sole instance—reasons for retention of ى here—corresponding predication of ى after دامما as respects conversion of دامما into كسرة—Fr and Sf on ُيَرَمِم—instances of non-finality as preventive of conversion—analogous instances in other cats.—Khl on differentiation of ُيَرَمِمً and ُيَرَمِم• from ُيَرِمِمً and ُيَرِمِم.
§ 722. Similar treatment of final ٰ after ٌDam, in spite of intervening letter of prolongation, in ٰ—this, converted into ی—and then preceding ٰ, and ٌ Dam of ٌع into Kasra—this process invariable in pl., but not in sing.—exs. of conversion and non-conversion in sing.—س on proper letter in sing. and pl.—final ٰ, strong when doubled—conversion then necessary, proper, or improper—ٰ not converted if not final—extraordinary cases of conversion—ٰ مَءَسَر or ٰ مَعَدِر—cause of transformation in former—similar transformation in pass. part. whose ل is Hamza—ٰ فُثَر—vowel of ف in ٰ فُعُول after conversion of ٰ and ٌDam—ٰ صَم and ٰ قَلٰ—conversion why allowable here—its regularity disputed—ٰ نَجَام anomalous.

§ 723. Final ٰ and ی after aug. ی converted into ی, and afterwards into Hamza—ٰ رَأِی and ٰ ثَلٰی—cause of conversion into ی—and then into Hamza—preceding ی to be aug.—reasons for this—and also, says Mz, third—ٰ زَأٰن—زَأٰن—زَأٰن—زَأٰن coordinated with ٰ رَأٰی and ٰ ثَلٰی and ی and ی not converted before inseparable ی.
of feminization—inseparable termination
a preventive of conversion into ٰ — eza.
ٰ ٰ or ٰ ٮٰ عَلِىَةٰ, ٰ ٰ عَبْا, or ٰ ٰ عَبْا, and ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ or
ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ — ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ and ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ allowable for
same reason as ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ here — ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ and ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ not
like ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ and ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ—inseparable termination
not a preventive of conversion of , when
a ل, after Kasra into ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ — ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ
and ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ.

§ 724. Conversion of final ٰ, after Kasra into ٰ — its
cause—conditions requisite for conversion
of mobile ٰ, after Kasra into ٰ — treat-
ment of mobile ٰ after Damma — ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ and
ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ — reason of conversion in them—deriva-
tion of ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ — of ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ and ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ — conversion
of ٰ in cat. of ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ, ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ, and ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ into ٰ
—whether this ٰ be orig. ٰ, or not—such
conversion peculiar to ٰ.

§ 725. ٰ ٰ عَلِىَةٰ, (1) when ٰ, preserved—no dis-
tinction here between substantive and ep.—
cause of non-conversion—(2) if ٰ, pre-
served in ep., and converted into ٰ in sub-
stantive—substantive why selected for
transformation—moderation intended—this change made in most cases—alleged exceptions—change of چ into چ in substantive said by IM here and in CK, agreeably with opinion of most GG, to be regular—but in Tashil to be anomalous—as also in another of his compositions—his admission there as to opinion of most GG—his proof that this change is anomalous—criticism on his proof—ل of چ, preserved—no distinction here between substantive and چب—cause of non-conversion— (2) if چ, preserved in substantive, and converted into چ in چب—IM's opinion contrary to that of most Etymologists—opinion expressed by R— quello, quello, and quello regarded by S as substantives—inequality of IH in treating چب as a substantive, and چ没啥 and چ没啥 as چب. چب on چب—conversion the rule, according to him, in every چب fem. of چب whose چ is چ—unless it be [actually used as] an چب—Sf's explanation of his meaning in latter case—ل of چب, from
defective, not converted in substantive or esp. - exs. of it scarce.

§ 726. Sings. of ultimate pl. ending in ی preceded by Hamza—general rule to alleviate these two letters in ultimate pl.—mode of alleviation—ی why converted into ی— and Hamza into ی—Hamza mostly converted into ق in du. of ق نمایان— but not in ultimate pl.— هدایت anomalous—general rule contravened in (1) همراه (2) گزار (3) هدایت and غوری—but observed in (2) گزار (1) گزار (3) هدایت and سکوت and خطای (4) هدایت exception—observations on (1) ی third in all these pls.—(2) Hamza after ی in گزار — (3) ی second in sings. گزار and شایسته (4) هدایت and ی and in هدایت (5) ی هدایت —(6) ی and ی in سکوت (7) ی and Hamza in خطای —Khl on خطای—remark by IH—conversion necessary in Hamza and its Kasra, after ی of ultimate pl., when that Hamza is adventitious in pl., and ی of pl. is Hamza, ی، or ی—no conversion (1) when Hamza is found in sing. as ی—condition for conversion prescribed by IH—and by
S, ŋ, and IHsh—meaning of "adventitious in pl."—(2) when ل is sound—Hamza here included among unsound letters—conflicting opinions on its soundness or unsoundness—formation of (1) خُطَابٌ—opinion of S and majority of BB—and of Khl—objection to latter—(2) قَصَامٌ—(4) جَرَوَةٌ—(3) مُطَلَّبٌ pl. of غَدِّرٌ—right view—true explanation of قَصَامٍ in it—their language not justifiable by assuming its sing. to be غَدِّرٍ—assertion of IAmb—anomalies in this cat.—

Akh on هِدْوَةٌ—opinion of KK on measure of all four formations mentioned above—and of BB—latter correct—difference between statement attributed to Khl, and opinion of KK, on measure of خُطَابٌ.

§ 727. Final ی, fourth or upwards converted into ی when letter before it is not pronounced with Damm—conditions of conversion when letter before it is pronounced with Fatḥ—two reasons assigned for conversion—یِضَجَّ أَنَّ تُغَزِّيَتْ—Akh on يِشَأ بَيَانٌ—weakness of second reason—object of proviso "when letter before it is not pronounced
with Ğamm"—additional proviso requisite.
—original proviso properly restricted to vs.
—amendment of it suggested by R.

§ 728. ע in cat. of ḫūṣi and qūṣi treated as sound—reason for not transforming it—and so in
cat. of ḫūṣiṭu and qūṣiṭu—another reason in
case of ḫūṣiṭu, ḡūṣiṭu, qūṣiṭu—and in that
of ḫūṣiṭu—and another in that of ḡūṣiṭu and
גūṣiṭu treated as sound in n. also—גūṣי, etc., anomalous—why so called—א how
explained by Fr—and by Ks—anomalous
according to all three accounts—last two
explanations applicable to גūṣי, etc.—incor-
poration in cat. of ḫūṣi—more frequent
than display—بخ and ע in —incorporation
why more frequent—stipulation that vowel
of second unsound letter be inseparable—
exs.—not imported on account of adventi-
tious and separable letter, nor inflectional
—inclusion or display allowable if
vowel be either inseparable, or imported on
account of adventitious, but inseparable,
letter—incorporation more proper in either
case—inseparability why stipulated—vowel
of first ی how pronounced in display—
Kasr of ف in ح — reason for Fath or Kasr — better explanation — assertion about Kasr in act. voice apparently a blunder — incorporation in pass. pret. — not so frequent as in act. — construction of ح

- Damm or Kasr of its ح — reason for each vowel — similar vocalization of ف in فعل ل

- Sf on ل for ل, and ح for ح — du. and pl. of ح and ل

- أحن and أحن — استتح — استتح — استتح — استتح

- Dial. vars. of استتح — and of استتح — استتح — استتح — استتح — استتح — استتح

- Exs. of استتح، استتح — استتح — استتح، استتح — استتح

- حواي or حواي or pass. of حواي — استتح — not said as aor. of حواي or حواي — حواي — incorporation eschewed in aor. pass. of حواي

- and in aor. act. — even in subj. — no incorporation in ext. of حواي — transformation preferred to incorporation — حواي — استتح

§ 729. Double ظ peculiar to فعل — objection to forming or فعل from ext. of ظ — especially — this objection obviated in ظ
—double and avoided when \( \text{ع} \) is orig. mobile—
but tolerated with incorporation—in \( n. \), not
in \( v. \)

§. 730. Pret. and aor. of \( ل 
\text{فعل} \) whose \( ل \) is 
\( \text{فعل} \) —reasons
for not incorporating—inf. n. of
\( جریء 
\text{فعل} \) —aor. 
\( جریء 
\text{فعل} \) —pret. of \( ل 
\text{فعل} \) whose
and \( ل \) are \( ص \), or whose \( ل \) is —their
aor., act. part., and inf. n.—
\( جریء 
\text{فعل} \), aor. 
\( جریء 
\text{فعل} 
inf. n. 

§. 730A. Additions to this chapter—modes of combi-
ning (1) two \( ص \)—(2) three \( ص \)—(3)
four \( ص \)—all of this the predicament of
\( ص \)—(4) two \( ص \)—(5) three \( ص \)—(6) four
\( ص \)—God knows best.

CHAPTER XI.—INCORPORATION.

§. 731. Definition—\( \text{دَخَلَنَّ} 
\text{اذْغَام} 
\text{اذْغَام} \)—incorporation
as defined (1) by IH—why so named—two
letters requisite for it—quiescent and mobile
—first quiescent, and second mobile—both
proceeding from one outlet—without separa-
tion—modes of separation—(2) by R—his
objections to IH's conditions "quiescent and mobile" - and "without separation" - incorporation necessary, disallowed, and allowable - intended to lighten concurrence of homogeneous letters - such concurrence of three kinds - (1) first homogeneous letter quiescent, and second mobile - here incorporation necessary - whether in one word or two - (2) first mobile, and second quiescent - here incorporation disallowed - ǎ², ǎ³, ǎ, ǎ³ - (3) both mobile - here incorporation (a) necessary - (b) allowable where homogeneous letters are (a) separate, and preceded by mobile, or by letter of prolongation or softness - first homogeneous made quiescent for incorporation - incorporation when good, and when best - why omissible - display of reduplication better after letter of prolongation than after mobile, and after letter of softness than after letter of prolongation - incorporation why allowable after letter of softness - (b) virtually separate - (c) disallowed, (a) where one homogeneous letter is coordinative, whether in v. or n. - (b) where incorporation would lead to confusion of paradigms - no such confusion in vs. - (c) where homogeneous letters are separate, and first
is preceded by quiescent other than a letter of prolongation or softness—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 incorporation not disallowed if preceding quiescent be a letter of prolongation or softness—incorporation of approximates—incorporation of two kinds—of likes and of approximates, in one word and in two—meaning of "approximates"—incorporation proper to etymology and to Readers, but latter kind ignored here by IM—incorporation of likes, whose first is quiescent and second mobile, necessary on three conditions, that first be no.

(1) a ظ of silence—مِلَّة هَلْكَ  (2) a

Hamza separated from the ف—treatment of two consecutive Hamzas in one word—and in two—(3) a letter of prolongation,

(a) at end of word—إِخْشَأ فَأَرَبَّا  and مُغْرَاب—إِخْشَأ و أَرَبَّا (b) substituted, not permanently, for another letter—أَوْب for أَوْب—IM's mention of these conditions—incorporation of likes, both of which are mobile, necessary on eleven conditions, (1) that both be in one word—reduplication extremely heavy—no concurrence of likes in rads. of quad. or quin.—nor in ف and ع
of tril., except extraordinarily—nor in beginning or middle of augmented tril. n. not commensurable with v.—concurrence of mobile likes in beginning or middle of augmented vs., and of augmented ns. commensurable with vs.—whether trils.—or quads.—treatment of likes in augmented quad.—and in augmented tril., (a) in beginning (α) of pret.—similar treatment of approximates when of تَفَاعَل or تَفَعَّل is approximate to its ت—incorporation in pret. extended to aor., imp., inf. n., and act. and pass. parts.—(β) of aor.—(b) in middle—incorporation why allowable in inf. ns. of conjugs. mentioned—this the predicament of mobile likes combined in beginning or middle of word—their predicament at end, (a) if first have another letter incorporated into it—(b) if reduplication be co-ordinative—elision of l in ارطُي —(c) if first be unsound—or sound, (αα) in v.—(bb) in tril. n., unaugmented or augmented—(γ) فَعَل (β) فَعَل (α) فَعَل —عم — رَدًّد، سَور، سَور (δ) فَعَلْنَانَ، فَلَانْنَان، فَلَانْنَان (ε) إِدْقَ (η) زَاد، مَدِق، مَرِد، مَسْتَعْدَ and أَظَلَل—these the predicaments
of mobile likes combined in one word—
elision or transfer of vowel from their first
when incorporation is intended—conditions
of incorporation if likes be in two words—
question whether “incorporation” attribut-
ed to IAl in certain texts be mere stifling—
or pure incorporation—Readers safer guides
than GG on this question—incorporation by
transfer of vowel from first of two likes not
allowable when likes are in two words—(2)
that they be not initial—aoistic

إِبْتَابُحُ

for

نَتَابُحُ — condition of non-initiality not
mentioned here by IM—(3–6) that they be
not on measure of (a) فُعُلُ، (b) فَعَلُ، (c)
فُعُلُ، (d) فَعَلُ — incorporation disallowed in
all these measures—reason of its disallow-
ance—and in n. commensurable, in its fore
part, with any of them—as also in فُعُلُ —
combination of two mobile likes possible in
four more measures of tril.—فُعُلُ not used
—فُعُلُ، فُعُلُ， فُعُلُ， فُعُلُ — used—incorporation
generally prescribed in فُعَلُ and فَعَلُ — and
dissolution in فُعُلُ—(7) that no letter be
incorporated into the first of the two likes
—(8) that mobilization of their second be
not adventitious—(9) that word containing them be not co-ordinated with another—such co-ordinates of three sorts—words cut out from composite expressions—incorporation disallowed in all three sorts—(10) that word containing them be not one of those expressions wherein dissolution is anomalously chosen by the Arabs—whether vs.—or ns.—dissolution or incorporation allowable in (a) عَبْرَ and عَدُّ—reasons for these alternatives—تَسْقَط—dissolution preferable—(b) لِسْلَكَ and لَنَسْجَلِ (a) and (b) exceptions to rule as to necessity for incorporating first of two mobile likes in one word—(11) that quiescence do not supervene upon their second either through its conjunction with a nom. pron., or through apo-copation or quasi-apocopation—such formations of two kinds—meaning of “nom. pron.”—no incorporation with it, according to majority of Arabs—dialectic variations—choice allowed, in apoc. and imp., between dissolution and incorporation—reason for the latter—meaning of “choice allowed”—effect of incorporation upon conj. Hamza in imp.—incorporation retained with َ of pl., ِ of 2nd pers. sing. fem., or corrob. ٰ—
connection of this question with condition (8)—proposed amendment of A’s language—vowel of letter that has its like incorporated into it, (a) before ٰٓ of 3rd pers. sing. fem. and ٰٓ of 3rd pers. sing. masc.— ٰٓ and ٰٓ allowed by KK, and ٰٓ by Th—the latter censured for allowing Fath—Kašr a dial. var.—(b) before a quiescent—Damm rare—(c) not conjoined with any of the foregoing, from “ٝ of pl.” to “quiescent”—dissolution obligatory in ْفُلّ of wonder, and incorporation in ٰٓ—this proviso a correction of preceding rule as to “choice allowed in . . . imp.”— ْفُلّ of wonder regarded, by majority of BB, as a pret. v.— and ٰٓ, by Hijāzīs, as a verbal n.—vowel of its final—prominent nom. prons. attached to it—pause upon double letter—outlets of letters.

§ 782. Outlet defined—how recognizable—ex.—IY’s definition—outlets of letters sixteen—(1) of Hamza, ٰٓ, and ٰٓ—(2) of ٰٓ and ٰٓ—(3) of ٰٓ and ٰٓ—outlets in the throat—relative positions of (a) Hamza, ٰٓ, and ٰٓ—opinion
of S—of Akh—disproof of latter—continuation of argument on his opinion—(b) خ and ح, and (c) ﯾ and ﯭ—Hamza, 1, 9, and ﯼ said by Lth to be hollow—and by Khl to be airy—his opinion on relative positions of ﯾ, خط، ﯥ, ﯦ, and ﯬ—these seven letters, from outlets (1-3), guttural—(4) of ﯴ—(5) of ﯵ—difference in their outlets how recognizable—both these letters uvular— ﯴ how articulated by Arabs of the desert—this articulation hereditary—way to account for it—(6) of ﯴ، ﯶ، and ﯼ—their relative positions—their outlet where placed by S—(7) of ﯵ—its position on the side of the tongue—right or left—description of the teeth—central incisors—lateral incisors—canines—bicuspids or premolars—molars—postmolars—position of ﯵ in relation to tongue and teeth—from which side uttered—called "long."—(8) of ﯶ—no letter more extensive in outlet—its outlet where placed by S—(9, 10) of ﯴ، and ﯼ—farther out than ﯶ— ﯴ a little farther in than ﯼ—difference in positions of ﯴ، and ﯼ demonstrated by language of IH—criticism of some of his commentators thus rebutted—
(11) of ط، د، ص، ز، and ت—(12) of س، ص، ز، and ت—in contact with central incisors—س prior in outlet to ز.—
(13) of ط، د، ص، and ت—these eighteen letters, from outlets (4-13), lingual—(14) of ف—(15) of ب، م، and م—ف, م and ب, م, and ف, م—nasal—these four letters, from outlets (14-15), labial—fifteen preceding outlets allotted to twenty-nine primary letters—relative positions of these outlets—(16) of single ن—Fr's differences from S—latter's opinion best—outlet of secondary letters other than single ن.

§. 733. Number of letters 43—primaries 29—Hamza
—their number not complete in other languages—no Hamza in foreign speech, except in inception—nor any ض—ض not an independent letter—but reckoned as a single letter in H's "Speckled Epistle"—Hamza omitted by Mb—but rightly first letter of alphabet—under form of ل—proof of this—soft ل—distinct from Hamza—secondaries 6—all chaste—why called "secondary"—(1) quiescent ن—named "single" and "stifled"
—its outlet—ل of Imāla—named. 
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meaning of broad (3) broad mentioned by IH—not broad!—latter how pronounced—found in what dial. how written in Codex and elsewhere.(4) like ج same as ج like ش —approved by S—(5) ص like ج —mentioned in §. 696—read in Kur. I. 5—(6) Hamza of betwixt-and-between—of three kinds, making chaste secondaries 8—hybrids 8—these also secondary—(1) ك like ج —(2) ج like —(exs. of (1) and (2)—both the same—(3) ج like ش —IH's assertion that (2) and (3) are not real—(4) weak ش —used by foreigners trying to speak Arabic—how exemplified by Mbn—most easily sounded from left side—(5) ص like س —approximation of س to س not so good as substitution of س for س —(6) م like م —(7) د like د —often heard from foreigners, and of two kinds—these 8 hybrids used by Arabs who have mixed with foreigners—or by the progeny of Arab fathers and foreign mothers—additional secondaries—(1) ق between ق and ك —(2) ج like ج —(3) ش like ج —(4) إ like إ
§ 734. Classification of letters according to qualities
—eighteen divisions notorious—use of qualities—(1) vocal—specification—(2) surd—all
letters surd or vocal—these two kinds how exemplified—why so exemplified—origin of
names "vocal" and "surd"—this distribution of letters agreeable with opinion of
ancients—but modified by one modern—
his reasons—criticism on his opinion—
refutation of one of his reasons—difference
between vocal and rigid—(3) rigid—num-
ber and specification—(4) lax—(5) inter-
mediate—orig. rigid—number and specification—number of lax—specification—these
three kinds how exemplified—why so
exemplified—(6) covered—how defined by
Jrh—number and specification—definition
of covering—inapplicable to خ—another
definition—covering indispensable to these
letters—name "covered" tropical—(7)
open—this name also tropical—(8) elevated
—number and specification—definition of
elevation and depression—elevation possible
without covering, but not covering without
elevation—origin of name "elevated"—
this name tropical—but explicable in natural sense—(9) depressed—specification—also called "low"—(10) liquid—no quad. or quin. devoid of them, unless exotic or anomalous—liquidity defined—liquids lightest of letters—specification—why named "liquid"—best for mixing with others—(11) solid or muted—number and specification—meaning of "solid"—these letters why named "solid"—or "muted"—first name more appropriate—(12) resonant—number and specification—why so named—also called "movent"—difficulty in sounding them quiescent—(13) sibilant—(14) soft—specification—susceptible of prolongation—letters of prolongation and softness, or of softness only—so mentioned in §. 663—explanation of "soft" given in Chd—(15) swerving—its sound how produced—S's definition—and explanation—(16) reiterated—reckoned as two letters—(17) airy, or ascending or descending—why named (a) "airy"—from one meaning of S's explanation of "airy"—faintness and expansiveness of \( \overline{\text{\text{"}}} \) as compared with \( \overline{\text{\text{}}} \) and \( \overline{\text{\text{}}} \)—(b) "ascending" or "descending"—from alternative meanings of \( \overline{\text{\text{"}}} \) —
this letter also called "sonant"—(18) gabbled—why so named—reason given by IH—said in CHd to be ɡ, not تضخم—ضخم and ضخم—strong or weak letter put for strong or weak meaning—natural affinity between letters and meanings—classification of letters according to outlets.

§ 735. Unity of predicament in approximates as respects (1) incorporation—(2) interchange in rhyme—اية—cause of incorporation—pronunciation without it comparable to gait of shackled—manner of incorporation—preliminary conversion—incorporation really in two likes—exs.—operations requisite for incorporation—modes of conversion and incorporation—rule and obstacle—nature of obstacle—منكم and سنت.

§ 736. Incorporation regulated by closeness of approximation—concurrency of approximates in one word or two—(1) in one word—confusion not heeded—(a) if both approximates be mobile, incorporation neither necessary nor approved—(b) if first be quiescent, incorporation necessary in two cases—approved in others—(2) in one word
§. 737. Incorporation not absolutely allowed in approximates, nor disallowed in remotes—sometimes withheld from former, and permitted to latter—incorporation of approximates where found in one word—where mostly found—one preventive of it—no incorporation of (1) letters of ضوئی مشترک into approximates—special qualities of these letters—cause of disallowance—letters of ضوئی مشترک not incorporated into approximates,
but approximates into them—، and ى incorporated, one into the other—سُدُم and وُبُلُة—IH's explanation of incorporation here—R's criticism on it—incorporation of ض into ش، of ن into ل، and of ف into ب، transmitted from Readers—meaning of "incorporation" here—practice of Ks and Fr—and of I Al—(2) sibilants into other letters—what they are incorporated into—(3) covered letters into others, without covering ُعُبُنُصَلُع—(4) guttural letter into more guttural—incorporation of، and into، gutturals—of approximate gutturals—ذُخْجُهَة—criticism on statement of fourth case—incorporation of (1) ن into ض—(2) six letters of tip of tongue into ش and ض—(3)، and ى—predicament of every letter, in respect of incorporation, to be now explained.

§. 738. Incorporation general in letters of mouth and tongue—not in letters of throat or lip—Hamza and ل not incorporated—process more suited to Hamza—Hamza not incorporated into its like, except in two cases—nor into any other letter, except after alleviation—nor any other letter into it.
§ 739. Not incorporated into like or approximate—reason for its incapacity—alternative reason—nor incorporated into.

§ 740. Letters that are incorporated into their approximates—ṣ into ẓ after or before it—separation better, and incorporation good—but not ẓ into ṣ—separation better—لاطمْ حثماً
—nor ẓ into ẓ—only its like incorporated into it—no approximate.

§ 741. ḥ incorporated into (1) its like—(2) ẓ after or before it—incorporation or separation good in former case—conversion of ḥ into ẓ good in former case, allowable in latter—ẓ not incorporated into ḥ, except after conversion of ḥ into ẓ—instance transmitted with conversion of ẓ into ḥ—(3) ẓ, after conversion of both into ẓ—لاطمْ حثماً
and ẓ—dispute as to allowability of that when ḥ is preceded by ẓ—only its like incorporated into it—no approximate—treatment of ḥ and ẓ when combined—frequent among Banū Tamīm.

§ 742. Ṣ incorporated into (1) its like—no difficulty in that—(2, 3) ẓ and ḥ—not into ẓ or ḥ—but into ẓ and ḥ, by converting them.
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into ǧ — reason of such incorporation — and conversion — ș and ǧ regarded by Z as incorporated into ǧ.

§ 743. ġ and ġ incorporated, each into (1) its like — no difficulty in that — concurrence of ġ s or ǧ s in Kur — (2) its fellow — why ġ into ǧ — separation better, but incorporation good — and preferred by Mb — why ġ into ġ — separation better — incorporation good — superiority of separation proved — incorporation of higher into lower why allowable here — and not in ǧ and ġ — dispute as to incorporation of ġ and ǧ into ġ and ǧ.

§ 744. Letters of the mouth — ǧ and ǧ — like ǧ and ġ — incorporation of (1) each into its like — no difficulty here — (2) ǧ into ǧ — incorporation or separation good — reasons for incorporation — (3) ǧ into ǧ — incorporation good, but separation better — why better.

§ 745. ǧ incorporated into (1) its like — no difficulty in that — no concurrence of ǧ s in Kur — (2) ǧ — incorporation or separation good — no other letter mentioned by Z — but ǧ by Al-Yazidî — letters incorporated into ǧ.
§ 746. ض، and ض not mentioned by IH—ض incorporated only into its like—no concurrence of ض in كر—not into any of its approximates—reported incorporation of ض into س، and ض into ض—not practised by BB—who disallow both—letters incorporated into it.

§ 747. ض incorporated into its like, (1) attached—(2) quasi-attached—(3) detached, when first ض is preceded by فثًا—not كسرًا—difference between the two cases—three letters incorporated into it—(1) its like—(2) ض—و and ض adjacent—incorporated, one into the other, whether ض be first—or second—خز. of latter—(3) ض—because treated like letters of prolongation and softness.

§ 748. ض incorporated only into its like—incorporation into ض reported—but not free from flaw—adversely criticized—why allowed—not followed in other passages of كر—IY's opinion of it—letters incorporated into ض—why these—and not ض.

§ 749. ض incorporated, (1) if determinative, necessarily into (a) its like—(b) thirteen other letters—their characteristics—causes of its
incorporation into them—(2) if not determinative, necessarily into р.—allowably into remaining twelve—or allowably into all thirteen, its incorporation being good into р., bad into н., and middling into remainder—*exs.* in verse—and in readings of Kur—such incorporation how graduated by Р—only its like and н incorporated into it—not р. —р and п—why so written.

§ 750. н not mentioned by IH—incorporated only into its like—not into any other letter—its incorporation into л disputed—disallowed by С and his school—reported as practised by Ya’kūb and IАl—allowed by Кs and Fr—hardly known among Readers later than IАl—л and н incorporated into р.

§ 751. Quiescent н, including Tanwin, (1) incorporated into letters of т—necessarily—with some exceptions—cause of incorporation—л—only, preferably into all but н—(a) with nasality into letters of т—restriction on incorporation into м, и, and н—(b) without nasality into л and р—reason for removal, or retention, of nasality—IH’s reply to objection against removal.
of nasality—R's criticism on it—his analysis of ن's predicaments with (a) ل، ر، م، م، and (b) ب—(c) other non-gutturals—(d) gutturals—retention of nasality with، and غ chaster than removal—existence of nasality in م itself—retention of nasality by some Arabs with ل and، and omission by some with، and غ—opinion of س and GG on source of nasality with these four letters—his language—(2) displayed separate with six gutturals—separation why necessary—stifling by some with غ and خ—(3) converted into م before ب—in one word or two—motive for conversion—(4) stifled with fifteen remaining letters—reason for stifling—mnemonic phrase ن لم مم ر why omitted—states of ن with reference to approximateness, or remoteness, of following letter—separation with letters of mouth a solecism—necessity of display with gutturals deducible from IH's language—ن's states reckoned as five—mobile ن allowably incorporated into letters of ن،—its predicament before fifteen letters mentioned in case (4)—quiescent letter nearer to what follows it than mobile.
§ 752. Letters of tip of tongue and central incisors — ذ، ط، ث، د، ث — incorporated, (1) one into another—(2) all into ص، ز، and س — ظ، ث، ذ. and ث—mention before ص، ز، and س—restriction on incorporation of sibilants—what ث meant here—incorporation of first six letters exemplified—covering more chastely retained on incorporation of covered into uncovered letter—IH’s wavering as to whether incorporation be then genuine—his argument—analysis of his language—his conclusion—incorporation into ث when an attached pron.—(3) all into ض—and this incorporation why allowable—more valid into ض than into ش—(4) ث into ج in reading—ص، ز، and س incorporated, one into another—more often than ظ، ث، ذ، and ث—covering properly retained on incorporation of ص into either of its fellows—last three not incorporated into first six.

§ 753. ف not mentioned by IH—incorporated only into its like—its incorporation into ب anomalous—but ب incorporated into it.

§ 754. ب incorporated into (1) its like—(2) ف and م—IAl’s practice—his principle—allowability of incorporation not disputed after
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mobile—disputed after quiescent—only its like incorporated into it.

§. 755. م and پ omitted by IH—م incorporated only into its like—its alleged incorporation, after a mobile, into ب—such م and ب not pronounced as double ب—so-called incorporation merely stifling—as wherever incorporation is forbidden by analogy—ن and ب incorporated into it.

§. 756. ت incorporation of ت (1) ت into it—قَتَلَ—قَتَّلَ—تَقْتَلَ—تَقْتَّلَ—تَقْتِيلَ—تَقْتَيْلَ—تَقْتِيْلَ—تَقْتَيْلَ

(2) it into ت—قَتَلَ—قَتَّلَ—تَقْتَلَ

distinguishable from whose inf. n. is قَتَلَ—تَقْتَلَ—تَقْتِيْلَ
elision of vowel from first of two likes why not allowable in يعِضُ، دَرُبُ،

and يَغْرُ—but allowable here—opinion of Fr—يَقْتَلَ—اُور. and act. and pass. parts.—
vowels of their ف and ت فِيْتَلَ—قَتْلَ—تَقْتَلَ—تَقْتِيْلَ

—concurrence of two quiescents unheeded here—or vowel of first ت merely slurred—مْقَتْلَ—يَقْتَلَ

Kasr of م not allowable—مُنْقَتْلُ—مُقَتْلُ—مُنْقَتْيْلُ

orig. مُنْقَتْلُ—its evolution—قَتَلَ—Kasr
of ق—(3) it into approximate—allowable only with د or 사—but not forbidden by analogy with any approximate—(4) approximate, or ض، into it—ت here converted into ف—but converse allowable with ث—incorporation omissible, except with ب and ل—then ث (a) converted into ب after ض، and ط—and into د after ز and ض—لًدُكَر—(b) unaltered after س and ث—necessity for incorporation or conversion, except with ت and س—incorporation by conversion of ب into ب، and د into د—and even ض into ط of إلَعَلُلٌ converted after nine letters—into (1) ط after ض، ط، and ب—reason for this substitution—then, (a) after ب، incorporation necessary—but (b) after ب، separation allowable—and incorporation by change of first into second, or the converse—this last not named “incorporation” by Readers—بex.—(c) after ص، separation allowable—and incorporation, by conversion of second into first—بex.—(d) after ض، separation allowable—and incorporation by conversion of second into first—بطُعَ anomalous—(2) د after د، ض،
and ـ—reason for this substitution—then, (a) after ـ، incorporation necessary—(b) after ـ، display allowable—and incorporation by conversion of second into first—(c) after ـ، display allowable—and incorporation in both its modes—ٌل، rare—(1) and (2) the only changes of this ـ mentioned here by ـ،—(3) ـ، after ـ، or ـ، converted into ـ،—separation good—dispute about separation—(4) س after س،—second why converted into first—separation good—most prevalent forms with ض، ص، and ط،—(2) ض and د، (3) ث، and (4) س،—change of ـ into ـ after ـ،—and of ـ into ـ،—attached ـ of ـ، converted into (1) ـ، after س، ص، and ط،—(2) د، after د، and ـ،—ـ of pron. here assimilated to ـ،—reason for assimilation—consequent conversion—inclusion with ـ، ص، and ـ، incorporation of ـ، ـ، and ـ more frequent with attached than with detached ـ،—and separation better with latter ـ، than with former—conversion more frequent in ـ، than in ـ، of pron.—better not to convert the latter—its
conversion said to be anomalous—

not incorporated into

—even if be mobile—reason in latter case.

§ 757. Combination of aoristic with of alleviable by (1) elision—its cause—which elided—remaining not incorporated into n—this elision where found—similar elision in aor. headed by two n s—(2) incorporation—but not if first be (a) not preceded by anything—(b) preceded by quiescent other than letter of prolongation—language of IM and BD—of other GG—this incorporation found only in continuity, and after a letter of prolongation or a vowel—elision requisite for alleviation of aor. in inception—and allowable in continuity—neither elision nor incorporation allowable in aor. of pass.—incorporation of in into in and —conf. Hamza then imported in inception— and here distinguishable from —this incorporation applicable to pret., aor., imp., inf. n., and act. and pass. parts.—not found in conjug. of —even when is a.
§ 758. Irregular incorporation—\( \text{ست} \) and \( \text{ست} \) and \( \text{سدة} \) and \( \text{سدة} \) and not convertible one into the other—nor congruous in quality—each therefore converted into \( \text{دود} \) for \( \text{رود} \)— incorporation the practice of Tamīm—but not regular—\( \text{عدان} \)—its dial. vars.—\( \text{عدان} \) anomalous—\( \text{عدان} \) sometimes used instead.

§ 759. Deviation to elision when incorporation impossible—such elision classed as incorporation—euphonic and curtailing elisions previously mentioned—present kind of elision found in (1) aor. act. of \( \text{تفعل} \) and \( \text{فعل} \)—both \( \text{ت} \) s allowable—or elision of one—condition of this elision—which \( \text{ت} \) elided—rule for elision—(2) \( \text{مَستُ} \), \( \text{حَكَسُ} \), and \( \text{حَكَسُ} \)—elision of \( \text{ع} \)—disposal of its vowel if \( \text{ف} \) be \( \text{أ} \) quiescent—(b) mobile—object of Kasr or Ḍamm of \( \text{ف} \) —elision more frequent in pret. than in aor. or imp.—\( \text{طلبت} \), \( \text{طلبت} \), and \( \text{طلبت} \) used—elided variously said to be \( \text{ع} \) or \( \text{l} \)—vowel of \( \text{ف} \)—similarly \( \text{طلبت} \), etc.—meaning of
this elision disputed—etc.—
—forms allowable in aor. and imp.—no elision when خ is pronounced with Fath—rare—other explanations of َوُلِّصَنَّ for َوُلِّصَنَّ (3) أَفْضُهُنَّ َوُلِّصَنَّ aor. َلِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ—best-known dial. var. َلِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ—then aor. َلِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ—aor. َلِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ ِسْتَ—elision when approximates or likes are in separate words—exs.—ن of بِلْ يُلُبُّ elided before ل of art.—after elision of unsound letter—regularly in names of clans where ل is not incorporated—بُلُبُمُّ—بُلُبُمُ on ل of علماء—ملقب ب ملهم here elided, after elision of ل, before ل of art.—exs.—foregoing elisions due to impossibility of incorporation—but all irregular—يَسُرُّ—سِقَامَةً َجَلَّ، عَلَى and قَمَامَة regular and قَمَامَة anomalous—reason for elision here—تَلُكُّد—تَلُكُّد not of this class—first elided in three words—from frequency of
usage—their *act. parts.*—and *prets.*—

*taq*—

*aor.* *taq*—dispute about

*taq*—and

*taq*—more anomalous—how explained

by *S*—not *orig.*—but *taq*—why

"more anomalous"—elision and retention

of *n* of protection.
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<td>7</td>
<td>Suppression of <em>pron.</em> expressing <em>obj.</em> required by second of two <em>ops.</em> in case of contest in government.</td>
<td>x—xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suppression of <em>op.</em> of unrestricted <em>obj.</em> necessary when <em>inf. n.</em> occurring as such <em>obj.</em> acts as substitute for its <em>op.</em></td>
<td>xii—xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENTS.</td>
<td>PAGE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 9. Government of pron. in gen. by حَتَّى.</td>
<td>xiii—xv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, 10. Analysis of ضَلْلُ لَ in wonder. Proof that ضَلْلُ is a v., and ضَلْلُ suppressible when indicated.</td>
<td>xv—xviii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>xviii—xx</td>
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<td>xx—xxi</td>
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<td>xxi—xxiii</td>
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<td>xxvi—xxvii</td>
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L' Envoi.                                                                 | xxvii |
§ 624. This augment is like the augment of disapprobation [620] in conforming to [the vowel of] what precedes it, if this be mobile [623]; and, when this is [a sound] quiescent, it is mobilized with Kasr, as it is mobilized there, and afterwards the augment conforms to it: S says "We have heard them say إنما یثبت [497, 623] and for قد یثبت and the ی and ی when trying to remember الپارث and the like," and he says, "We have heard a trustworthy person say هُذَا سِیفِی, meaning This is a sword of such and such a quality, [when trying to remembers its ep.] (M). This augment is not followed by the ی of silence, contrary to the augment of disapproval [622], because this is added only when pause is not intended (R).
PART THE FOURTH.

THE PROCESSES COMMON TO TWO OR THREE PARTS OF SPEECH.

CHAPTER I.

THE COMMON PROCESSES IN GENERAL.

§. 625. This Fourth Part is the last part of the book. And Z names it "Common" because it is common to the three kinds [of word], i.e., the n., the v., and the p.; or to two of them (IV). The common [processes] are such as Imāla, pause, alleviation of the Hamza, concurrence of two quiescents, and the like, in which the three kinds [of word], or two of them, appear together (M). For Imāla is found in the n. and v. [626], and sometimes in the p. also [639]; and similarly pause is found in the n., v., and p. [640]; and so are alleviation of the Hamza and concurrence of two quiescents, as will be related in its place [658, 663] (IV). Etymology is one of the elements of grammar, without dispute. The moderns hold that etymology is the science of the formations of words; and of the properties of their letters, such as radicalness or augmentativeness, elision, soundness or unsoundness, incorporation and Imāla; and of the accidents, not being inflection or uninflectedness.
Etymology is conventionally applied to two things, (1) the transmutation of words into different formations on account of various kinds of meanings, as in the dim. [274], broken pl [234], act. part. [343], and pass. part. [347]; and this sort is usually mentioned by authors before etymology, as is done by IM, though it is really a part of etymology: (2) the alteration of the word, not because of a meaning supervening upon it, but for another object, [like co-ordination, or freedom from concurrence of two quiescents (Sn)], which [alteration (Sn)] is comprised in augmentation [671], elision, substitution [682], conversion, transfer, and incorporation [731]; and this sort is what is intended here by "etymology" (A). The clause "not being inflection [or uninflectedness]" excludes the science of syntax in [all] its parts, i.e., the investigation of the infl. and uninfl. (Jrb). For the predicaments of the final are not regarded in the "formation" of the word; while inflection is [an accident] supervening upon the last letter of the word, so that it is not included in the changes of the formations; and similarly uninflectedness (R).
CHAPTER II.

IMĀLA.

§ 626. It is common to the n. and v. [625, 639] (M). It is the inf. n. of ُامَّالَةُ لَصِحِيًّا deflected the thing, inf. n. ُامَّالَةُ deflection, when you make it deviate to another direction (Jrb, Tsr). And [in conventional language (Tsr)] it is your taking the Fatha towards Kasra (Aud), so that the Fatha imbibes something of the sound of Kasra, becoming intermediate between Fatha and Kasra (Tsr). Then, if the Fatha be followed by an ٓ, the latter is taken towards ى, [becoming intermediate between ٓ and ى (Tsr),] as in [below] (Aud), with Imāla of the Fatha and ٓ (Tsr); and if [the Fatha be (Tsr)] not [followed by an ٓ (Tsr)], what is pronounced with Imāla is the Fatha alone, [whether the Fatha be before the s of feminization, or not (Tsr),] as in [633] and ٌسَكَّرٌ LIV. 34. [64] (Aud). Imāla is of three sorts, deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra before (1) the ٓ, which is then deflected towards ى [626—637]; (2) the ٓ, as in ٌرَحْبَةٌ [638]; (3) the ٓ, as in [633]: so that "deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra" includes the three sorts; while the deflection of
the ی towards ی is necessitated by the deflection of the Fathā towards Kasra, because the pure ی is found only after the pure Fathā, and the ی is necessarily deflected towards ی in proportion to the deflection of the Fathā towards Kasra. Imāla is not the dial. of all the Arabs (R). The people of AlḤijāz [below] do not practise Imāla (R, Tsr), except in a few cases. Those who practise it are Tamīm, Kais, Asad, and the generality of Najd (Tsr); while the tribe most addicted to it are the Banū Tamīm (R). It is also named كسر pronouncing with Kasr, "flattening, and إصبع lowering, depressing (A).

The utility of it is consonance of sounds (Tsr). But everything pronounced with Imāla may be sounded full, because this is the o. f., since the original pronunciation of a letter is that its sound should not be blended with the sound of any other (Irb, Tsr): so says Irb (Tsr). Imāla has causes [below] that exact it, preventives [632] that counteract those causes, and a preventive of these preventives [634], that intervenes between it and prevention (Aud). Its causes are of two kinds, (1) لط., vid. the ی and Kasra; (2) مط., vid. indication of a ی or Kasra (A). The causes are eight, (1) the ی's being substituted for a final ی, as in الهدی 629 and الفتی among ns., and اشتی and مّدی among vs.; while such as كلی 630, though its ی is [substituted (Tsr)] for a ی, as
is proved by [its broken pl. (Tsr)] ḍīyāb [242], is not pronounced with Imāla, for lack of finality: whereas such as ʿī Controller [fem. of Controller (Tsr)] is pronounced with Imāla, because the s of feminization is constructively separate [266] (Aud); so that the i, if not literally, is constructively final (Tsr): (2) the i's being replaced by ʿa in some variations [of the word], like the i of ʿalā, [where the i is a subst. for a (Tsr)]; of ʿarūṭi, [where it is an aug. added for co-ordination (Tsr)]; of ḥabili, [where it is an aug. added for feminization (Tsr)]; and of ʿaʿra', [where it is a subst. for a, in vs. (Tsr)]; so that these [exs. (Tsr)] and the like are pronounced with Imāla, [because the i in them is replaced by ʿa in some variations, like the du. and pl. among ns., and the pass. among vs. (Tsr),] as in the du. ʿarṭyān, [629] mulâhīan, and [229]; the pl. ʿarṭiyyaṭ, mulâhīyaṭ, and (Tsr) [234]; and the pass. uγa' [629, 719]: (a) according to this [last (Tsr)], the saying of IM [in the Alfiya and elsewhere (Tsr)] that the Imāla in the i of tāla in XCI. 2. [538] is for correspondence with the Imāla in the i of ḥulā XCI. 3. [538], and his saying [in the CK (Tsr)] and the saying of his son [in the C (Tsr)] that the Imāla in the i of sūkī XCIII. 2. is for
correspondence with the Imāla in the 1 of ١٠٣٣ך. ٢. ٧٣] are dubious; may, the Imāla in both cases is because of [the pass. (Tsr)] سُبِّحَى ٣٠٣٠ך and (b) those [words] in which the conversion of the 1 into ى is (a) peculiar to an anomalous dial., like the conversion of the 1 of عَصَا and ٣٦٩ into ى in the saying of Hudhail, when they prefix these ns. to the ى of the 1st pers., ٢٩٩ and ٣٢٩, or (b) caused by amalgamation of the 1 with an aug. letter, like the conversion of the 1 of عَصَا and ٣٦٩ into ى in the dim., as ٢٨٠ and ٢٩٩, or in the pl. on the measure of ٢٤٣, as ٢٩٩ and ٢٤٣, are excepted from [the operation of] that [cause] (Aud) mentioned, vid. "the 1's being replaced by ى in some variations"; so that none of those [words] is pronounced with Imāla (Tsr): (3) the 1's being substituted for the ى of that ٣٥١ which, on being attributed to the ى [of the pron. (Tsr)], is reduced to ٣٥١ ٣٥١ with Kasr of the ى [and elision of the ى (Tsr)], whether that 1 be converted from (a) a ى [pronounced with Fath or Kasr, the first (Tsr)] as in ٣٥٠ and ٣٥٠, and [the second as in (Tsr)] ٣٥٠ ٣٥٠ ٣٥٠ ٣٥٠ ٣٥٠ ٣٥٠ ٣٥٠; or (b) apronounced with Kasr, as in ٥٣٠ and ٣٤٠ [in the dial. of all (Tsr),] and ٣٤٠ in the dial. of those who say ٣٤٠ ٣٤٠ ٣٤٠ ٣٤٠ with Kasr [482]: contrary to [the 1 converted
from a, pronounced with Fath or Damm, as in (Tsr) such as قَالَ and طَالَ [in the dial. of all (Tsr)], and مَاتُ in the dial. of Damm (Aud); so that these are not pronounced with Imāla, because you say قَلْتُ and مَتْ, with Damm of the ف, by transfer in قَلْتُ, and according to the o. f. in جَلْتُ and مَتْ [403, 482, 484] (Tsr): (4) the ʾs occurring [immediately (Tsr)] before a ي [pronounced with Fath (Tsr)], as in يَبْعَتْ and سَابِرَتْ: (a) this [cause] is neglected by IM [in the Alfiya (Tsr)], and by [S and (Tsr)] most (Aud); but is mentioned by IM in the Tashil, where he says "or immediately preceding a ي” (Tsr): (5) the ʾs occurring after a ي, (a) adjoining [it, with no barrier between them (Tsr)], as in يَبْلِح [with a single ي, and يِبْلَع with a double ي, except that the Imāla with the double ي is stronger, because of the repetition of the cause (Tsr)]: (b) separated [from it (Tsr)] by (a) one letter, as in جَاتَتُ بِذَا [628] and جَاتَتُ بِذَا. His two hands were bountiful, [the Imāla in the first being stronger, because the lowness of the sound is more apparent in the quiescent ی than in the mobile, on account of the nearness of the former to the letter of prolongation (Tsr)]: (b) two letters, one, [or, in the language of the Tashil, the second (Tsr),] of which is a ُ, as in دَخَلْتُ بِنَتِهَا She entered her house (Aud), provided that the ي and ُ be
not separated by a letter pronounced with Damm, as in اَنْسَع بِيَنُهَا. *Her house was wide*: so says the author of the Ahd in the Glosses (Tsr): separation by the s, by reason of its faintness, is not reckoned a barrier: but IM here, and likewise in the Kāfiya, does not impose the restriction that the s should be second; and apparently Imāla is allowable in هَاتَان شَرْيَهْتَانِ. *These are thy two little sheep*, because separation by the s is like no separation, and, when the s is dropped out of consideration, شْرِيٍّهْتَانِ is equal to شَبْيَانِ (A): (6) the l’s occurring [immediately (Tsr)] before a [letter pronounced with] Kasra as in عَالِم [628] and كاتِب: (7) the l’s occurring after a Kasra [627]: (8) desire for correspondence, [when no other cause exists (Tsr),] as in (a) رَأَيْت عِبَادا [631] (Aud), where the first l is pronounced with Imāla because it occurs after a Kasra separated from it by one letter, vid. the م; and the second t, converted from the Tanwin, is pronounced with Imāla for correspondence with the first (Tsr): and (b) the reading ﺍًضْنكَي XCVII. 1. *By the forenoon*, where the l, though [converted (Tsr)] from the ﺍًضْنكَي، is pronounced with Imāla for correspondence with سُكيٍّ XCVII. 2. *قَلِي XCVII. 3. [above], and what follows them (Aud)، because observance of correspondence
in the terminations of the versicles is an important object, according to them (Tsr): (a) such Imāla is named "Imāla on account of Imāla", and "Imāla on account of the vicinity of the [I (Sn)] pronounced with Imāla"; and is mentioned last because of its weakness in comparison with the preceding causes: (b) the Imāla of the I on account of correspondence has two phases, (a) that it should be on account of the vicinity of an I so pronounced, like the Imāla of the second I in رَأَيْتُ عَبَادٍ [above], which is for correspondence with the first I; (b) that it should be on account of the I's being the final of a phrase adjacent to a phrase whose final is pronounced with Imāla, like the Imāla of the I of نِئَلَ in XCI. 2. [above], which is for correspondence with what follows it, i.e. جَلاَهَا XCI. 3. [538] and يَفْضِها XCI. 4. [637], according to the opinion of others than S, vid. Mb and a party (A); (c) the I that has no cause [of Imāla] in it, (a) if preceded by the I pronounced with Imāla on account of one of the causes aforesaid, is pronounced with Imāla, as in عَبَادٍ [above]: (b) if followed by it, then, if they occur in the terminations of the versicles, is pronounced with Imāla, for correspondence of the terminations, as in والَصَحَبِي [above]; but, if they do not occur in the terminations, is not pronounced with Imāla (Tsr). These causes are all reducible to the ی and Kasra. Opinions differ as to which of the two is
stronger, the majority holding that Kasra is stronger, and more conducive to Imāla, than the ى [628, 632], which appears to be the language of S; while IS holds that the ى is stronger than Kasra. The first is more obvious for two reasons, (1) that the tongue sinks lower with the Kasra than it does with the ى; (2) that, as S mentions, the people of AlḤijāz [above] pronounce the l with Imāla on account of Kasra, while they and many of the Arabs do not pronounce [the l] with Imāla on account of the ى; [so that those who pronounce the l with Imalā on account of Kasra are more numerous than those who pronounce it with Imāla on account of the ى (Sn),] which shows Kasra to be stronger (A).

§. 627. The Kasra before the l [626] takes effect only when it precedes the l by (1) one letter, as in ٌجِمَامٌ tent-pole: (2) two letters, the first of which is quiescent, as in ِسُلَالَ [385] (M), because the quiescent is not minded, and is not a strong barrier, so that ِسُلَالَ becomes like ِسُبَالَ; and similarly in إننا لِلَّهِ وَإِنَّا إِلَيْهِ رَاجِعُونَ II. 151. Verily we belong to God, and verily unto Him are we returning, where Imāla is excellent (IV). But, when the Kasra precedes [the l] by two mobile letters, as in أَكْلَتُ مِنَّا I ate grapes, or by three letters, as in فَتَّلَتْ قَبَبا I twisted hemp, it does not take effect (M); so that Imāla is not permissible, because of the distance
of the Kasra from the ꞅ (IY). And, as for their saying 

"He means to strike her" [633], 

"He is with her" and لَعْبَانُ، "He has two dirhams [or دَرْعَانُ] thy two dirhams], it is anomalous (M), rare (IY). What makes it permissible is that the ꞅ, being faint, is not taken into account (M); so that, the ꞅ being like the non-existent, يِضْرُبُهَا becomes like (IY).

For, when the ꞅ drops out of consideration, يِضْرُبُهَا is equal to such as [عِبَادَة] كِتَابٍ and [عِبَادَة] عِنْدَهَا and دَرْعَانُ or دَرْعَانِ [above] (A). But the exemplification by such as دَرْعَانِ requires consideration, because its Imāla may be on account of the ن pronounced with Kasr, in which case it is not anomalous, nor relevant to what we are discussing (Jrb). And, for that reason, the author of the Aud following IM, exemplifies by it pre. to the ꞅ. IH and others mention that the Imāla of such as دَرْعَانِ is anomalous: but F, in the Idāh, does not mention that the Imāla of دَرْعَانِ is anomalous, notwithstanding his explicit attribution of the Imāla to the preceding Kasra, not to the Kasra of the ꞅ of the دَعُ. (Tsr). When the letter before the ꞅ that is immediately followed by the ꞅ is pronounced with دَامَم, as in يِضْرُبُهَا, Imāla is allowed by no one, because, with the دَامَم, the ꞅ cannot be like the non-
existent, since the letter before the \( l \) is never pronounced with \( \text{Damm} \) (R).

\section{628.} The condition of efficiency in the cause of \( \text{Imāla} \) is that it should be part of the word containing the \( l \). But from that is excepted the \( l \) of the \textit{fem. pron.} \( \text{hā} \) [639], as in \( \text{wādār jibāb} \) or \( \text{kam yusrib bihā} \), which is pronounced with \( \text{Imāla} \), though its cause is detached, i.e. part of another word. And others than IM mention that the \( l \) is sometimes pronounced with \( \text{Imāla} \) on account of the Kasra, when detached from the \( l \), although this Kasra is weaker [in exacting \( \text{Imāla} \) (Sn)] than the Kasra that is in the same word with the \( l \). S says “We have heard them say لَرَيْبٌ مال Zaid has camels [633], pronouncing with \( \text{Imāla} \) on account of the Kasra, by assimilating this phrase to one word”. It is plain, therefore, that the language of IM “Do not pronounce with \( \text{Imāla} \) on account of a cause that is not attached” is not universally correct; and he ought properly to say “Do not pronounce any thing but \( l \) with \( \text{Imāla} \) on account of a detached \( i \)”, the Kasra being excluded because it is stronger, as before mentioned, than the \( i \) [626] (A). They treat the detached \( l \), [which is converted from Tanwin (II),] like the attached, [which is part of the word itself (II),] as درَسَتْ عِلْمًا \( I \) \textit{studied science} and رَآيتْ زُيدا I saw Zaid (M), with \( \text{Imāla} \), like عِبَاد [627]
and [626] respectively (IY); and the accidental Kasra [of inflection after the ٣ (IY)] like the original [Kasra of the ٣ (IY)], as ٣ َٰٓ أَخَذَتْ مِنْ مَالِيٰٓ I passed by his door and ٣ َٰٓ مَالِيٰٓ I took of his goods or camels (M): except that the Imāla in such as [٥٠٠ عَالِمٰٓ or ٣ َٰٓ سَالِمٰٓ] [626] and [٥٠٠ عَمَّادٰٓ سَالِمٰٓ] [627] is stronger than the Imāla here, because the Kasra there is inseparable; while in ٣ َٰٓ بَيْنٰٓ and ٣ َٰٓ بَيْنٰٓ it is accidental, disappearing in the nom. and acc., where there is no Imāla, as there is none in ٣ َٰٓ بَيْنٰٓ brick and ٥٠٠ [٣٤٧] (IY).

§. 629. The final ٣ is either in a ٣, or in a ٣, and is either third or upwards. That which is in the ٣ is pronounced with Imāla, however it be (M), its Imāla being good, if it be converted from ٣ , as in ٣ َٰٓ رَمَيٰٓ and ٣ َٰٓ تَطَيٰٓ: and allowable, though inelegant, if it be converted from ٣ , as in ٣ َٰٓ غَرِيٰٓ and ٣ َٰٓ دَعَيٰٓ, because, when this formation is transported by the Hamza to ٤٨٨ [٤٨٨], its ٣ becomes ٣ , as ٣ َٰٓ أَدْعَيْتُ ٣ َٰٓ إِفْرَئِيٰٓ [٦٨٥, ٧١٩, ٧٢٧], so that you say ٣ َٰٓ أَدْعَيْتُ ٣ َٰٓ إِفْرَئِيٰٓ with Imāla; and also because, when it is turned into a pass., its ٣ becomes ٣ , as ٣ َٰٓ غَرِيٰٓ and ٣ َٰٓ دُعِيٰٓ [٦٢٦, ٧١٩]; so that they imagine what is virtually present to be literally present (IY). And that which is in the ٣. (M), if converted from ٣ , is pronounced
with Imāla, which is good, as in رَحِى [626] and رُحِى (IY), if not recognized as converted from اَلْي, is not pronounced with Imāla when third (M), as in عَصَا [626] (IY); but is [preferably (IY)] pronounced with Imāla when fourth (M), whether it be (1) اَلْي, as in كَهْوَت مُلْهِي [626, 727]; or (2) an aug., added (a) for feminization, as in حُبْلَيْنِ, where the اَلْي is converted into اَلْي in the du. حُبْلَيْنَ [626] and sound pl. حُبْلَيْنَاتٌ [626]; or (b) for co-ordination, as in اَلْي, where you say in the du. اَلْي [626] (IY). But اَلْي, [which is a n. of three letters, from the اَلْي, (IY),] is pronounced with Imāla only because of their saying [in the sing.] اَلْي [725] (M): for the اَلْي in اَلْي is that very اَلْي which is in اَلْي, but is converted into اَلْي in the pl. on the measure of the اَلْي, so that it is like [the اَلْي in] اَلْي [248] (IY).

§. 630. The intermediate اَلْي (IY), if it be اَلْي (IY) in a v. wherein اَلْي is said, like طَبَابَ (IY), and مَاتَ [and مَاتَ in the dial. of those who say مَاتَ, aor. يَمَاتُ (IY)], is pronounced with Imāla [626] (M), as in the reading لِيَتِنَ خَافِ مَقَامِي XIV. 17. For him that feareth My judgment-seat, because the letter before the اَلْي [in طَبَابَ] is pronounced with Kasr in
and $\text{حُفَت}^*$ (IY): and what the ! is converted from is not regarded (M), except that Imāla is better in that [v.] which belongs to the cat. of the $\text{ي}$, [like $\text{i}$, $\text{بَاغ}$, $\text{هِبْب}$, and $\text{طَاب}$] because it contains two causes, its being of the cat. of the $\text{ي}$, and its [$\text{ف}$’s] being pronounced with Kasr in [$\text{طَاب}^*$ and $\text{هِبْب}$ and $\text{يُعْت}^*$]; whereas those [v.s.] which belong to the cat. of the $\text{i}$ contain only one cause, the Kasr alone (IY). Opinions differ as to the cause of the Imāla in such as $\text{ِحَاف}$ and $\text{طَاب}$: Sf and others say that it is because of the accidental Kasra of the $\text{ف}$ [in some variations (Sn)] of the word; and this is apparently the language of F, who says “They pronounce $\text{ِحَاف}$ and $\text{طَاب}$ with Imāla, notwithstanding the elevated [letter, i.e. the $\text{x}$ and the $\text{ط}$ (632) (Sn)], from desire for [indication of (Sn)] the Kasra in $\text{ِحَفَت}$ [and $\text{طَاب}$ (Sn)]:” but 1HKh says “The better opinion is that the Imāla in $\text{طَاب}$ is because the ! in it is converted from a $\text{ي}$, and in $\text{ِحَاف}$ because the $\text{ع}$ is pronounced with Kasr: they wish for indication of the $\text{ي}$ and Kasra, respectively” (A). But, if the intermediate ! be in a $\text{n.}$, what it is converted from is regarded: so that $\text{ِعَبَب}$ [626] is said, [and i.q. $\text{ِعَبَب}$, because they belong to the cat. of the $\text{ي}$ (IY)]; but not $\text{ِعَبَب}$.
[635] (M), nor گار, since the ی is a ی (IY). The language of IM implies that the ی substituted for the ی of the ی is not pronounced with Imāla, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether it be converted from a ی or a ی (Sn)]: but the author of the М distinguishes between what is converted from a ی, as in یاب and عیب, i.e. یاب, where he allows Imāla; and what is converted from a ی, as in باب and یار, where he does not allow it: while some distinctly declare that Imāla of the ی converted from a ی, when an ی in a tri. н., is anomalous; and this is apparently the language of S (A).

§. 631. They sometimes pronounce the ر with Imāla on account of a preceding ی so pronounced, saying یآیت یعاباد ا I saw a tent-pole [626] and یعابیا our goats (M), the object of that being consonance of the sounds, and approximation of their tones (IY).

§. 632. The letter of elevation [734], as likewise the ی [not pronounced with Kasr (IA)], restrains [the cause of (A) Imāla (IA, А) from taking effect (A), when the cause is (IA, А)] an expressed Kasra or [an existing (IA)] ی [below] (IM). For the letters of elevation are elevated towards the palate; so that, with them, the ر is not pronounced with Imāla, from desire for homogeneity [of sound (Tsr)]: while the ی, [though there is no elevation in it (Tsr),] is assimilated to the elevated [on account of 71 a]
the reiteration in it (Tsr), because it is reiterated [734] (A, Tsr), when doubled or quiescent; so that it is, as it were, more than one letter; and therefore has strength (Sn): nay, it is said to be stronger as a preventive [than the letters of elevation] (Tsr). The preventives [of Imāla (A, Tsr)] are eight (Aud, A) also (Aud), like the causes [626] (Tsr), (1-7) the seven letters of elevation [784] (Aud, A), vid. the خ, the غ, the ص, the صم, the ط, the طب, and the ق (Aud), which are the initials of these [mnemonic] words قد صاد سرار فلائم خليلة ستلعبة Dirār, the manservant of my maternal uncle Tālḥa, has caught a male ostrich (A): (8) the ر [634] (Aud, A), not pronounced with Kasr (A, Tsr). These eight prevent Imāla of the !, and restrain its cause from taking effect, when it is an expressed Kasra (A). IM's saying "or ی" [above] is a distinct declaration that the letter of elevation and the ر not pronounced with Kasr prevent Imāla, when its cause is an expressed ی: and in the Tashrīl and the Kāfiya he distinctly declares that; though in the Tashil he says "the existing Kasra and ی", and in the Kāfiya "the expressed Kasra and the existing ی". He gives no ex., however, of that ی (Sn): and what he says of the ی is not recognized in their speech:—nay, Imāla appears to be allowed in such as عربان گم and غمیان, [where the letter of elevation and the
precede the ل (A); and similarly in بِيِاشْ and بِباَعْ. These are thy wells, where the letter of elevation and the ل, follow the ل (Sn): and AH says “We have not found that” meaning, restraint of the ل by the letter of elevation or the ل; “but it prevents with the Kasra alone” (A). This necessarily implies that the ل is stronger than the Kasra; whereas the preferable opinion, as before stated [626], is the converse; and possibly it is this that induces IM to add the ل (Sn). The condition of the Imāla restrained by the preventive is that its cause should not be a supplied Kasra, [as in جاف, the ل of which is converted from a ل, pronounced with Kasr (Tsr)]; or a supplied ل, [as in طاب, the ل of which is converted from a ل (Tsr)]: for here the supplied cause, being present in the ل itself, is stronger than the expressed [cause (Tsr)], which either precedes the ل, [as in بِيِاشْ and بِباَعْ (Tsr)]; or follows it, [as in عالم and طاب (Tsr)]; and for this reason such as جاف and طاب and راغ are pronounced with Imāla (Aud), notwithstanding that the letter of elevation precedes [the ل] in جاف and طاب, and follows [it] in جاف and راغ (Tsr). The elevated [letter] restrains the Imāla of only the ل, exclusively: Jz says “The elevated [letter] prevents Imāla of the ل in the ل; but not in the ل, as طاب and
because Imāla in the v. possesses a strength that it does not possess in the n., for which reason the circumstance that the l of the v. is [converted] from the ى or from the , is not regarded; but it is pronounced with Imāla unrestrictedly” [629, 630] (A). The cause [of Imāla], however, in بَعِي طَابَ and بَعِي is supplied; and the preventive does not prevent the Imāla produced by a supplied cause, either in the n. or in the v.; so that what Jz mentions is not contrary to what IM says (Sn). These letters [of elevation] do not prevent Imāla when they are a هذه pronounced with Fath, forming part of a v. unsound in the ع, as in طَابَ; or in the ل, whether a ى, as in طَّغَى and طَّغَى; or a و, as in عُرَى and عَرَى, where this ل becomes a ى, as we mentioned, in [629]: for these v.v. contain two inducements to Imāla, vid. conversion from the ى, and strength of plasticity in the v.; so that the elevated [letter] is overpowered (IV). [But, in the case of حَافِط, Kasr of the ف in جَفَع (630) takes the place of conversion from the ى as the first of the two inducements.] The condition of [prevention by (Tsr)] the [letter of (Tsr)] elevation preceding the l is that it should be (1) contiguous to the l, as in صَلَعُ: (2) separated [from it] by one letter, [because separation by one letter is like no separation
(Tsr),] as in ُخَبَامٍ ُطلَابٍ; unless the letter of elevation be (a) pronounced with Kasr, as in ُخَبَامٍ ُطلَابٍ, which they pronounce with Imāla (Aud), because the Kasra is constructively after the letter [of elevation], so that consonance of the sound of the ْl with the Kasra is more appropriate, [since it avoids a rise in pitch after a fall] (Tsr); (b) quiescent after a Kasra, as in مَصْباحٌ, [because the Kasra, being in its vicinity, while it is quiescent, is assumed to be conjoined with it, so that it is equivalent to the one pronounced with Kasr (Tsr); though some of the Arabs do not consider this [quiescent (Tsr) letter of elevation] to be equivalent to the one pronounced with Kasr (Aud), but treat it as a preventive of Imāla (Tsr). The condition of [prevention by] the [letter of elevation (Tsr)] following the ْl is that it should be (1) contiguous to the ْl, as in فَنَامِلٌ ُسَاحِرٍ [633]: (2) separated [from it (Tsr)] by (a) one letter, as in ُنَامِلٍ ُسَاحِرٍ [633]; (b) two letters, as in مَنْشِيطٌ ُمَشَطٍ [633]; though some pronounce this with Imāla, on account of the remoteness of the [letter of] elevation (Aud). Prevention by the [letter of elevation] following the ْl is stronger than prevention by the [letter of elevation] preceding [the ْl]: and, for that reason, the [letter of elevation] preceding [the ْl] is subject to the [foregoing] restrictions, that it should not be pronounced with Kasr, nor quiescent after a letter pronounced with Kasr, nor separated [from the
§. 633. They treat the [preventive] detached [from the َ], i.e., belonging to another word, like the attached, which belongs to the same word (IY). This detached [preventive] is (1) contiguous to the َ, without any barrier, as in ﻣُرَّرتُ ﻲﻓَاضِيلَي ﻢَيَّاسٍ ﻛَاَيْسٍ. I passed by a learned man [632]: (2) separated from it by (a) one letter, as in ﻲِبَالَ قَاَيْسَ by the camels of ﻢَيَّاسٍ [below], like by a croaker [632]; (b) two letters, as in ﻢَيَّاَتْ In her hand is a whip, like ﻢَيَّاَتْ [632] (Tsr). S says (M), We have heard them say ﺃَرَادَ أن يَضْرِبْهَا ﺃَيْنً ﺃَيْنً Zaid meant to strike her [627], pronouncing [the َ in يَضْرِبْهَا] with Imāla [because of the Kasra before it (IY)]; but ﺃَرَادَ أن يَضْرِبْهَا ﺃَيْنً He desired to strike her before, pronouncing with Fath, [notwithstanding the Kasra of the ُ (IY),] because of [the preventive, vid. (IY)] the ق (S, M) in قَ بَلِ (IY); and [similarly (M)] ﻣُرََرتُ ﻲِبَالَ قَاَيْسَ [above] and ﻲِبَالَ قَاَيْسَ by the camels of ﻢَلِيَّ (S, M) and ﻲِبَالَ قَبُلُ by the camels of ﺔَنَقُلَ, all with Fath, because of the ق, being assimilated to ﻛَاَيْسَ and ﻛَاَيْسَ [632] (S). But some distinguish
between the attached and detached, saying ٌتِلَيْق ٌتَسَيِّم with ٌملام ٍتَسَيِّم (S, IY), as though they did not mind the elevated [letter], since it belongs to another word (IY). The preventive of ٌملام ٍتَسَيِّم takes effect [even (Tsr)] if it be detached; but the cause of ٌملام ٍتَسَيِّم does not take effect except when attached (Aud), the distinction being that the preventive is stronger than the cause (Tsr). Therefore such as ٌتَسَيِّم كَيْسِم came is not pronounced with ٌملام ٍتَسَيِّم, because of the presence of the ٌلَيْق, [even though it is in another word (Tsr)]; nor ٌلَيْقُ مَال Zaid has camels, because of the detachment of the cause (Aud), since the ٌل is in one word, and the Kasra in another (Tsr). This is a summary of the language of IM [in the CK (Tsr)], and of his son (Aud) in the C (Tsr). But they are subject to objection in two respects, (1) that they exemplify [the first rule] by ٌتَسَيِّم كَيْسِم [above], notwithstanding their acknowledgment that the preventive does not take effect on the supplied ٌل [632], on which sort [of cause] the [letter of] elevation, if attached, would have no effect, [and a fortiori when detached (Tsr)]; while the good, [irreproachable (Tsr),] ex. is ٌتَسَيِّم كَيْسِم the book of Kāsim, [since the cause of ٌملام is the expressed Kasra, which is restrained by the preventive, even though it is detached (Tsr)]: (2) that the precepts of the GG are opposed to both the rules
mentioned by these two [authors]:—IU says in his Muṣarrar [fi-nNaḥw (HKh)], after mentioning the causes of Imāla, what is to this effect "whether the Kasra be attached or detached, as in لَضَيْنِ ِمَالَ [628], except that the Imāla of the attached, be what it may, is stronger"; and he says also "And, when the letter of elevation is detached from the word [containing the臀], it does not prevent Imāla, except in what is pronounced with Imāla on account of an accidental Kasra, as in بِنَالِ قَلِيمٍ [above]; or in such of the ¡s appended to the prons. as are pronounced with Imāla [639], as in أَرَادَ أَنْ يَعْرِفْهَا قَبْلُ He meant to know her before" (Aud), where Imāla of the ¡ [in َعَا ] is prevented by the ق of قَبْلٍ after it, though the ق is detached [from يَعْرِفْهَا ] (Tsr).

§. 634. The condition of prevention by the ر [632] consists of two matters, (1) its not being pronounced with Kasr [below]: (2) its being contiguous to the ¡, either before the ¡, [being then pronounced only with Fath (Tsr),] as in حَرَشَ and رَأَى (Aud), where the ر prevents [the operation of] the cause preceding [the ¡ ] in the first [ex.], and following [it] in the second (Tsr); or after it, [being then pronounced with ِةَمَم or Fath (Tsr),] as in هُمَا حَمَارٌ. This is a he-ass and رَآَىَ حَمَارً This is a he-ass. But some treat the ر, posterior [to the
I., when] separated [from it] by one letter, as in ٌكَانُر
This is an unbeliever, like the contiguous (Aud) in prevention of Imāla (Tsr). The preventive of the preventive [626] is the \( \text{ر} \) pronounced with Kasr [above], in the immediate vicinity of the \( \text{ل} \): for this prevents the elevated [letter (Tsr)] and the \( \text{ر} \) from preventing (Aud) Imāla, because one characteristic of the \( \text{ر} \) is reiteration [734], so that this letter is virtually two letters, and the Kasra in it is virtually two Kasras, one of which is in opposition to the preventive, while the other is the cause of Imāla (Tsr); and for this reason

II. 6. And upon their eyes and إِذِ هُمَا دَى الْعَرْفِ IX. 40.
[204, 599] are pronounced with Imāla, notwithstanding the presence of the \( \text{ص} \) [in the first (Tsr)] and the \( \text{غ} \) [in the second (Tsr)]; and إِنْ كَنَّا بَلَى الْأَبْرَارِ LXXXIII. 18.
[236, 598], notwithstanding the presence of the \( \text{ر} \) pronounced with Fath [before the \( \text{ل} \) (Tsr)]; and دَارَ الْقُرْرَاتِ XL. 42. The abode of stability, notwithstanding the presence of both (Aud) preventives, the elevated \( \text{ق} \) and the \( \text{ر} \) pronounced with Fath. In all of that, the \( \text{ر} \) pronounced with Kasr is contiguous [to the \( \text{ل} \)] (Tsr).
But some treat the [\( \text{ر} \) when] separated [from the \( \text{ل} \) (Tsr)] by one letter, like the contiguous [in prevention of the preventive (Tsr)]: S heard Imāla [of ٌقَالُر (Tsr)] in the saying [of Hudba Ibn Khashram (S)]
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May-be God will compensate me for the lands of Ibn Kadir with pouring rain, black in clouds, running over the surface of the ground (Aud), notwithstanding that the \( \text{�} \) pronounced with Kasr is separated from the \( \text{ٛ} \) (Tsr). But those who say \( \text{مرّت عكاب} \) are more numerous than those who say \( \text{مرّت بقادر} \), because the \( \text{ق} \) is a letter of elevation [632] (S). It is understood from the language of IM [and IHsh] that Imāla is [à tortori (A)] allowable in such as ज्ञार्य; for, since the \( \text{ँ} \) is pronounced with Imāla, on account of the \( \text{झ} \) pronounced with Kasr, notwithstanding that the requirer of abandonment of Imāla, vid. the letter of elevation or the \( \text{ँ} \), not pronounced with Kasr, is present, with more reason should it be pronounced with Imāla when the requirer of such abandonment is absent (IA, A).

§. 635. Some mention two causes, other than the foregoing [626], for Imāla of the \( \text{ँ} \), (1) difference between the \( n. \) and the \( p. \) [639]; and that is in the \( \text{ँ} \) and similar letters in the initial monograms of the chapters [of the Kur]: S says "And they say ज्ञ and ल and ब", i.e., with Imāla, "because they are names of what is uttered", [i.e., the letters (Sn)]: so that they are not like ज्ञ and ल and ब and ओ and ओ and other ps. uninfl. upon quiescence: (a) the
letters of the alphabet, that are at the beginnings of the chapters [of the Kur], if an be at their end, are pronounced by some with Fath, [i.e., not with Imāla (Sn).] and by others with Imāla; but, if an be in their middle, as in ٰلا, ٰلا, and ٰلا, are pronounced with Fath, without dispute: (2) frequency of usage; and that is in (a) ٰلا AlḤajjāj [below], when a proper name, in the nom. and acc., [not in the gen., where Imāla is regular, on account of the presence of its cause, vid. the Kasra (Sn)]; and similarly ٰلا AlʿAjjāj, in the nom. and acc.: so some of the GG mention: (b) ٰلا, in the nom. and acc.: IB says “ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Dāʿūd transmits from IAl the Imāla of ٰلا in the whole of the Kur, in the nom., acc., and gen,”: so says IM in the CK; “and this”, says he, “is transmitted by ʿAlmād Ibn Yazīd alḤulwānī, through Abū ʿUmar adDūrī, from Ks.” Imāla on account of these two causes is anomalous; not regular, but confined to hearsay (A). That ٰلا AlḤajjāj is pronounced with Imāla on account of frequency of usage is the saying of S: but Mb says that they pronounce it with Imāla, when it is a proper name, on account of the difference between the det. and the indet., and the substantive and the ep. (IV). And باب ٰلا This is property and a door are transmitted
from some of the Arabs (M), whose Arabic, says S, is to be trusted; as though they assimilated the مال to the مال in جَوَان and جَوَان, treating the ع [630] like the ل [629]: but such pronunciation of مال and باب in the nom. and acc. is rare (IY). And they say [blindness by night (IY)], مَكَا [hole of the fox or hare (IY)], and مَكَا [sweepings of the house (IY)], though these are from the جَوَان (M): the Imāla being introduced into them by assimilation to what is from the جَوَان, because the ل is a ل; for alteration gains access to the ل, since you pronounce عَرْبًا with Imāla [629], but not قال [626] (IY).

But, as for their saying عَرْبًا gain [in selling, though it is from the جَوَان, since they say in the du. جَوَان (IY)], it is on account of [their saying جَوَان, treating it as from the جَوَان, together with the Kasra of (IY)] the جَوَان (M).

§ 636. Properly جَوَان from the reduplicated, such as جَوَان and جَوَان pl. جَوَان and جَوَان, should not be pronounced with Imāla, because the Kasra that was in it, necessitating Imāla, has been elided on account of the incorporation [731] (IY). But some pronounce [that (IY)] with Imāla, saying جَوَان and جَوَان, [because the Kasra is supplied (IY)], from regard to the جَوَان جَوَان and جَوَان جَوَان, as they pronounce جَوَان with Imāla.
because it is constructively جَوَّة, or because it is reducible to جَفْت, though there is no Kasra in the actual expression; and similarly (IY)] as they pronounce هِدَا مَاشُ This is a walker with Imāla in pause [643] (M), though there is no Kasra in it, because, when the speech is continued, it is pronounced with Kasr (IY).

§. 637. And رَأَيَ الشَّمْسِ وَضَحَاها XCI. 1. [538], where [analogy forbids Imāla, because (IY)] the ٰ in الصَّعْكَى (IY)] is [converted] from the ٰ, is pronounced with Imāla for conformity with جَلاَهَا XCI. 3. [538] and يُغَشَاها XCI. 4. It covereth it [626] (M), both of which are so pronounced because the ٰ in them is [converted] from the ی, since you say جَلَّيْتِه I displayed it and, in the du., يُغَشَّيَانِ They two cover (IY).

§. 638. The Fatḥa is pronounced with Imāla before one of three letters, (1) the ٰ, which has been already discussed [626-637]: (2) the ر, on condition that it be pronounced with Kasr, that the Fatḥa be on a letter other than ی, and that they, [i.e., the Fatḥa and the ر (Tsr),] be (a) contiguous, [with no barrier between the letter pronounced with Fatḥ and the ر (Tsr),] as in مِن أَلْحِيَارِ XIX. 9. Of old age (Aud): (a) there is no difference between the Fatḥa's being on a letter of
elevation, as in لَمْ يَلْقِي. And of kine; or on a، as in LXXVII. 32. With sparks; or on any other letter, as in XIX. 9. (above) (A, Tsr): (b) separated by a quiescent other than ی، as in یَمْنُ عَصِرُ from ‘Amr; [or, adds IUK, by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in یَضْرُ بَلَّلِهِ insulent (Tsr)]: contrary to such as ۚأَفْعَدْ بِآٓللّهِ مِنْ أَلْحَيِّرْ مِنْ قَمِّ عَسِيرِ I take refuge with God from the vicissitudes of fortune, and from the badness of ways of acting, [because the Fatha in both is on the ی (Tsr)]; and to [such as] مِنْ خَبْرُکَ from others than thee (And), because the separation is by the quiescent ی (Tsr): (a) it is understood from IM’s saying “[Pronounce the Fatha with Imāla (IM)] before the Kasra of a [final (IM)] ر ” that the Fatha is not pronounced with Imāla on account of the Kasra of a ر before it, as in رَمَّة decayed bones; and that is positively stated by others than IM (A): (b) it is stipulated that the ر should not be followed by a letter of elevation, as in وَمِنْ أَلْتُرِقْ I. 260. From the east; for it prevents Imāla: that is positively stated by S (A, Tsr): (c) it is not stipulated that the Fatha should not be preceded by a letter of elevation (Tsr); [for,] if the letter of elevation precede the ر، it does not prevent [Imāla] (A), because the ر pronounced with Kasr overpowers the elevated [letter],
when that letter occurs before it; so that such as مِنَ الْقُرْرِ from loss is pronounced with ʿImāla (A, Tsр)
IUK says "Accuracy requires one to say that every Fatḥa on a letter other than ی is pronounced with ʿImāla
before a ٰ pronounced with Kasr contiguous to it, or separated [from it] by a letter pronounced with Kasr,
or by a quiescent other than ی, when the ٰ is not followed by a letter of elevation" (Tsр); (d) IM's stipula-
tion of finality in the ٰ is refuted by the positive statement of S that they pronounce the Fatḥa of the ٰ in
I saw leaves blown off by winds with ʿImāla (Aud); while others mention that the Fatḥa of
the ٰ in ُحَبُّطٌ رِياحٍ ُhard may be pronounced with ʿImāla, though
the ٰ in that is not (A, Tsр) a ِسَ (A), [i.e.,] a final; and
perhaps IM particularises the "final" because that is
frequent in such cases (Tsр); so that the stipulation of
the ٰ's being "final" is from regard to the prevalent
[usage], and is not invariable (A): (e) it is deducible
from the ʿImāla in the ex. [mentioned by S] that it is not
stipulated, as a condition of ʿImāla of the Fatḥa on
account of the Kasra of a ٰ after it, that they should be
in one word (Sn): (f) IM makes no restriction in his
saying "Pronounce .......... with ʿImāla" [above]; and
therefore it is known that the ʿImāla here is [used] in
continuity and pause, contrary to the ʿImāla mentioned
below, which is peculiar to pause; and that is distinctly declared by him in the CK: (g) this Imāla is regular, as IM mentions in the CK: (h) S mentions that Imāla of the in such as from the feared is forbidden when the Fatha of the  is pronounced with Imāla: he says "But it is not strong enough to cause Imāla of the ", meaning that the Imāla of the Fatha is not strong enough to cause Imāla of the  on account of its Imāla [i.e., of the Imāla of the Fatha (Sn)]: but IKh asserts that those who pronounce the [second]  of  with Imāla on account of the Imāla of the  before it [631] pronounce the  here with Imāla on account of the Imāla of the Fatha of the : which [assertion] is invalidated by the fact that Imāla on account of Imāla is one of the weak causes, so that none of it ought to be copied, except in the case of what has been heard, vid. Imāla of the  on account of Imāla of the  before or after it [631, 637] (A): (3) the s of feminization: but this [Imāla (Tsr)] is only in pause [646], exclusively, as in mercy and favor, because they assimilate the s to the [abbreviated (Tsr)] of feminization, on account of their agreement in outlet [181, 732], sense, [vid. indication of feminization (Tsr),] augmentativeness, finality, and peculiarity to ns. [263] (Aud): (a) it is good in such as  , [where the Fatha is neither on a
( 767 )

nor on an elevated letter (Jrb)]: and bad [when the Fatḥa is] on a ر, as in ١٢١٣ dinginess, [because the Imāla of its Fatḥa is like Imāla of two Fatḥas, on account of the reiteration of the ر, so that the labour in pronouncing it with Imāla is more (R)]: and middling [when the Fatḥa is (MASH)] on a [letter of (MASH)]
elevation, as in ١٣٢٩ casket (SH), because, though the s is treated like the ١, it is not unrestrictedly like what it is assimilated to; so that the elevated letter does not prevent Imāla altogether here, as it does there; but, with it, Imāla is middling in goodness and badness (R): (b) the s of femininization here includes the s of intensiveness (A), because it is orlg. the s of femininization [265] (Sn), as in ١٤٣٠ علما ٢٩٤, ٣١٢], which may be pronounced with Imāla; but excludes the s of silence [615], as in LXIX. 19. [below], the Fatḥa before which is not pronounced with Imāla, according to the correct [opinion]: (c) when there is an ١ before the s, it is not pronounced with Imāla, as in ١٤٣٠ ضلا prayer and ١٤٣١ حياة life: what is pronounced with Imāla, however, is the Fatḥa, not the consonant, that is immediately followed by the s of feminization; and, that being so, there is no reason for IM's excepting the ٢, since the ١ is not included in the Fatḥ; but he does it here in order to dispel the notion that the s of feminization makes Imāla of the ١ permissible, as it makes Imāla of the Fatḥa: (d) "the s", and not "the s", " of ٧٣ a
feminization" is said, in order that the ُ which is not converted into s may be excluded, because the Fatḥa is not pronounced with Imāla before it (A): this comprises the s of such as ُنُقَاطَّةُ Fāṭima and ُرَحْمَةُ [263], according to those who pause with the ُ [646], in which case the Fatḥa is not pronounced with Imāla, as is distinctly declared by others than IM; and the [quiescent] ُ of feminization attached to the v. [607], as in ُبَكَّاءُ she sold (Sn): (e) Imāla of [the Fatḥa before (Tsr)] the s of silence also, as in كَبَبَايَةُ LXIX. 19. [22, 647, 648, 679], is transmitted from Ks, [because of its resemblance to the s of feminization in pause and writing (Tsr)]; but correctly should be disallowed, contrary to the opinion of Th and IAmb (Aud), who declare Imāla to be allowable in what precedes it (Tsr).

§. 639. Imāla is one of the peculiarities of vs. and decl. us.: and therefore Imāla of the indecl. [n.], as ِئَا [204] and ِمَا [180], is not regular; except in the case of ُمُرِّبِّيْها and ُتُنْظِرُ إِلَيْهَا He passed by her and He looked towards her, ُمُرِّبِّينا He passed by ns and ُتُنْظِرُ إِلَيْنَا He looked towards us; for their Imāla is regular, on account of the frequency of their usage. But Imāla of the indecl. n. [197] has been heard in the case of the dem. ﺃز [171, 293], and of [the advs.] ﻣَتَى
[206] and [207]. And some ps. are pronounced with Imāla, vid. بَلِي [556], the voc. يَا [554], and [the neg.] لَ in their saying إِنَّا لَلَّهُ [1, 565], because these ps. act as substitutes for props., and therefore acquire a superiority over others. And Ktb transmits Imāla of [the repl. (Sn)] لَ [547], because of its being independent (A) in the reply, as [is stated] in [the commentary of] İUK (Sn); while Imāla of حَتَّى [501] is reported by S and those who agree with him, and is transmitted from ِحَامَزة and Ks. Imāla is not forbidden in what is accidentally uninfl., as in يَا حَبِّي نَأَفْتِي O youth and O pregnant woman [48], because it is orig. infl. [16, 18]. There is no doubt as to the allowability of Imāla in the pret. v., though it is uninfl. [402, 403] (A): Mb says "And Imāla of عَسَى [403, 459] is excellent" (M, A) because it is a v., and its ِ is converted from a ُ [629], as is shown by عَسَينَا [462] (İY). The reason why the ps. are not pronounced with Imāla is only that their ِ is not [converted] from a ُ; nor is in the vicinity of a Kasra (A), in most cases, since the ِ of لَلَّهُ [500] is in the vicinity of the Kasra of the ِحَامَزة (Sn). Analogy
forbids Ḫāliya in the case of the ps., because the ps. are prim. aplastic instruments; while Ḫāliya is a kind of plasticity, because it is an alteration (IV). If, however, they are used as [proper] names, they are pronounced with Ḫāliya (A), when the cause of Ḫāliya exists, as in ُحَلَّتُ used as a name, because the ٤ fourth in the n. is converted into ی in the du. [229]; contrary to ُلْلَيْلِi used as a name, because you say in the du. ُلْلَيْلِi (Sn). And, according to this, the ٤ of ُمْلِ and ُلْحَرْ, and the ُهَا and ُطَا and ُحَا [of ُطَطَ and ُحَحَ (Sn)], in the initial monograms of the chapters [of the Kur] are pronounced with Ḫāliya [635], because they are names for the disconnected sounds uttered in the outlets of the letters [732]; and, since they are names for these sounds, and are not like ُلا [546] and ُم [in being ps. (Sn)], the Ḫāliya in them is intended to notify that they have become annexed to the ns., in which Ḫāliya is not forbidden. Zj and the KK say that [the letters of] the initial monograms are pronounced with Ḫāliya because they are abbreviated, Ḫāliya being prevalent in the abbreviated; but this is refuted by the fact that Ḫāliya is not allowable in much of the abbreviated: while Fr says that they are pronounced with Ḫāliya because in the du. they are restored to ی, as two Tā’s and خَلْيَتِي andَ خَلْيَتِي two Hā’s. And similar is the Ḫāliya of the letters of the alphabet,
which are not in the initial monograms of the chapters (Sn), as ﷲ and ﷮ and ﷹ (A), according to the dial. of those who abbreviate these ns. [234, 321] (Sn).
CHAPTER III.

PAUSE.

§ 640. Pause is [defined by IH as] severance of the word from what is after it [below] (SH). IH's saying "from what is after it" suggests the notion that pause upon a word occurs only when there is something after it; and, if he said "[Pause is] becoming silent upon the final of the word, from choosing to make that word the end of the speech", it would be more general (R). Pause is [defined by some as] stoppage of the speech upon [the utterance of (Fk)] the final of the word (A, Tsr, Fk, MKh). This is better than the saying of IH "severance of the word from what is after it" [above], because sometimes there is nothing after it (Sn). Pause is (1) optional, when it is intended for its own sake: (2) compulsory, when [it is not intended at all; but (Sn)] at it the breath is stopped: (3) tentative, when it is intended [not for its own sake, but in order (Sn)] to test [the condition of (Sn)] the person, whether he pauses properly, [or not (Sn),] upon such as ٍعَمَّ [181] (Sn, MKh), ٍفِيَمَ, (Sn), and ٍإِقْتَضَأَ مَ (Sn), and in the mode hereafter mentioned [648]; and upon such as XXVII. ٤٢٥. [2, 59, 574] and VI. ١٤٤, ١٤٥. Or what the wombs of the two females have
enclosed? where an expression is supposed to be one word, but is virtually more. For اما in the last [ex.] is not the *cond.* اماٍ [593]; but is [compounded of] the copulative اَمِّ [541] and the conjunct ما [180], so that one pauses upon ام disjoined from ما. And, as for اَلِّ in XXVII. 25., according to the reading of Ks, with a single ج, it is an inceptive and premonitory پ [551]; while يا is premonitory, or is a *voc.* پ whose *voc.* is suppressed [59]; and استجدوا is an *imp.* ج; so that one pauses upon يا disjoined from استجدوا: and it ought to be disjoined in writing also; but they are conjoined in the Codex of 'Uthmān, so that they resemble the *aor.* in pronunciation and writing, though virtually not one. But, according to the reading of the rest, with a double ج, it is the subjunctival اَن [571] incorporated into the *red.* لى [566], for which reason the ن of the *aor.* is dropped [405]; while the resultant *inf.* ج [497, 551] is the *obj.* of يِهِتَدُونَ, by suppression of the *prep.* 514], the sense being لَا يِهِتَدُونَ إِلَى أَلسَكْبُون* they are not guided aright (to this,) that they should bow down, i.e., (to) bowing down: so that, upon stoppage of the breath, one pauses upon اَن, or upon لَا; not upon the ا, because it is part of a word [404]: and [in explanation of this reading] other things are said [574] (MKh). The [pause] meant here is the optional (A, Tsr, YS, MKh); not
[the compulsory, nor (Sn)] the tentative (Tsr, YS, Sn): and not the optional unrestrictedly (Sn); but other than that which occurs in (1) trying to remember (A. Tsr, YS), as in تقول [623] قال (Sn); (2) quavering (A., Tsr, YS) as in [608] (YS, Sn); (3) demanding precise information (A., YS), and asking for specification of a vague [indet.] (Sn), as in [185] (YS, Sn), quiescent in the ن (Jh), and أيمن, and in ممنون [183], 497, ممنى (Sn); (4) disapprobation (A., Tsr), as in ارضّد (Sn). The pausal letter differs in predicament from the initial, the pausal being quiescent, while the initial is only mobile: except that beginning with the mobile is quasi-compulsory, since it is impossible to begin with a quiescent [667]; while pause upon the quiescent is artistic and approvable, when the mind is wearied by the succession of words, consonants and vowels (IY). And from the [primary] object of resting, in pause, three [secondary] objects are derived; for it serves to denote completion of the purport of the speech, completion of the metre in poetry, and completion of the rhythm in prose (Tsr). It is common to the three kinds [625] (M), the n., as هذا زيد This is Zaid; the v., as يضرب زيد Zaid strikes or ضرب struck; and the p., as جبر Yes [556] (IY). It has [eleven (Jrb, Tsr, Fk), or rather thirteen,] modes, [i.e., sorts of predicaments
(R.), (1) [bare (SH, Fk)] quiescence [below]; (2) Raum [below]; (3) Ishmām [below]; (4) substitution of the ! [640, 649]; (5) change of the [nominal (SH, Fk)] š of feminization into ș [646]; (6) addition of the ! [648]; (7) affixion of the ș of silence [644, 648]; (8) [expression or (Tsr, Fk)] elision of the [ and (R, Tsr, Fk)] ی [643, 645, 648]; (9) change of the Hamza [into a letter homogeneous with its vowel (642) (SH)]; (10) reduplication [below]; (11) transfer of the vowel [640, 641] (SH, Tsr, Fk); (12) conversion of the Tanwīn into ى or ى [below]; (13) conversion of the ! into ى or ى or Hamza [643]. These [modes] mentioned are the predicaments of pause, i.e., of silence upon the final of the word because of the completion [of the purpose] of the speech. And by "predicament" [of pause] we mean what is necessitated by it; for pause, in the language of the Arabs, necessitates one of these things (R). The [modes] mentioned here [in the IM and Aud] are [eight,] seven [of which are] collected by somebody in a [mnemonic] verse.
Pause is mostly attended by alterations, which are reducible to seven things, quiescence [No. 1], Ishmām [No. 3], Raum [No. 2], substitution [No. 4, and possibly Nos. 5, 9, 12, and 13], addition [No. 6 and possibly Nos. 7 and 10], elision [No. 8], and transfer [No. 11] (A). Reduplication [No. 10] is not [explicitly] mentioned, because it is an addition of a letter, together with quiescence; so that it is not excluded from the seven, as is indicated by A's expression "reducible" (Sn). Pause is [said by MKh to be] mostly reducible to six sorts of alteration, collected in the saying
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Addition [No. 6, and possibly No. 7], elision [No. 8], quiescence [No. 1], and transfer [No. 11], and similarly reduplication [No. 10], and Raum [No. 2], and Ishmām [No. 3], and substitution [No. 4, and possibly Nos. 5, 9, 12, and 13]. But sometimes it makes no alteration at all (MKh): [for] the saying of A [and MKh] "mostly" is intended to except the abbreviated not pronounced with Tanwīn (Sn), as الْفَتَى the youth and حُبَلَى pregnant; and [the defective not pronounced with Tanwīn (Sn), ] as الْفَقَاهِي the judge (Sn, MKh); since there is no alteration in them [643] (Sn). These modes vary in goodness [of effect], and in place [of application] (SH, A). For some of them are better than
others, conversion of the ٰ into ى or ى or Hamza being weak, as will be seen [643]; and similarly transfer of the vowel and reduplication [below]. But sometimes two or more modes agree in goodness [of effect], like quiescence [below] and conversion of the ṣ of femininization into ٰ [646]. And each mode has a place, in which it is authorized; but sometimes two or more modes share in one place, as quiescence and Raum [below] share in the mobile (R). The modes will [now] be discussed in detail (A). The [word] paused upon is a n., v., or p.; and the n., when its final is a sound letter, and it is triptote, is in the nom., acc., or gen. (IY). Moreover the [n.] paused upon is sometimes pronounced, and sometimes not pronounced, with Tanwin (Tsr). If the final of the word be quiescent [below], as in كُمْ [217] and مَنْ [182], you are relieved from the task of providing quiescence; and, with it, none of the modes of pause is employed; but you pause with the [existing] quiescence only; though, if the quiescence of pause were said to be different from the quiescence of continuity, it would not be improbable, as [the vowels and aug. consonant in the pl. are said to be different from those] in [the sing.] ٰٰ[234, 246] and ٰٰ[234] (R). When you pause upon a [n.] pronounced with Tanwin [below] (Aud) and not made fem. with the ى [646], the Arabs have three dials., (1) elision of the Tanwin unrestrictedly, [i.e., in all three
cases,] which is the dial. of Rabi’a [below] (Tsr); though apparently, says IA, this is not necessary in the dial. of Rabi’a, since, in their poems, pause upon the acc. pronounced with Tanwîn is often with ! (Sn): (2) change of the Tanwîn unrestrictedly, into ! after Fatha, , after Damma, and i after Kasra, which is the dial. of AlAzd [below]: (3) making a distinction between the [final] pronounced with] Fathâ and [the final pronounced with] any other [vowel] (Tsr). The most preponderant and frequent of the [three (Tsr)] dials. is that its Tanwîn should be (1) elided after Damma and Kasra, [the letter before the Tanwîn being made quiescent (Tsr)], as هَدَا زَيْدَ This is Zaid and مَرَّتْ بِزيّدَ I passed by Zaid, [with quiescence of the ژ in the two exs. (Tsr)]: and (2) changed into ! after Fatha, whether the Fatha be (a) inflectional, as in رَأَيْتْ زَيْدَa I saw Zaid; or (b) un-inflectional, as in [i.q. أَنْتَفَفَ Desist (Tsr),] and ژَيْبَها [187, 198] (Aud), i.q. أَعْتَبَ I marvel (Tsr). And they assimilate [594], with the acc. pronounced with Tanwîn, changing its ژ into ! in pause. This is the saying of the majority: while some assert that pause upon it is with the ژ, and this is preferred by IU [in the Commentary on the Jumal (Tsr)]; but the common consent of the Seven Readers is against it (Aud), since they agree in pausing upon such as ژَنْ تَفْلِحُوا
XVIII. 19. *And ye shall not ever prosper then* with the ی (Tsr). When mobile, the final of the ی paused upon is either a ی of feminization [646], or not (IA). In pause upon the mobile [final], that is not the ی of feminization [646], you are allowed [a choice between] five modes, vid., that you should pause with (1) quiescence (Aud), stripped of Raum and Ishmām [below] (Tsr): (a) "mobile" [here] means "mobilized with a vowel not accidental", as IM restricts it in the U, because the [letter] possessed of an accidental vowel is in the predicament of the quiescent [above]; so that it is paused upon with mere quiescence, like the ی of feminization in the ی. in اقتربت الساعة LIV. 1. *The hour hath drawn nigh* [607], and the ی of يوميَّ في اليومن on that day [201, 204, 608], as [IM says] in the CU: (b) what is meant is the "mobile" other than [the final of] the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, according to those who change its Tanwin into ی [above], since in it not one of the five [modes] is practicable; though this is disputed in the case of transfer, as will be mentioned [641]: so in the Hamʿ and elsewhere (Sn): (c) quiescence is absence of the vowel (Jrb, A) altogether, without any indication thereof (Jrb): (d) it is equally applicable to the [ی] pronounced, and the [ی] not pronounced, with Tanwin; and to the inflected and the uninfl. (Jrb, Tsr): (e) it is the original (IY, Jrb, Aud), and most frequent and prevalent [mode], because
[it is (IY)] deprivation of the vowel, [which (IY)] is most effective in realizing the object of rest (IY, Jrb, Tsr): (f) its sign [in writing (M, R)] is [said by AH to be (Tsr)] a ħā (S, M, R, A, Tsr) above the letter (IY, R, A, Tsr) paused upon (R), as ھَا ھَكَم This is Hākam (M), and is made by S like this, ـٔ (Tsr), meaning ḥafīṣ light (IY, R, A, Tsr), or ḥafq ḥafq It has become light (A, Tsr), or ḥafqāh imperceptibility, because the quiescent [letter] is lighter [and less perceptible] than any other (IY); but the author of the Aud finds fault with him, saying that it is only the head of a ħā or ٔ , either of which is abbreviated from ħājīm Cut off [the vowel], or Make quiescent; and apparently it is the head of a ٔ abbreviated from ħājīm Rest, because pause is rest (Tsr) : (g) some of the scribes make it a circle, [which, in my opinion, is (IY)] because the circle, [in the conventional language of the arithmeticians (IY),] is a cipher, which is what has no number in it (IY, Tsr); so that they make it a sign of the quiescent, because the latter is devoid of vowel (IY) : and some of them make it a [pure (IY)] ٔ , as though, when they saw it without any explanation, they thought it to be a ٔ (IY, Tsr): (h) quiescence is allowable in every mobile, except [the final of] the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, where the common dial. is conversion of the Tanwin into ٔ ; though Rabi'a
[above] treat the acc. like the nom. and gen., as

by AlA‘sha Maimūn, praising kāis Ibn Ma‘dikarib, Unto the perfect man, Kais, I prolong the nightly journeys; and I take from every tribe ties, i.e., safe-conducts to another tribe, because in every tribe the poet had enemies whom he had satirized, or who hated the subject of his eulogy, properly عُصْيَا (AKB)] : and it is necessary in pause upon the ʿ of femininization [646] (Aud), where the remaining modes are not practicable (Tsr) : (i) when the final of the word is Tānūn [above], its quiescence is not taken into account, nor do you content yourself with it in pause; but you elide [it] in the nom. and gen. [609] ; so that the letter before it becomes the final of the word, and therefore its vowel is elided : (j) the reason why you elide the Tānūn in the nom. and gen. is that you intend the word to be lighter in pause than it is in continuity, because pause is for rest; and, since the word is lightened by elision of a p. [608] like a part of it, its lightening by elision of what is more strongly united with it than the Tānūn i.e., the Ḍamma and Kasra, is more appropriate : and, as for the acc., in it the extreme of lightness is realized for the word without elision of the Tānūn, vid., by its conversion into !, since the ! is the lightest of the consonants : (k) similarly in the du. and sound pl. masc. the
lightness is realized by elision of the vowel of the ُ alone (R): (2) Raum, which is **stifling the sound of the vowel** (Aud): (a) it is a feeble sound, as though you were **desiring** [to sound] the vowel (IY, Jrb); not completely achieving it, but slurring it over (IY, Jrb, Tsr); for a notification of the vowel in the o. f. (Jrb, Tsr), together with a realization of part of the object of the pause (Jrb): so says Jrb (Tsr); (b) it [is not confined to any particular vowel; but (Tsr)] is allowable in all the vowels, contrary to the opinion of Fr, who disallows it in the case of Fatha, and whose opinion is adopted by most of the [Seven (Tsr)] Readers (Aud), while AHm agrees with them in the disallowance (Tsr): (c) when the [final] pronounced with Fatha has Tanwin, as in ﴡِلُجُکَّ)، there is no dispute that Raum is not allowable in it, except according to the rare *dial.* of Rabr'a, i.e., elision of the Tanwin, as in ِلَأَحَدٌ ﻣُﻦُ ﻣُأْمُعُرَ [above]: but, when it has no Tanwin, as in ﴡِلُجُکَّ) and ِلَأَحَدٌ، the opinion of the Readers, and of Fr among the GG, is that Raum of the Fatha in it is not allowable, because Fathe is impartible, on account of its lightness, its part being its whole; while, according to S and other GG, Raum is allowable in it, as in the nom. and gen. (R): (d) the sign of Raum is a line in front of [below] the letter (S, M, R, A, Tsr), like this, ﴡِلُجُکَّ) *(Tsr)*, as ﴡِلُجُکَّ).
This is Khalid (M): (3) Ishmām: (a) this is peculiar to the [final] pronounced with Damm (Aud), and does not occur in the [final] pronounced with Fāth or Kasr; while the Ishmām in the gen., which is transmitted from some of the Readers, is explicable as Raūm [above], according to the technical nomenclature mentioned below as adopted by some of the KK (Tṣr): (b) it is really the indication of the vowel by the lips, after quiescence, without emission of any [audible (Tṣr)] sound (Aud): this means that you compress your lips after quiescence, leaving between them some gap, in order that the breath may pass out from it; so that the person addressed, seeing them compressed, may know that, by their compression, you mean the vowel [Damma]: thus it is a thing perceptible by the eye exclusively, not by the ear, because it is not a sound to be heard, but a motion of an organ (Tṣr); and is therefore perceptible only by the seeing, not by the blind (Aud): (c) some of the KK apply the name Ishmām to Raūm [above]: but this is really a misnomer, because in Raūm, with the motion of the lips, there is a small sound, whereby the consonant almost becomes mobile; so that it is perceptible by the blind and the seeing, contrary to Ishmām (Tṣr): (d) some attribute to the KK the allowance of Ishmām in the gen., and also in the [final] pronounced with Kasr; but apparently they are mistaken, since not one of the
GG allows it, except in the nom., and in the [final] pronounced with Damm: for the instrument of Damm is the lip; while by Ishmām you intend to represent the outlet of the vowel to the beholder in the shape that it assumes upon utterance of that vowel; so that you may thereby indicate that this, and no other, is the vowel dropped; and, the lips being exposed to his eye, their compression [to represent the utterance of Damm] is perceptible by his vision: whereas the Kasra is part of the ی, the outlet of which is the middle of the tongue [732]; and the Fatha is part of the ！”, the outlet of which is the throat [732]; and both these [outlets] are hidden by the lips and the teeth, so that it is not possible for the person address to perceive the preparation of the two outlets for [the utterance of] these vowels (R); (e) the sign of Ishmām is a dot (S, M, R, A, Tsr) in front of [below] the letter (TY, A, R, A, Tsr), like this, · (A, Tsr), as جَعَفْر This is Jatfar (M), because Ishmām is weaker than Raum, since in it no part of the vowel is uttered, contrary to Raum; while the dot is smaller than the line (R): A’s saying “in front of the letter” [above] means “after it”, not “above it”, like the preceding [sign of quiescence, i.e., the خ], to dispel the notion that it is a جَرَمْة sign of quiescence; as the sign of Raum [above] is not above it, to dispel the notion that is a نَصْب sign of the acc. (Sn): (f) the derivation of Ishmām is from
smell, as though you made the consonant smell a whiff of the vowel, by preparing the organ to pronounce it (Tsr): (g) the object of it is to distinguish what [is mobile in continuity, but (Tsr)] is made quiescent in pause, from what is quiescent (A, Tsr) in every state (Tsr); (h) according to IH (R), the majority hold that there is no Raum or Ishmām in [three forms (Jrb),] the š of femininization [646], the m of the pl., and the accidental vowel (SH): but I have not seen one of the Readers or GG mention that Raum or Ishmām is allowable in any of the three [forms] mentioned: on the contrary, all of them disallow both [modes] in these [forms], unrestrictedly: and I believe that what makes IH fancy that Raum and Ishmām are allowed in them is that Sht, after saying

[And, in a š of femininization, and the m of the pl., and an accidental vowel, say, they (the pron. referring to Raum and Ishmām) are not to be applied. And, i the š of the (attached sing. masc.) pron., a set of Readers, like Mkk and Ibn Shuraih, have disapproved of them, when before it (the pron. referring to]
while, if they were said, it would be plainer) is Damm or Kasr formed, or their bases, a, and a, as in عقلُهُ, شرِّه, XII.20. And they have understood it, إسْمُ, II.108. His Name, and in II.1. About it, إلِّيِه, II.26. Unto Him, and مِنْ رَبِّ, II.85. From his Lord (AAK), adds

وَغُصْنَ مِنْ يُرِى لَهُمَا إِلَّا كُلِّ حَالٍ مُّحَمَّلٍ

[While some of them, like AdDâni and Ns, are seen to be allowing them in every case (AAK)]; so that IH supposes that, by his saying “in every case”, he means “in the case of the s of feminization, and the m of the pl., and the accidental vowel, and the s of the [attached sing.] masc. [pron.]”; as some of the Commentators also have misunderstood his language, [fancying that its meaning is “in every case of the letter paused upon” (AAK)]; whereas Sht only means “in every case of the s of the [attached sing.] masc. [pron.] alone”, as will be seen [648]: (i) the reason why Raum and Ishmâm are not allowable in the s of feminization [642] is that on the s there is no vowel to be notified by Raum or Ishmâm, the vowel being only on the s for which the s is a subst.; and, on that account, they are allowable according to those who pause upon the ت without conversion, as in بطْلُ جَيْزٍ تَيِّهَا النَّحْم [183, 646]: (j) as for the م of the
pl., the majority hold that it should be made quiescent in continuity [161], as ﻋَلَّاٰٰ، and ﻋَلَّاٰٰ; while Raum and Ishmām do not occur in the quiescent [above]; and, as for those who mobilize it in continuity, conjoining it with ﺷِاءٰ or ﻦِیّاٰ, the reason why they do not employ Raum or Ishmām, after elision of the ﻦِیّاٰ or ﻦِیّاٰ [in pause], as Raum of the Kasra in ﺗَاءٰ ﻦِیّاٰ is employed after elision of its ﻦِیّاٰ [643], is that this Kasra does sometimes occur at the end of the word in continuity, as in ﺗَاءٰ ﻦِیّاٰ LIV.6. On the day when the summoner [Isrāfil (K, B), or Gabriel (K),] shall summon, [which is read (K) with elision of the ﻦِیّاٰ (K, B), for the sake of lightness (B)]; whereas ﻋَلَّاٰٰ and ﻋَلَّاٰٰ, when you conjoin them with a mobile after them, do not occur with Ḍamm [and Kasr, respectively] of the ﻦِیّاٰ, [i.e.,] with the mobile, and the conj. elided; while Raum or Ishmām of a vowel, that is never a final in continuity, cannot be employed [in pause]: and, as for such as ِیَكَتَاب٥ VI. 114. [77] and ِیَكَتَاب٥ VI.111. [585], the final of the word in their case is the ﻦِیّاٰ and ﻦِیّاٰ respectively, which is elided on account of the two quiescents; and what is elided on account of two quiescents is in the predication of the expressed: this is if we say that, before their conjunction with the quiescent, they were ِیَكَتَاب٥ and ِیَكَتَاب٥, according to the reading of Ibn Kathir [161]:


while, if we say that, before that, they were لَقَدْ آسْتَهْزَى إِبْرَإْلُ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ and لَقَدْ آسْتَهْزَى إِبْرَأْلُ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ, with quiescence of the مُ in both, then the Kasr and داّumm are accidental, on account of the two quiescents; and there is no Raum or Ishmâm in the accidental vowel [below], as مَنِ يَشَأُ اللَّهُ يَضْلِلُهُ VI. 39. Whomsoever God willeth [to lead astray (B)], him doth He lead astray, and لَقَدْ آسْتَهْزَى إِبْرَأْلُ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ VI. 10. And assuredly Apostles before thee have been mocked at, because Raum and Ishmâm belong only to the vowel understood in pause; while the vowel supervening on account of the two quiescents occurs only in continuity; so that, not being understood in pause, it cannot be notified [by Raum or Ishmâm] (R): (k) the accidental vowel is the vowel of the concurrence of two quiescents [664], as in XC VIII. 1. [450] IV. 45. And disobeyed the Apostle, and فَلْتَنْفِرْ لِلْأُنْسَان LXXX. 24. Then let man look; and in مَنْ يَشَأُ اللَّهُ يَضْلِلُهُ [above] (MAR): and the reason why there is no Raum or Ishmâm in it is that the consonant [on which it appears] has [orig.] no vowel in continuity; but the vowel supervenes only because of a quiescent, that encounters it; and disappears upon pause, because of the departure of the necessitating cause; so that it is not taken into account (MASH): (4) reduplication of the letter paused upon, [in a n. or v. (Tar),] as هَـذَا خَالِدُ This is
*Khalid* and ꝕوُيَحِبَعُ He makes (Aud), with reduplication of the ꝕ in ꝕِحِبَعُ, and of the ꝗ in ꝕِحِبَعُ (Tsr): (a) reduplication is the strengthening of the letter paused upon: (b) the object of it is to make known that this letter is orig. mobile: (c) the letter added for pause is the quiescent that precedes, and is incorporated into, the letter paused upon (A): (d) the sign of reduplication is ꝕ (S, M, R, A) above the letter (IY, R, A), as ُخُدَّا ُنَحَّرَ. This is Faraj (M); this being the initial of ꝕِذِيدَ strong (IY, R, A), or ꝕِذَّ It has become strong (IY), or ꝕِذَّ It has been strengthened (Sn): but, in the language of the Tsr (Sn), its sign is (Tsr) the head of ꝕ (Tsr, Sn) above the letter, like this, ꝕ (Tsr): (e) it is rare (SH, Tsr), because of the occurrence of the doubling in place of the lightening (Jrb, Tsr); and for this reason it is not transmitted from any of the Readers except 'Āsim in مُسْتَطَرَ LIV. 53. Recorded [in the Tablet (K, B)], in the Chapter of the Moon (Tsr): (f) it is a Sa'di dial.; (g) its conditions are five matters, vid. that the ꝕetter (Tsr) paused upon should not be (a) a Hamza [642], as in ꝕُحَصَّا fault and ꝕَرْفَمْ young gazette (Aud), because the Hamza in the position of the ꝕ is not incorporated, nor incorporated into [737] (Tsr); (b-d) a ꝑ, as in the judge, ꝑ, as in ꝕُمَهُر calls, or an ꝑ,
as in ُخَشَى dreads (Aud), because of the heaviness of the unsound letter [642] (Tsr); (e) immediately after quiescence, as in زِيد Zaid and عُمْر Amr (Aud), lest three quiescents be combined, the penultimate, the incorporated, and the [letter] paused upon (Tsr): (h) reduplication occurs in the nom. and gen., unrestrictedly: and, as for the acc., if it be pronounced with Tanwin, the only [mode] allowable in it is conversion of the Tanwin into ْل [above], except according to the dial. of Rab'ra [above], who allow elision of the Tanwin, in which case there is no disallowance of reduplication; but, if it be not pronounced with Tanwin, as ُرَأَيْتُ أَلْرَجَلَ I saw the man, لَنْ يَجْعَلَ He shall not make, and ُرَأَيْتُ أَحْمَدَ I saw Ahmad, there is no question about the allowability of reduplication, as in the nom. and gen.: (i) reduplication is applicable to the nom. and the [final] pronounced with Damm, the gen. and the [final] pronounced with Kasr, and the acc. not pronounced with Tanwin and the [final] pronounced with Fath (R): (j) such as لَأَقْصَبَا [in the saying of the poet أَوُ كَُلْكَرْيِي لَمْ (Jrb)] is an anomalous poetic license [below] (SH), because he imports the predicament of pause, vid. reduplication, into the state of continuity [647]; and we say that it is "the state of continuity", because the rhymes are mobilized only when meant to be understood as continuous [with what follows
them] (Jrb): (k) the doubled letter ought to be quiescent, because you double it only to explain the [existence of a] vowel in continuity; whereas, when it becomes mobile, you are independent of indication of the vowel, since it is perceived [by the ear]: but they allow, in rhymes exclusively, the doubled letter to be mobilized, for the purpose of putting the letter of unbinding, because poetry is the position of quavering, trilling, and reiteration of sound, and especially at the ends of verses; while the letters of unbinding, i.e., the ٌ, ٍ, and ى, are particularly appropriated out of [all] the letters, to repetition and reiteration [of sound]; for which reason they are affixed in poetry, for the purpose of unbinding, to words that they are not affixed to in prose, as in

\[115\], whereas you do not say \( I \text{ passed by} \) \( \text{Amr, except according to the dial. of the Azd [above]} \) of As Sarāt; and as in

\[\text{Asmā has announced to us her intention of departing. Many a sojourner there is, of whose sojourning one is wearied!} \] (EM, N), whereas you do not say \( \text{Asmā has come to} \)
and you say in poetry, whereas in prose that is not allowable in any of the dialects; and similarly the poet [Imra al-Kais (Jh, MAR)] says:

[And many a mail-clad warrior there was, whose skirt I uncovered with the spear, whose inclination towards flight I righted with a trenchant blade, having wavy lines! (MAR)], with the s of the conj. after the s of the pron., whereas in prose that is not allowable when the s of the pron. is paused upon, as جَانَى فُكَانَةُ His young man came to me [648]: so that, as, for the sake of putting the [letter of] unbinding, it is allowable for them to mobilize that [letter] which in prose ought to be quiescent, so, for the sake of the letter of unbinding, they allow the doubled ل to be mobilized in such as

[by a man of the Bani Asad (S).] With a nine-year-old she-camel, robust or swift [647], although it ought to be quiescent; and similarly the doubled ب in such as أَوْ كَأْلَحْضِيقُ أُلَمَ [below] is orig. quiescent, but is mobilized for the sake of the letter of unbinding, as the ن of أَلْتَدْرِيْنَ in the saying [of 'Amr Ibn Kulthum at Taghlabi (EM)]]
Now wake up, O female cup-bearer, and give us a morning-draught with thy bowl, and keep not back for others the wines of the inhabitants of Al-Andarî, a city in Syria, i.e. خَمْرُ الْآنَدْرِيِّينَ, where three s are combined, so that they are lightened by poetic license, or the wines of the Andarîn, said to be cities in Syria abounding in wines (EM). I ought to be quiescent, as in مَرْنُ ٌباَلْسَلْبِيَّينَ I passed by the Muslims, all rhymes being paused upon, even though the sentence be not complete without the following verses: and, for this reason, we do not [often] find, in ancient poetry, such as الشَّكْرَتِي the tree, with the followed by the conj.; but the شَكْرَتِي occurs, with the quiescent s [646]; while the شَكْرَتِي is frequent only in the poems of post-classical [poets]: and, according to this theory, the saying القَصَبَا [below] is not "an anomalous poetic license" [above]; as the mobilization of the ن in the above] and the mobilization of the ر in the saying

The winds have sported with it (the abode); and, in mine absence, the whirlwinds of dust and the showers have altered it (MAR), for the sake of the letter of unbinding, are, by common consent, not anomalous.
notwithstanding that the two letters would have to be quiescent if they were not in poetry: and, because of its not being anomalous, you will see mobilization of the doubled [letter], for the sake of the [letter of] unbinding, to be frequent in their language: Ru’ba [Ibn Al ‘Ajjaţ at Tamimi (Jsh)] says

لقد خشيتك أن أرى جذٍّا ففي عامٍّما آخَصَبْا

إِنَّ الْكَبْرَ يَغْلِبُ الْعُقَوَّةِ دَبَا رَهَبٌ يَرِمُّ قَبَا

تَقُرَّ مَا أَبْقَى الْكَبْرَ سَبْسَبَا كَأَنَّهُ بُسْطَٰٰلٍ إِذَا أَسْلَحَةٌ

أَوْ كَالْحَرْصِقِ رَقَاقُ الْقَصَّاٰ وَالْتَّيْنَ وَالْحَلَفَاءٍ فَالتَّهَبَا

[647] (R) Assuredly I have dreaded that I may see a drought in this our year, after it has been fertile in herbage. Verily the young locusts have crawled over the ridges of the ground, and the wind has blown up dust continually, leaving what the locusts have spared a desert, as though it were the flood where it spreads abroad, or like the flame when it has met the reeds and the straw and the long coarse grass, and has then blazed up (MN): nor is there anything in the language of S to indicate that the like [mobilization] is anomalous or a poetic license; nay, the only reason why the like [mobilization] is not extremely frequent is that reduplication [itself] is rare in pause, because the property of pause is to lighten, not to make heavy; so that
the rarity of such as \( \text{جَآَهَيْنِ} \) جَعْفَر, \text{Ja'far came to me}, and of \( \text{يَجْعَلُ} \) جَعْفَر [above]: (R) but [Jrb contends that] even those who say that the rhymes are mobilized because a letter of prolongation, that is paused upon, has been added to them, which is what is named [letter of unbinding], not because they are meant to be understood as continuous [with what follows them], do not take it out of the cat. of the anomalous: except that the anomaly, according to the first [theory], consists in continuity's being treated like pause [647]; while, according to the second, it consists in the vowel's being combined with reduplication, whereas the condition of the one is the non-existence of the other (Jrb): (1) reduplication should properly not be applied to the acc. pronounced with Tanwin in such as

\[ \text{تنَتْرُنْ ما} \text{اَبْقَيَ} \text{آَلْدَبَا} \text{سَبْسَبَا} \] [above], because the letter of its inflection ought to be mobile in pause, its Tanwin being converted into \( \text{ل} \), and nothing else; while the letter of inflection, when mobile in pause, not for the sake of putting the letter of unbinding, is not doubled: but the poet makes the acc. accord with, and follow the analogy of, the nom. and gen., as in the dial. of Rabī'ā [above] (R): (5) transfer of the vowel of the letter [paused upon] to that which is before it, as in the reading [of IAl (Tsr)] رَبِّ تَواصَوَّا بِالصَّبِيرَ CIII. 3.
And enjoined, one upon another, patience; [with transfer of the Kasra to the \( \text{Tsr} \)]; and the saying \[498, 641\] (Aud), with transfer of the \( \text{Damm} \) of the \( \text{Q} \) before it (Tsr): (a) this also is rare (SH), like reduplication, except in the Hamza [641], because of the apparent alteration in the formation of the word, by the mobilization of the quiescent \( \text{ء} \) with \( \text{Damm} \), Fat\( \dot{h} \), or Kasr, although the vowels are accidental; and also because the transfer of the inflection, which ought to be on the final, to the medial [of the word] is disliked (R): (b) its object is either to make the vowel [of the inflection (A)] plain, or to escape from the [concurrency of (A)] two quiescents (A, MKh); and the reason why it is not necessary is only that concurrence of two quiescents is allowable in pause (MKh): (c) its sign is the absence of sign (A).

§. 641. Its conditions are five [or rather six (Tsr)] matters, (1) that the penultimate should be quiescent, [in order that it may receive the vowel transferred, because the mobile does not receive another vowel (Tsr)]: (2-3) that mobilization of that quiescent should not be impracticable, [as in the case of the \( \text{i} \) and the incorporated letter, which do not receive a vowel (Tsr); and should not sound heavy, [as in the case of the \( \text{j} \) and \( \text{y} \), to which the vowel is not transferred, on account of the heaviness (Tsr)]: (4) that the vowel [intended to be transferred
(۷۹۷)
(Tsr) should not be Fathā [642] (Aud), according to the soundest opinion, as held by the majority of the BB, because, if the [final] pronounced with Fath was [orig.] accompanied by Tanwîn, the transfer [of its Fathā] would entail elision of the Ul of, [i.e., substituted for (Sn),] the Tanwîn [640]; while the [final] unaccompanied by Tanwîn is made to accord with the accompanied: so says IUK (Tsr): (5) that the transfer should not lead to an unprecedented formation (Aud), because that is not allowable: (6) that the [final which the vowel is] transferred from should be sound [642] (Tsr). Transfer is therefore not allowable in such as This is Ja'far, because of the mobility of the penultimate [642]: human being and is hard, because the ! [in ] and the incorporated letter [in ] do not receive a vowel, [since they are necessarily quiescent, except that the quiescence of the ! is constitutional, while the quiescence of the incorporated is accidental (Tsr)]: (3) says and sells, because a vowel would sound heavy upon the , preceded by a [letter] pronounced with Damm [in (Tsr)], and upon the ی preceded by a [letter] pronounced with Kasr [in ]: I learnt knowledge, because the vowel is Fathā (Aud): for they transfer Damma and Kasra, because they dislike to elide them,
on account of their strength; while, Fatha being light, they pardon its elision: so says Jrb (Tsr): but that [transfer of Fatha (Tsr)] is allowed by the KK [below] (Aud, A), and, [according to the author of the Aud (Sn),] by Akh [below] (Aud, Sn), unrestrictedly (Sn), for the sake of uniformity in the cat. (Tsr); and it is reported of Jr that he allows it, [unrestrictedly, like the KK (Sn)]; and of Akh [above] that he allows it in the [n.] pronounced with Tanwin, according to the dial. of those who say رآيت بكر I saw Bakr (A), vid. Rabr'a [640], because the preceding objection [as to its entailing elision of the l substituted for the Tanwin] is absent, according to the dial. of these (Sn): (5) هُدَا عَلَمُ This is knowledge, because in Arabic there is no فعل [368], with Kasr of its first [letter], and Damm of its second (Aud): غَزُور [648], because the [final which the vowel is] transferred from is not sound (Tsr). The last two conditions [mentioned by IHsh, vid. that the vowel should not be Fatha, and that the transfer should not lead to an unprecedented formation (Tsr),] are peculiar to [the n. whose final is] other than Hamza: so that transfer is allowable in such as أَلَّذٍ يُخْرِجُ الْفَخْبَةٍ (1) XXVII. 25. Who bringeth forth the hidden, [where you say أَلْحَبِّ (Tsr),] though the vowel is Fatha, [because, if you said أَلْحَبِّ with quiescence, without transfer, you
would find it sound manifestly heavy (Tsr) [2]: (2) 

This is a buttress, [where you say ْدُرّ with Kasr of the ُّ, and َّDamm of the ِّ(Tsr),] although the transfer leads to the formation ْمَعَ [above] (Aud), because the Hamza is heavy; and, when the preceding [letter] is quiescent, the utterance of the [quiescent (A)] Hamza is difficult (Tsr). The opinion of the KK [above] is that pause with transfer is allowable, whether the vowel be Fatha, َّDamma, or Kasra, and whether the final be Hamza or any other letter; so that, according to them, you say ْرَأَيتَ ُّأَلْصَرْبَ I saw the striking and ْرَأَيتَ ُّأَلْصَرْبَ I saw the buttress; while the opinion of the BB is that transfer is not allowable when the vowel is Fatha, except when the final is Hamza; so that, according to them, ْرَأَيتَ ُّأَلْصَرْبَ is allowable, while ْرَأَيتَ ُّأَلْصَرْبَ is disallowed: but the opinion of the KK is better, because they have transmitted it from the Arabs (IA). Those who do not authorize ْمَعَ [368], with َّDamma [on its first (Tsr)], and then Kasra [on its second (Tsr)], but assert that ْمَعَ weasel is transferred from the v., do not allow transfer [of the vowel] in such as ْبُقِّفَلَ by a lock, because, after the transfer, it becomes ْبُقِّفَلَ with َّDamm of the ِّقَ, and Kasr of the َّبِّ: but allow it in such as ْبُبُطَهَ with slowness, because the final is Hamza (Aud); while
unprecedentedness [of formation] in transfer from the, Hamza is pardonable, because of the heaviness of the Hamza (Tsr). This is the dial. of many of the Arabs, among them Asad and [most of] Tamîm (II, A), who, in the case of [the n. whose final is] Hamza, make no distinction between Fatha, and Damm or Kasr, of the initial; but say 

This is slowness and من البطى from slowness [642]. This is the buttress [642] and 

I passed by the buttress, as they say مرت بالردى

This is the hidden [and مرت باللحى I passed by the hidden (M)]: and do not avoid reduction to the formation فيل, which has no precedent in the language, or فيل, which has no precedent among ns.; because a formation [here] is accidental, not the [original]: formation of the word (IV). But some [of Tamîm (M, A, Tsr), in the case of the n. whose final is Hamza (R),] flee [from the unprecedentedness (A, Tsr) effected by this transfer (A)] to [mobilization of the quiescent with the vowel of the ف, by (Tsr)] alliteration (M, SH, A, Tsr) of [the vowel of] the ع to [that of] the ف (A) [i.e.,] of the transferred Damma to the Kasra of the ف, and of the transferred Kasra to the Damma of the ف (MASH), making Kasra follow Kasra, and Damma follow Damma (IV, Jrb), as هذي الاردى with two Kasras.
and معَ البَطْرُ ُ مَهْدَا رُدْدَي مَعَ كَفْرُ with two Dammas [642] (M, Jrb, MASH): while some of them alliterate; but, after alliteration, change the Hamza [into a letter homogeneous with the alliterative vowel before it (Sn)], saying هَدْدَا رُدْدَي مَعَ كَفْرُ This is a buttress with another to match it (A). And similarly [they alliterate] in the case of the n. whose final is not Hamza (IY, R), though [Z or] IH does not mention it, the difference being that, in the case of the n. whose final is Hamza, the leading to a discarded formation is pardoned; so that this is allowable, as alliteration is allowable. The pause of the people of AlHijāz [642] is not mentioned by [Z or] IH in this section (R). When the vowel of the Hamza is transferred, the Hijāzis elide the Hamza, pausing upon the bearer of its vowel, [i.e., potentially "the bearer", because actually it bears only quiescence (Sn)]; as it is paused upon, when independently entitled to possession of that vowel, [by reason of the vowel's orig. belonging to it (Sn)]: so that they say هَدْدَا الْعَضِبُ This is the hidden, [with transfer and elision (Tsr),] pronouncing [the ب (Tsr)] with quiescence, Raum, or Ishmām [658] (A, Tsr); or with any other [mode], subject to its conditions (A); or [rather (Sn)] with reduplication [642] (Tsr, Sn), but not transfer, according to the well-known dial.; though in the dial. of Lakhm [below], respecting transfer to a mobile, its allowability is not improbable (Sn). But others than the Hijāzis,
[when they transfer (Tsr),] do not elide the Hamza (A, Tsr), because they are eager to keep the inflection from disappearing (Tsr). Transfer is authorized in the nom. and gen., by common consent (R). The Rājiz says [498, 640], meaning (Mb); [and] the poet says

أَرْنِيِّ جَلَدًا عَلَيْ سَاقِهَا # فَهَبَّ النَّفْوَةُ لِذَاكِ الْجَبِيلِ
فَقَلَتْ # وَمَا أُخَفِّي عَنْ صَاحِبِي # أَلَا يَلَّوْيَ أَصْلِ يَلْكِ الْجَبِيلِ

She showed me an anklet upon her leg, and the heart became soft because of that anklet. Then said I, and hid not mine emotion from my companion, Now, by my father be the root of that leg (ransomed)!, meaning [368]; and, similarly (IV), the poet says

تَصَخَّرُهَا الْأَرْتَرُ وَالْأَلْبَدِي الأَشْعَرُ وَالْنَّبِلُ سَتُوْنُ كَانَتِهَا الأَجْبِرُ

The strings of the bows and the hairy hands drove them, the arrows being sixty, as though they were live coals, meaning [الْجَبِيرُ and the أَشْعَرُ (M). As for the acc., (1) if the n. be pronounced with Tanwin, transfer is not authorized in it, except in the dial. of Rab'ā [above], because of their eliding the Fathā also: (2) if it be not pronounced with Tanwin, transfer is (a) disallowed by S, who says “They do not say رَأَيْتْ أَلْبَكَر,” [“because it is in the position of Tanwin” (S), which is
understood by R to mean "on the ground that the art. is accidental, the o. f. being Tanwin, so that the [n.] made det. by the art. is in the predicament of the [n.] pronounced with Tanwin"; [and by IUK and others to mean that the acc. not pronounced with Tanwin is made to accord with the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, for the sake of uniformity]; (b) allowed by others than S, because the acc. not pronounced with Tanwin is exactly like the nom. and gen. in the necessity for quiescence of the J. If, however, the final of the acc. not pronounced with Tanwin be Hamza, transfer is authorized in it, by common consent, because the Hamza [below], when quiescent, is imperceptible after the quiescent (R): and the acc. pronounced with Tanwin is like the acc. not pronounced with Tanwin in allowability of transferring the vowel of its Hamza, although it is not exemplified by [R and] A (Sn). The majority hold that transfer is peculiar to the vowel of inflection; so that مِنْ بَعْدٍ [201] is not said, nor مَصْحَى اَمسَ [206], because their eagerness for knowledge of the vowel of uninflectedness is not like their eagerness for knowledge of the vowel of inflection, [on account of the preeminence of the latter (Sn)]: but some of the moderns say that, on the contrary, the eagerness for [knowledge of] the vowel of uninflectedness is more strongly felt, because the vowel of inflection has something that indicates it, vid. the op. [1] (A). The s of the pron. is like
the Hamza [above] in imperceptibility; so that, when
the letter before it is quiescent and sound, transfer of its
Ḍamma to that quiescent is allowable, [as] in مَنَةَ and
عِنْةٌ, for the sake of making the Ḍamma plain (R). The
poet [Ziyād al-Aʿjam (S, IY)] says

(804)

(S, Mb, M, K on IV. 101, R, A) I marvelled (and
fortune, much is its marvelling!) at an ‘Anazi that
reviled me, while I smote him not (N), meaning
لَمْ أُصَدِّرْ (Mb, A, N), with quiescence of the ب, and
Ḍamm of the ﺱ (N); and Abu-nNajm says

فَقَرْتُ هَذَا وَهُدَا زَحْلَةٌ

Then bring this near, and remove this far (S, Mb,
M), meaning زَحْلَةٍ (Mb, IV); and Ṭarafa says

حَابِيَةِ زَحْلَةٍ رَفَعَ وَقَفَتْ يِهٍ ﺎَلْبُ أَطْبَعَ ﺎَلْنَفْسَ لَمْ أُرِمْهَا.

What detains me is a dwelling that I have stopped at,
such that if I were to obey the prompting of my soul,
I should not quit it, where he is not obliged to restore
the ﺱ [elided in ٌ], when the م becomes mobile, because
its vowel does not really belong to it, but is only the
vowel of the ﺱ (Mb). And some of the Banū ‘Adr, of
Tamīm, mobilize the letter before the ﺱ with Kasr, on
account of the two quiescents, saying ضَرْرَتْ. She struck
him and فَاقِتْهَا She said it; but the first [mode, vid. transfer of the Damma from the slaught to the quiescent before it, as فَرْنِهَا and فَقِتْهَا,] is more frequent (R). Pause with transfer of the vowel to a mobile is [allowable in (A)] the dial. of Lakhm [above] (A, Tsr), as in من يَا تَبْر لِلْحَيْر فِيْمَا فَقَدَّهَا فَيْحَد مَسَاعِيهِ وَيَعْلَمُ رَسَدَهُ (A) Whose conforms to good in what he has purposed, his efforts are praised, and his rectitude is known (MN), where the poet transfers the vowel of the slaught to the slaught, which was mobile (MN, Sn) before (Sn), orig. قَصَّة (MN): and, as an instance of this dial., Jh cites the saying of some Rājiz

Shaibān ceased not to be strong in his throwing down, until his match came to him, and broke his neck, saying "He means قَرْقِصَة; but, when he pauses upon the slaught, he transfers its [vowel, vid. the (Jh)] Damma to the preceding slaught, which he then mobilizes (Tsr) with the vowel of the slaught" (Jh). And another peculiarity of this dial. is pause upon the slaught of the 3rd pers. fem. by elision of the slaught, and transfer of the Fatḥa of the slaught to the mobile before it, as in the saying

نَزَآئِبَ كُنْتُ فِي لَعْمٍ أَخَانِهُ Misfortunes that I was fearing for, or on account of,
Lakhm, meaning أَخْاَفُهَا (A). And it is said in the Nihâya "For ضَرْبَة He struck him you say ضَرَّة in poetry; and the vulgar use it in prose" (Tsr). It is allowable to pause upon a single letter, like [the ف and (MAR)] the aoristic letter, which is then conjoined with a Hamza followed immediately by an ı; but sometimes is restricted to the ı: the poet says

بَالَعْخَايِرٍ خَيْرَاتٍ وَإِنْ شَراً نَاَّ وَلَا أَرْبِدَ آخَرَ إِلَّا أَنْ تَاَ [In return for good shall be good things (from me); and, if (what is done to me be) evil, then (its return shall be evil); and I mean not evil (for thee), unless thou will evil (for me) (MAR)], i. e., إِنْ شَرَّا نَفَرُ and إِلَّا أَنْ تَفَضِّلُ: and it is sometimes related فأَّن and تَا, as though another ı were added to the ı, like the imploitation of Fatha; and then the first, being mobilized because of the two quiescents, were converted into Hamza, as in [665] (R).

§. 642. The Hamza is the remotest and faintest of the letters, because it proceeds from the farthest part of the throat [732]; while pause causes the letter paused upon to become fainter than it is in continuity, because pause involves elision of the vowel that immediately follows the letter, making its sound plain; so that, when Hamza is paused upon, it needs to be made plain. The Hamza paused upon is either lightened by conversion or
elision, which is the method of those who alleviate, [vid. the people of AlḤijāz (MAR)]; or sounded true, which is the method of others [641, 658]. The Hamza sounded true needs something to make it plain, because it remains, and is therefore faint, contrary to the lightened. The [Hamza] sounded true is preceded either by a quiescent [letter], or by a mobile. If the preceding [letter] be quiescent, you pause upon the Hamza with elision of its vowel in the nom. and gen., as you pause upon [the] Amr and Bakr : and here, besides quiescence, Raum or Ishmām occurs ; but not reduplication 640]. Many of the Arabs, however, throw its vowel, oftener than the vowel of any other [letter], upon the preceding quiescent, because the Hamza, when it follows a quiescent, is fainter, since, the quiescent being faint, it is a faint [letter] after a faint; whereas, when you mobilize the preceding [letter], that makes the Hamza plainer. Since, then, the Hamza is more in need of mobilization of the preceding [letter] than are the rest of the letters, because of its excessive faintness, they (1) throw its vowels upon the preceding [letter], whether the vowel be Fatḥa, Damma or Kasra; whereas they do not transfer the Fatḥa [641] of any other letter to what precedes it : (2) throw upon the preceding [letter] the Damma of the Hamza in the case of the tril. pronounced with Kasr of the م, as مَضْمَرَةً. 78 a
[641]; and its Kasra in the case of the tril. pronounced with Ḍamm of the ٍ ف, as مَنْ أَلْبِطَٰٓ ٍ [641]; although, by this transfer, the two expressions are transformed into a discarded measure; nor do they mind that, because this measure is a temporary accident, not the original constitution of the word: whereas that is not done by them in the case of any [final] other than Hamza; so that they do not say حَذَا عَذَلٌ This is a counterpoise, nor مَنْ أَلْبِطَٰٓ from the full-grown unripe dates. All of that [transfer of vowels] is because of their dislike that the Hamza should be quiescent when preceded by a quiescent. And, where the inflection is thus transferred to what precedes the Hamza, Raum and Ishmām do not occur, because they serve to make the vowel plain, while that is already realized by the transfer. But, even in the case of the Hamza, some of the Banū Tamīm avoid the two discarded measures, notwithstanding their being accidental; and therefore abandon transfer of the vowel in what leads to them, i.e., the tril. pronounced with Kasr or Ḍamm of the ٍ ف; but, in both [formations], make [the vowel of] the ٍ إ imitation of [that of] the ٍ ف, in the three cases, [nom., acc., and gen.,] saying مَرَّتْ بِالْبِطْفٍ, هَذَا الْبِطْفٍ, and مَرَّتْ بِالْرِّدْيٍ, هَذَا الْرِّدْيٍ; and مَرَّتْ بِالْبِطْفٍ, هَذَا الْبِطْفٍ, and مَرَّتْ بِالْرِّدْيٍ [641]. For, since they see that, in the gen. of بْطَفْ, and the nom. of رَذَة, transfer leads
to the two discarded measures, they make [the vowel of] the ی imitate [that of] the ف in the gen. of َبْطَن، and in the nom. of ِرَدُّ; so that the nom. and gen. in both [formations] are the same; and then, disliking that the acc. should be different from the nom. and gen., they make [the vowel of] the ی imitate [that of] the ف in the three cases. And, besides quiescence, in these two [formations], where [the vowel of] the ی is made to imitate [that of] the ف, Raum and Ishmām occur, because they serve to make the vowel of the final plain; and it, though transferred to the penultimate, is annulled by the alliteration of [the vowel of] the ی to [that of] the ف; so that it needs to be made plain. Some of the Arabs are not content with making the Hamza plain, by means of what we have mentioned; but seek more than that. They are of two kinds:—(1) some elide, and do not transfer, the vowel of the Hamza; and afterwards convert the Hamza into an unsound letter homogeneous with its vowel, saying هَذَا اللُّظْفُ This is the bruise and ِبُطَن slowness and the buttress, and مَرْت بِالْبُطَنَى ِرَدُّ and ِبَلْدَيْبُطَنَى ِرَدُّ, with quiescence of the ی in the whole [of them]: while, in the acc., quiescence of the letter before the ی not being possible, since the ی occurs only after Fatha, they say ِرَدُّا ِبُطَنَأ and ِرَدُّا ِبُطَنَأ and ِبُطَنَآ [below], with transfer and conversion; so that here the
Hamza is made plain by its conversion into й, as some make the й in حَبَّلَى plain by its conversion into Hamza [648], because [here] the й preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath is plainer than the Hamza preceded by a quiescent, as there the [Hamza] preceded by a mobile is plainer than the й: (2) some transfer the vowels to the ē in the whole [of these formations]; and afterwards regulate the Hamza, in respect of conversion, by the vowel of what precedes it, saying رَآِيْتُ الْبَطْرُ and and رَآِيْتُ الْبَطْرُ, and مَرْتُ الْبَطْرُ, and الْرَّدَدُ and الْرَّدَدُ, and the [above]. This conversion, however, is not an alleviation of the Hamza, as in يَبِيرَ well, رَآِسُ head, and مُلْمِسُ believer, because these Arabs are not among those who alleviate [658]; but this conversion is because of their eagerness that the vowel of the letter paused upon should be made plain. Then those transferors of the vowel, who avoid the discarded measure with [retention of] the Hamza [641], avoid that with conversion of the Hamza also; and say رَآِيْتُ الْبَطْرُ and هَذَا الْبَطْرُ and رَآِيْتُ الْبَطْرُ, and هَذَا الْبَطْرُ, and مَرْتُ الْبَطْرُ, and مَرْتُ الْبَطْرُ, making the й inseparable from the first [formation], and the й from the second. And, in the case of these [formations], whose й is converted into a soft letter, Raum and Ishmām do not occur, because the vowel was upon the Hamza, not upon
the soft letter, as was mentioned in the case of the ُ of feminization [640]. All of this is when the letter preceding the Hamza is quiescent. But, if it be mobile, as in ُٰ ُرَّاُرَشُّاُ ُyoung gazelle, ُأُکُبُرُ ُmushrooms, and ُأُهِنِّيُ [below], you pause upon such a formation as you pause upon ُجُمُّ ُجِّمِلُ he-camel, ُرُجُّلُ ُman, and ُكُبُدُ ُلِرَيْرَرَر* ُliver, without conversion of the Hamza, because it is made plain by the vowel of the letter before it: so that here all the modes of pause [upon the mobile] occur, except reduplication [640]; and except transfer, because of the mobility of the penultimate [641]. When the letter before the Hamza is pronounced with Fath, some of the Arabs, I mean, of those who sound [the Hamza] true, regulate it [in respect of conversion] by its own vowel, from eagerness to make [the Hamza] plain, because they account the Fatha [on the penultimate], by reason of its lightness, to be like the non-existent, so that it does not serve to make [the Hamza] properly plain; and therefore they say ُرُأَيْتُ ُأَكْلَدُ ُI saw fresh herbage, ُهُذَا أَكْلَدُ ُThis is fresh herbage, ُمَرَرْتُ ُبِأَكَلَدَيْلُ I passed by fresh herbage, [with Fath of the ُ, and quiescence of the ُ, and ُٰ (Sn),] converting the Hamza pronounced with Damm into ُ, the Hamza pronounced with Fath into ُ, and the Hamza pronounced with Kasr into ُ, because, after Fatha, the unsound letters are not considered heavy, when quiescent.
But, when the letter before the Hamza is pronounced with  or Kasr, as in  [below], it is not possible to regulate the Hamza [in respect of conversion] by its own vowel, because the  does not occur after Damma or Kasra, nor the quiescent  after Damma, nor the quiescent  after Kasra; and moreover the Damma and Kasra [on the penultimate] manage to make [the Hamza] properly plain: so that they retain the two Hamzas in their [original] state, [saying  and ]; and do not convert them, as they convert the Hamza when the letter before it is pronounced with Fath. All of this is according to the method of those who sound the Hamza true. But, as for those who alleviate [it, vid. the Hijazis], they lighten it in the proper way [658]: so that, (1) if the preceding letter be quiescent, they transfer the vowel of the Hamza to the preceding [quiescent] and elide the Hamza; and afterwards elide the [transferred] vowel, on account of the pause, as  and  and  and  ; and here quiescence, Raum, Ishmām, and reduplication [641] occur: while, in the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, the Tanwin is converted into  as  and  and  (2) if the preceding letter be mobile, the Hamza is regulated [in respect of conversion] by the vowel of the preceding [mobile], being [converted into] an  in  , in the three cases; a  in
and in: and here only quiescence occurs; not Raum or Ishnám, as we said in the case of the θ of feminization [640]; while reduplication is impossible, because it occurs only in the sound [640] (R). The people of AlHijáz say َاءَكْلا the fresh herbage [and َاءَنْخَطَا the fault (IY)] in [all (A)] the [three (M)] cases (M, A), because the Hamza is made quiescent by the pause, while the letter before it is pronounced with Fath; so that it is [converted into ٰ (IY),] like [the Hamza in] َآرس head [658] (M) and َآئْس axe (IY), because they do not change the Hamza after a vowel, except into the [letter] homogeneous with it (A), i. e., with this vowel (Sn): and [for that cause (A), by parity of reasoning (M), when the letter before it is pronounced with Damm or Kasr, it is converted into ُو or ُي, respectively; so that (IY)] they say َآَكْمُو for [above] (M, A); and َآَعْنَى for I give (M), from َهَنُّم أَلْمُجَل gave to the man, aor. َبِهْنِمُه أَعْنَى (IY); and َمُتْلِئ for َمُتْلِئَ full (A); َآَكْمُو being (IY) like َجُونُهَة pounce-box, and [ذَبْب like (IY)) َذُبْب wolf [658] (M).

§. 643. The unsound n. is that which has for its final an unsound letter, vid. َو or َي or َل [697]; and what precedes these letters is either quiescent or mobile (IY). When the final is unsound, and the penultimate is quiescent,
[which occurs, only with the, or ى (IY),] like the final of گلی گزelle [and صبي boy (IY), and of bucket [and عدار enemy, not with the, because what precedes the ى is always pronounced with Fath (IY)], it is [treated (IY)] like the sound (M) in pause, as it is treated in assumption of the vowels of inflection [16, 720]: so that its predicament is like the predicament of the sound; that being allowable in it which is allowable in the sound, and that being disallowed in it which is disallowed in the sound [640, 641]. But some of the Banu Sa'd substitute چ for the double ى in pause, because the ى is faint: while it proceeds from the same outlet as the چ [732]; so that the چ, but for its hardness, would be a ى; and the ى, but for its softness, would be a چ: and therefore they say چ تيبيني چ تيبيني for Fuqaimit [311] چ تيبيني چ تيبيني for Nqibil چ تيبيني چ تيبيني for Tamimi, and چ وعيف علي for چ وعيف علي for Ali: the poet says چ بالله ياشي گلي (IY). [When the penultimate of the unsound n. is mobile, the n. is defective or abbreviated.] When the defective [16] is paused upon, its ى must be expressed in three cases, (1) when it is curtailed of the ھ, as when you use the aor. of رئى ھن د fulfilled or رئى ھن د stored up as a [proper] name, in which case you say [in the nom. (Tsr)] ھددا یعى This is Yafl and ھددا یعى This is Yafl, [and in the gen. مرتا بسي This I passed by
Yaṣṣ and بِعَيِّ by Yaṣṣ (Tsr.),] with expression [of the ی in the nom. and gen. of both (Tsr)], because their o. f. is یُرُقَی and یَرُقَی [432, 644, 699]; and then their ی is elided, [on account of its occurrence between a ی pronounced with Fath and a Kasra (Tsr)]; so that, if their ی were elided [in pause (Tsr)], such elision would be a mutilation [of them, since none of their rads. would remain, except a single quiescent letter (Tsr)]: (2) when it is curtailed of the ے, as in یا act. part. of یِاš showed: for its o. f. is مُرَقَی, on the measure of مِرَقَی; and then the vowel of its ے, vid. the Hamza, is transferred to the ی [before it, which is quiescent, sound (Tsr)]; and afterwards the Hamza is dropped (Aud), for the sake of alleviation [658]; and the ں then subjected to the same alteration as قَاشِ (Tsr), its ی being elided, because of its concurrence, when quiescent, with Tanwin (Sn): and the ی, [which is its ی (Tsr),] may not be elided in pause, because of what we have mentioned (Aud), vid. the mutilation of the word from the elision of its ے and its ی, and [from] its being left with a single quiescent rad. (Tsr); so that you say ہُدَا مِرَی This is a shewer (IA, A): (3) when it is an acc., whether it be pronounced with Tanwin, as in رِبَّنَا إِنَّا سُبِّحْنا مُنَادِیًا III. 190. Our Lord, verily we have heard a summoner; or not, as in ڪَلَا إِذا بُلْقِی
LXXV. 26. *Not so, when it, [i.e., the soul (K, B),] reaches the highest parts of the breast (Aud); so that, in pause, the ḵ must be expressed in both [exs., as التَرَائِي and مُناَيِّيَة], because it is fortified [against elision] in the first by the ʾ of the Tanwīn, and in the second by ʿāl (Tsr). As for the acc., in it the defective is like the sound [640], because the vowel [of inflection] is affixed to it in the acc. : so that, if it be not pronounced with Tanwīn, its ḵ is made quiescent, as رَاَيِثُ التَقَاسِم I saw the judge ; and, if it be pronounced with Tanwīn, an ḵ is substituted for its ḵ. Tanwīn, as رَاَيِثُ تَقَاسِم I saw a judge (Jrb). If, however, the defective be a nom. or gen., its ḵ may be expressed [in pause because it is expressed in continuity, and nothing has arisen to necessitate its elision (Tsr)]; or elided (Aud), to distinguish between continuity and pause (Tsr). But, in the [defective] pronounced with Tanwīn, [there is a dispute as to which of the two modes is preferable: and, according to S (Tsr),] the preferable [mode] is elision, as هُدَا نَافِس This is a judge and مَضَرُتُ بَقَافُس I passed by a judge (Aud). This is the opinion of S and the moderns, because the ḵ is not expressed in continuity ; so that, when pause upon the defective is intended, its vowel and its Tanwīn are elided, by analogy to the sound: and because, pause being the place of rest, it is not fitting that what is not
found in continuity should be put in it: so says YS (Sn): [or] because the Tanwin, which is the necessitating cause of elision [16], is constructively remaining (Jrb, Fk).
But مَّرَتْ بِالْقاضِي هَذَا القاضي and هَذَا القاضي are allowable, with expression of the ي, which is preferred by Y; and, in accordance therewith (Tsr),] Ibn Kathir reads وَلَكِنَّ قَوْمِ هَادِي XIII. 8. And every people hath a guide، وَمَا لَهُم مِّن غَدِير مِّن ذَرِّيَّةٍ XIII. 12. Nor have they, beside Him, any protector (Aud), and وَمَا عَنِّي الّهُ بَاني XVI. 98. [2], with expression of the ي in [all of] them (Tsr); [for] some do not elide it, from regard to the fact that Tanwin is not in the word (Jrb). And in the [defective] not pronounced with Tanwin, [vid. the synarthrous (Tsr),] the preferable [mode] is expression [of the ي (Tsr)], as هَذَا القاضي This is the judge and مَّرَتْ بِالْقاضِي I passed by the judge (Aud). But pause with elision is allowable, as هَذَا القاضي and هَذَا القاضي; and, in accordance therewith is the pause of the majority [of the Readers] upon الْكَبِير الْمُتَمَعَّل and الْقاضي in the التلَّاق. XIII. 10. The Great, the High [645] and لِيَنْدِرْ يِمْ مَتَمَعَّل XL. 15. That He, [or it, or he (K, B),] may give warning of the day of meeting, [i.e., of resurrection (K, B),] where Ibn Kathir pauses with [expression of] the ي, according to the preferable mode. The argument of
those who, in the state of pause, express the ی in the [defective] pronounced with Tanwin is that its elision is allowable only on account of the Tanwin [16]; while in pause there is no Tanwin, so that the ی must return. And the argument of those who elide it in the [defective] not pronounced with Tanwin is that the pause is assumed to be upon the indet., with elision of the ی and Tanwin; and the art. to be then prefixed to it, after elision of the ی. But the argument of the first is stronger (Tsr). The [defective (Tsr)] not pronounced with Tanwin is of four sorts (A, Tsr), (1) that whose Tanwin falls off because of the prefixion of ئی [609] (Tsr), [i.e.,] the synarthrous (A), which has been mentioned above (Tsr): (2) that whose Tanwin falls off because of its being put into the voc. [48], as in یا قاضی O judge, in which case expression [of the ی] is adopted by Khl, [whose opinion is preferred by others than S (A),] because elision is allowed [by the غغ (Sn)], but is not frequent (A, Tsr), so that it is outweighed by the frequency [of the alternative mode, i.e., expression] (A); while elision is adopted by Y, [whose opinion is preferred by S (A),] because the voc. is the place of elision (A, Tsr) and alteration (Fk), for which reason curtailment is introduced into it [58] (A), while there is no mutilation of the word here (Fk): (3) that whose Tanwin falls off because of diptote declension [17], in which case, if it be an acc., as رآیت یاو ی I saw maidens [18], it is paused upon with expression of the
[necessarily (Sn),] as above mentioned, in [the discussion of pause upon] the [defective when it is an] acc. (A, Tsr); while, if it be a nom. or gen., it is said in the Ham' that expression and elision are allowable, but that the chaster [mode] is expression (Sn): (4) that whose Tanwin falls off because of prothesis [110, 609], as in قَاَشِي مَكْتِة the judge of Makka, in which case, [when it is paused upon (A),] the two modes allowable in the case of the [defective] pronounced with Tanwin are allowable, because, say they, when the prothesis ceases by reason of the pause upon the defective, then what went away [from it] because of the prothesis, vid. the Tanwin, returns to it; so that what is allowable in the case of the [defective] pronounced with Tanwin is allowable in its case (A, Tsr). As for the abbreviated [16, 326], which is that [infl. n.] whose final is an †, it is of two kinds, triptote and diptote. The † of the triptote [pronounced with Tanwin] falls off in continuity, because of its quiescence and the quiescence of the Tanwin after it, as هَذِهِ عَصَّا رَحَحُي يَا فَتَى This is a staff and a mill-stone, O youth: but, when you pause, the † returns; and the pause is upon it, contrary to the of قَاَشِي [above], as هَذِهِ عَصَّا This is a staff, I saw a staff, and مَرَتْ يَضَعْصَأ I passed by a staff; because of the lightness of the † (IY). The abbreviated pronounced with Tanwin is paused upon with the † (Jrb, MN, A,
(820)

Ts'rt, which must be expressed, in the three cases (Tsr), as رَأَيْتْ فَتْنَى I saw a youth [below] (MN, A). The GG dispute about this ! (IY, R). As to this ! there are three opinions, (1) that it is a subst. for the Tanwín, in the three cases (MN, A, Tsr), the elision of the converted ! [326, 684, 719] in continuity being adopted as a concomitant of pause (A, Tsr) : this is the opinion of Akh, Fr, and Mz [below] (MN, A, Tsr); and is understood from the language of IM here, ["Make Tanwín after Fath into an !"] (IM),] because the Tanwín is after a Fatha (A) : (2) that it is the converted !, in the three cases; that the Tanwín is elided; and that, when it is elided, the ! returns: this is transmitted from IAI, Ks, and [the KK; and is adopted by (MN, A)] IK and Sf [below] (MN, A, Tsr), and reported by IBsh to be held by S [below] and Kh(α, Tsr); and is adopted by IM in the Kāfiya: "and", says he in the CK, "this opinion is confirmed by the existence of readings with Imāla of the ! in pause, [as in سدي LXXV. 36. neglected, with Imāla, in the reading of Hamza and Ks (Sn); and by the ! 's being accounted a rhyme-letter" (MN, A); whereas the subst. for the Tanwín is not suitable for that (A), i. e., for Imāla and the rhyme-letter (Sn): and [IUK says that (MN)] the ex. of its being accounted a rhyme-letter is the saying of the Rājiz [Ash Shammākh (MN)]
Verily thou, O Ibn Ja'far art one of whom it is said "Most excellent is the youth!", and the best of them for a nightly visitor, when he comes. And many a guest, that has visited the tribe in (the time of) journeying by night, has found provisions and tidings, what he has desired!, or and some tidings that he has desired! (MN, A), where the evidence is in سَرْى (MN, Sn), because سَرْى is pronounced with Tanwin (MN); not in سَرْى [below], because it is not pronounced with Tanwin (Sn): (3) that the abbreviated is judged by comparison with, [i. e., analogy to (Sn),] the sound, the ! in the acc. being a subst. for the Tanwin, and in the nom. and gen. a subst. for the ! of the word: this is the opinion of S [below] (MN, A, Tsr), as reported by most (A, Tsr); and [is said to be the opinion (A, Tsr)] of the great majority of GG (MN, A, Tsr)]; and is adopted by F [below] (MN, A), except in the Tadhkira, where he takes to agreement with Mz [above] (A). But what is [last] ascribed to S is not intelligible from his language, since he says "As for the ! that goes away in continuity, it is not elided in pause, because the Fatha and the ! are lighter. Do you not see them flee to the ! from the ئُ and is preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684]?
And sometimes they flee to it from the [ة or ى] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as ُرِضاٌ for ُرِضاٍ (R) and ُنِهَأ (S, IY), for ُنِهَأ and ُلَعِي (IY).

And he also says that they lighten ُعِضْدُ [368, 408] and ُضِدُّ [368, 468, 482] by eliding the vowel of their ىs; but do not elide the vowel of the ى in ُجَمِلَ he-camel (R), because of the lightness of Fatha (IY). So says, which is the truth, "This passage indicates that the opinion of S is that the ى, which is expressed in pause, is the very one which was elided in continuity". The meaning, I say, of S's language is (1) that, when you say ُمُرَزَتْ يَقَافْصَ [above], you elide in pause the ى that you elided in continuity on account of the two quiescents [16]; although one of the two quiescents, vid. the Tanwin, has disappeared; and that because its disappearance is accidental: while, if the ى and Kasra were not elided in pause, the word, in the state of pause, would remain of a heavy aspect, according to them; although it would be lighter than it is in continuity, because the ى, in every state, is lighter than Tanwin: but (2) that, in the abbreviated, you restore in pause, in the three cases, the ى elided on account of the two quiescents, because the last quiescent, vid. the Tanwin, has disappeared, [such restoration being] because the ى is lighter than every [other] light [letter]. In the
abbreviated, then you consider the disappearance of the Tanwin, notwithstanding its being accidental, because the consideration of it conduces to making the state of pause the lightest possible. But, in the defective, you do not consider that accidental [disappearance of Tanwin], because the consideration of it would conduce to making [the word in] the state of pause assume a heavy aspect. And you see how general—in the nom., acc., and gen. —S makes the restoration of the ََ, which is the ََ, because, in the three cases, it is elided on account of the two quiescents. Nor does the language of S convey, directly or indirectly, what was [last] attributed to him; but what was [there] attributed to him is [really] the opinion of F [above] in the Takmilat (R) alIdah (HKh).

The fruit of this dispute appears in parsing: for, on the theory that the ََ is a subst. for the Tanwin, the abbreviated is َََ with vowels assumed upon the ََ elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and, on the theory that the ََ is converted from the َََ, the abbreviated is َََ with vowels assumed upon the ََ present, because it is then the seat of inflection (Sn). As for the abbreviated stripped of Tanwin, like ََََََََ أَلْكَفَى higher and the youth [above], the ََ in pause is the one that was in it in continuity, without dispute: and is sometimes elided by poetic license, as
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[645, 648] (R), by Labid [Ibn Rab'a al-'Amir (MN)].

When a clan of Lukayz was present, the kinsfolk of Marjum, and the kinsfolk of Ibn AlMu'allâ, where he elides the doubling and the t in pause (MN, MAR): [for] IM goes on to say [in the CK] "There is no dispute that, in pause, the form of the abbreviated not pronounced with Tanwin is like its form in continuity; and that its t is not elided, except in poetic license, as in [above], meaning 'Abî 'Al'ma'ali Abî 'Amr'] (A). As for the diptote, like [18, 272], and what has no Tanwin affixed to it, like [16, 326], its t, vid. the original t, which was [sounded] in continuity, is retained, because there is no Tanwin in it, for which the t might be a subst. (IY). The t paused upon has [four] dial. vars., (1) retention of its form; which is the best known dial.: (2) conversion into ى, because ى is plainer than t; which is the dial. of Fazara and some of Kais: (3) conversion into , because , is plainer than ى; which is the dial. of some of Tayyi: (4) conversion into Hamza [642], because Hamza is the sister of the t [732], and is the plainest of all the letters: which also is the dial. of some of Tayyi, in whose dial. alleviation [of the Hamza] is not found [658]. And, in [the last three of] them, the conversion may be either from the original t, or from the t substituted for the Tanwin, according to the different opinions before mentioned.
(Tsr). S transmits, in pause, (1) ﴿۵۲۵﴾ This is a pregnant (female), with the Hamza, meaning ﴿۵۲۵﴾. I saw a man [below], meaning ﴿۵۲۵﴾, where the Hamza in ﴿۵۲۵﴾ is a subst. for the ﴿۵۲۵﴿, which is a compensation for the Tanwin in pause [640]; not a subst. for the Tanwin itself. And one confirmation of the statement that the Hamza in ﴿۵۲۵﴾ is substituted for the ﴿۵۲۵﴿, not for the Tanwin, is that you say ﴿۵۲۵﴾. I saw a pregnant (female), pronouncing with Hamza, although there is no Tanwin in it; and for that reason ﴿۵۲۵﴾ He strikes her [below] is transmitted (TY).

Conversion of the ﴿۵۲۵﴿ [substituted for the Tanwin (Jrb)] into Hamza, [as in ﴿۵۲۵﴾ (Jrb),] is [of] weak [authority]: as [likewise (Jrb)] is conversion of every [other (R)] ! (SH) into Hamza (Jrb), whether it be for femininization, as in ﴿۵۲۵﴾ (R, Jrb); or co-ordination, as in ﴿۵۲۵﴾ [273, 375] (R); or anything else (R, Jrb), as in ﴿۵۲۵﴾ (Jrb), [and] as in ﴿۵۲۵﴾ [above], where some of the Arabs convert it into Hamza (R). And so is conversion of the ﴿۵۲۵﴿ of [femininization in (Jrb)] such as ﴿۵۲۵﴾ into Hamza, or ﴿۵۲۵﴾, or ﴿۵۲۵﴾ (SH), where IH's saying "Hamza" is not needed, with his [previous] saying "conversion of every !" into Hamza (R). All of this is in pause: for, when you continue, you say ﴿۵۲۵﴾.
He strikes her, O fellow, and I saw a pregnant (female) yesterday (IV).

§ 644. The v. is of two kinds, sound [in the final], and unsound. The sound is paused upon as the n. is paused upon; so that quiescence, Ishmām, Raum, and reduplication [640] are permissible in it, because the cause is one (IV). Pause (1) upon the ind. and subj. of the v., whose .invalid is unsound, is with retention of its finals [without elision (IV)], as, [in the ind. (IV),] يَغْرُزُ He raids, يَرْشَى He throws [645] (M), and يَخْشَى He dreads; and similarly, in the subj., لَنّ يَغْرُزُ He shall not raid, لَنّ يَرْشُى He shall not throw, and لَنّ يَخْشَى He shall not dread: (a) the v. has no Tanwīm affixed to it, necessitating elision, as in found in the n. [640]: and therefore its state in pause is conformable to its state in continuity, where you say, in the ind., هوَ يَغْرُزُ يَا فَتَى يَخْشَى يَا فَتَى and يَرْشَى يَا فَتَى and He raids, and throws, and dreads, O youth; and, in the subj., لَنّ يَغْرُزُ يَا فَتَى and لَنّ يَخْشَى يَا فَتَى and لَنّ يَرْشُى يَا فَتَى He shall not raid, and throw, and dread, O youth [404]: but, when you pause, you make [the final] quiescent (IV): (2) upon its apoc. and imp., is [in two modes (IV),] (a) with affixion of the s, [which is the better mode (IV),] as, [in the apoc. (IV),] لَمّ يَغْرُزَ He did not raid [below].
He did not throw, and He did not dread (M), orig. ُلاَّ يَخْضَع يُؤُم، [404] ُلاَّ يَغْرُف (IY); and [similarly, in the imp. (IY),] أَخْضَع أَغُرُف، Raithou [below], Throw thou, and煌煌 Dread thou (M), orig. ُلاَّ يَخْضَع إِلَّا يُؤُم، [431], and ُلاَّ يَخْضَع إِلَّا يُؤُم. (x) the لس are elided [in the apoc.] because of the apocopation; while the vowels before them remain, indicating the elided [letter]; the Дamma, Fatha, and Kasra being an indication of the elided ُئ، ُء، and ُئ، respectively; and similarly in the imp.: but, when the ِv. is paused upon, elision of the vowels is entailed, since pause is only with quiescence, not upon a vowel; so that, grudging that pause should take away the vowels, and thus the indicator and the indicated should [both] be removed, they affix the لس of silence [below] to them, in order that the pause may fall upon it with quiescence, and the vowels be preserved [648] (IY): (b) [with quiescence (IY),] without a لس، as ُلاَّ يَغْرُف [below, ُلاَّ يَخْضَع (IY)] ; and ُلاَّ يَخْضَع إِلَّا يُؤُم، [and ُلاَّ يَخْضَع (IY)] ; except in what is reduced, by omission of the لس, to a single letter; for here affixion [of the لس (IY)] is necessary, as ُلاَّ يَغْرُف Guard thou, [imp. of رَد يِقَي، aor. يِقَي (IY),] and بَرَد يِقَي See thou [615] (M), in order that the quiescence may fall upon it, and the vowel be preserved (IY). One peculiarity of pause is the importation of the لس of silence [615, 646] (Aud), to enable the
vowel to remain in pause, as the *conj*. Hamza is imported, to enable the quiescent to remain in beginning [667, 668]. It is named "the s of silence" because the silence falls upon it, not upon the final of the word (Tsr). And it has three positions. One of them is the v. altered by elision of its final, whether the elision be (1) for apocope, as in لَمْ يَخْشَهُ [above], لَمْ يَغْرُ [above], and لَمْ يَخْشَهُ [above]: (a) hence ٌلَمْ يَخْشَهُ II. 261. [647] (Aud), according to the saying that it is from ٌسَنَةٌ year, sing. of ٌسَنَواتٌ [234], and that its ل is an elided ٌل; the o. f. being ٌيَخْشَعْتُ; but the ل being converted into ل because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 719]; and the ل elided on account of the apocopative [404]; and then the s of silence affixed in pause: which is the opinion adopted by Mb (Tsr): or (2) on account of uninflectedness (Aud), as in the imp. v., according to the saying of the BB [431] (Tsr), as اَفْرُ [above], اَفْرُ [above], and اَفْرُ [above]: (a) hence ٌأَفْرُ [above], VI. 90. [647] (Aud), imp. of ٌأَفْرُ [above], the s in it being for silence, quiescent (Tsr), on account of pause (K, B). The s [of silence (Tsr)] in all of that is allowable, not necessary (Aud): you [may] say in pause لَمْ يَغْرُ [above], لَمْ يَخْشَهُ, and لَمْ يَخْشَهُ [above], اَفْرُ, اَفْرُ, and اَفْرُ [above], without the s of silence; and this is the *diaL.* of some of the Arabs: S says (Tsr), IIIU and Y told us that
(S, Tsr); but this dial. is the rarer of the two dials. [615] (S). And the s is not necessary (Tsr), except in one case, vid. when the v. [subjected to elision (Tsr)] remains with one letter, like the imp. of َهُبَّى، aor. َهُبَّى [482, 643, 699], where you say َهُبَّي (Aud), with elision of its ُفَ and its ُلَ, as in its aor. apoc.; and with importation of the s of silence, necessarily, in order that you may not be obliged to begin with a quiescent, or to pause upon a mobile (Tsr). And similarly, says IM [in the Alfiya and elsewhere, following others (Tsr)], when the v. [after elision (Tsr)] remains with two letters, one of which is aug., [because the v. then remains with one rad. (MKh),] as َلَمْ يَعْلَمُ. He did not collect: but this [that IM says (Tsr)] is refuted (1) by the common consent of the Muslims that pause upon such as َرَكَمْ أَلٌ XIX. 20. [450] and َرَكَمْ َتَقَيٌ XL. 9. And whatsoever Thou shalt guard is with omission of the s (Aud), from fear of confusion with the acc. pron.; although the Author of the Aud, in his Commentary on the KN, agrees with IM, and professes to accept his theory (Tsr): and (2) by the fact that the s is not necessary in the َلَ governed in the gen. by a p., because the p. becomes like part of the َلَ, as will be shown [648]; while the aoristic letter's being like part [of the v.] is stronger (MKh). [The other two positions of the s of silence will be found in §. 648.]
§. 645. S says (R), The whole of what is not elided, and of what should preferably not be elided [below], in [continuous] prose, is [allowably (R)] elided in terminations of versicles (S, R), as in LXXIX. 3. [below], ما كُنا نَبِيًّا XVIII. 63. What we were desiring, يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ XL. 34. The day of calling, one to another, [i.e., the day of resurrection, when some of them shall call to others for help (B),] and أَلْكَبْرِ الْوَتَآَلٍ XIII. 10. [643] (S); and in rhymes (S, R), as in the saying of Zuhair وَأَرَّأَكَ نَفَرِي [below] (S). He intends by "prose" [above] what has no pause in it: and by "terminations of versicles" the extremities of verses, and the breaks in speech (R), an expository coupling, meaning that what is intended by the "extremities" is the endings, not the beginnings (MAR). But ns. are more fit [than vs.] to suffer [such] elision, since, in them, elision occurs otherwise than in terminations of versicles and in rhymes [below] (S). S means [by "what is not elided"] the quiescent, and ى in [the ind. of] the defective v., as َيَغْرُزُ [644], which are not elided in pause, because their elision is not authorized in continuity, lest the ind. be confounded with the apoc. [below], except as a poetic license; or as a quasi-anomaly, like their saying لا أُدْرَسَ I shall not know, [transmitted by Khl
and $S$ (K on XI. 107),] and the texts XVIII. 63. [above] and يَرْمُبُ يَلُبُّ لا تَكَلُّمُ نَقْسٍ XI. 107. On the day, when it shall come, no soul shall speak (R), the latter being read by Ibn ʿAmir, ʿAṣim, and Ḥamza with elision of the ی, because the Kasra is considered sufficient without it (B); [or as a dialectic peculiarity, since Z says that] elision of the ی, because the Kasra is considered sufficient without it, is frequent in the dial. of Hudhayl (K on XI. 107): while [in most dials.] they do not say لَا أَرْمُبُ I shall not throw. This is as they say لَمْ يَلُبُّ زَيْدُ Zaid was not [450]; but not لَمْ يَلُبُّ لَمْ يَهْنُ, in the sense of لَمْ يَهْنُ was not mean. When, however, the ی and ی mentioned occur in terminations of verses, in continuity, it is allowable to elide them, contenting oneself with the vowel of the preceding [letter], as in وَاللَّهُ إِذَا يَسْرُ لXXXIX. 3. [319], for observance of homogeneity and conformity (R) with what precedes and follows them (MAR). And it is necessary to elide them, when you pause upon those terminations of verses, whose یs are elided in continuity. And similarly, in rhymes, they are often elided, for conformity, not for pause; although they are not elided [in poetry] for pause otherwise than in rhymes. It is therefore established that what is not elided otherwise than in terminations of verses, and in rhymes, is elided in them. The
poet [Zuhair, praising Harim Ibn Sinân alMurrî (IY, AKB, MAR) for decision, and execution of his resolve (IY),] says

(R) And assuredly thou cuttest out what thou hast measured; while some people measure, and then cut not out (AKB, MAR); or, in another version, And I see thee cut out what thou hast measured; etc. [above] (MAR): which is thus recited [ ] with the made quiescent, and the rhyme bound. S's saying "and what should preferably not be elided" [above] means the defective n., as [643], the of which is sometimes, though rarely, elided in continuity, otherwise than in terminations of verses and in rhymes [above], as [below] (R), fragments of two separate texts, XL. 34. [above] and XL. 16. [1], which R, as appears from his language, supposes to be one sentence (MAR),

XXXIV. 12. And bowls like huge watering-troughs [149], and cooking-pots standing firmly (R), read with elision of the [from ], the Kasra being considered sufficient, like LIV. 6. [640] (K), because it is not liable to be mistaken for an apoc. [above]. In terminations of
versicles, then, elision of its \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) in continuity is better than elision of the \( \text{i} \) of such as \( \text{يَرَمُى} \) [above], because the \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) of such as \( \text{الَّذِي} \) the thrower is elided in continuity, otherwise than in terminations of versicles, without anomalousness, as \( \text{يَتَّمُّ الْعَلَّقَ} \) \( \text{يَتَّمُّ} \) \( \text{هُمْ بَارَزُونَ} \) [above]; while the \( \text{i} \) of such as \( \text{يَرَمُى} \) is not elided, in the like [position], except anomalously, as we have mentioned. And, when you pause upon the defective \( n. \) whose \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) is elided in continuity, elision of the \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) is necessary. But, when you pause upon the defective \( n. \) whose \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) is retained in continuity, elision of its \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) is allowable, not necessary: \( S \) says (R), Retention of the \( s \) and \( \text{i} \) s [in the like (R)] is the more regular of the two modes of speaking (S, R); but this [elision] is allowable, [good] Arabic, frequent (S). The \( \text{t} \), however, is not elided, either in terminations of versicles, or in rhymes [below], except by poetic license, as in رَقْطُ مَرْجُمٍ [643], because of the lightness of the \( \text{t} \), and the heaviness of the \( s \) and \( \text{i} \). \( S \) uses language whose meaning is that, in rhymes, you elide the \( \text{rad}. \) and \( \text{i} \) in imitation [of the elision] of the \( \text{aug}. \) and \( \text{i} \) following Damma and Kasra, and resembling the \( s \) and \( \text{i} \) in the pause of the Azd of AsSarât [640]. He means that you elide the \( \text{i} \) from \( \text{يَفْرَي} \) [above] in imitation of the elision of the \( \text{i} \) in the preceding verse, vid. لَأَنَّتُ أَشْكِبُمُ.
When I was, in relation to Salma, during eight years, on the verge of a matter not bitter, and not sweet (MAR), where you allow elision of the ُ and ُ, though it is rad., because, when you intend binding [the rhyme], you elide the aug., arising, on account of the unbinding, in the تقلُ in the preceding verse

My heart has recovered from its passion for Salma, when it was near being inconsolable; and AtTa'ani and Ath Thikl have become empty of Salma (MAR); while this aug. ُ is elided only because it is assimilated to the aug. ُ in the dial. of the Azd of AsSarat in جآويني Zaid came to me [640]. The ُ, however, is not elided in rhymes [above] (R): you say

So says IBR (MN), by Ru'ba Ibn Al'Ajjaj.
I lent to Arwà, when debts were being discharged. Then she put off payment of part, and paid part (MN, N), because the ٰ paused upon, in such as ِزَبْدًا, is not elided in the best-known ["dial."], as the ٰ and ی arising, in pause, in the "dial." of the Azd of AsSarāt [640], are elided by most of the Arabs (R); and therefore, as the ٰ of ٍبُعضا is not elided, so the ٰ of ٍتَقْصَى [below] is not elided (S). S says (R), The elision of the ٰ of [such as (R)] ٍيَقْصِى, [and of the ٰ of such as ٍيَدْعُو, in rhymes (R).] induces many of Kais and Asad to elide the ٰ and ی that are [the sign of (S)] the pron.: though neither of them is so often elided as the ٰ of ٍيَقْصِى (S, R), and the ٰ of ٍيَدْعُو, because they are [entire] words (R), since they occur in the sense of ns. (S); and are not [mere] letters (S, R), founded upon what precedes them; so that they are on a par with the ٰ in

٤٦٩

O, I marvel at Fortune, when its ways are diverse! (S). The verse

[Let God not curse, or destroy, brethren that I have left, not knowing, after the morn of separation, what they have done! (MAR), meaning صنعوا (S),] is recited (S, R), by some of the Arabs that I have heard repeating this poem (S), with elision of the ٰ [of the pl.
and quiescence of the ع (R): and ['Antara says (S)]

(S, R) O home of 'Abla in AlJiwa, speak, and tell me of thine inmates, what they have done. And be thou pleasant at morn, home of 'Abla, and be safe! (EM), meaning [and رَأْسَلْيِهَا (S), [which] also is recited with [elision of the ي and (MAR)] quiescence of the م (R); and AlKhuzaz Ibn Lauđhān says

[187], meaning فَأَذْهَب (S). But the I [of the pron. (R)] in [such as (R)]

[recited to us by Khl (S), My two friends, fly with separation, or fall, or, in one MS, قَفَا stop (MAR).] is not elided (S, R), as it is not elided from تَفْقَحَ (S), because of what we have mentioned (R), vid. that the I paused upon, in such as زِيدَا, is not elided in the best-known [diaл.]. (MAR). I do not know any instance where the I of the pron. is elided in terminations of versicles, as it is in rhymes; but the ي of the pron. is elided in terminations of versicles, as XXIX. 56. [420] (R).
§ 646. When the ב of feminization is paused upon, the ב is kept, [being preserved from conversion here (Tsr),] if it be attached to (1) a p. [263, 402], as in [263, 402, 540] (Aud), ُرَّبَتُ [505], and [537] (Tsr) : (a) ُلُكَتُ [109] is paused upon, by Ks [alone (Tsr)], with the أ (A, Tsr), irregularly (Tsr); and, by the remainder [of the Seven Readers], with the ب : (b) IM says in the CK “In my opinion, it is allowable to pause with the أ upon ُرَّبَتُ and ُرَّبَتُ, by analogy to their saying ُلُكَتُ in the case of ُلُكَتُ” (A); but this is open to the objection that (Sn) the [similar] saying of AH “As for ُرَّبَتُ, ُرَّبَتُ, and ُرَّبَتُ, ُرَّبَتُ, they are commonly regarded as analogous to ُلُكَتُ, so that they are paused upon in both modes,” is refuted, because (Tsr) pause upon ُلُكَتُ with the أ is not regular, and (Sn) what is irregular is not to be copied (Tsr, Sn) : (2) a v. [263, 402, 607], as in ُقَامَتْ (Aud) and ُقَمَكَتْ She sat: (a) the ب is kept, in the p. and v., from fear of confusion with the pron. in ُرَّبِيَّةَ [168, 505] and ُضَرِيبَةَ struck him, what is unambiguous being made to accord [in this respect] with what is ambiguous : (b) IJ says “S says that, if you named a man ُضَرِيبَتَ Darabat, and then made it a dim., saying ُضَرِيبَةَ Duraiba, you would pause upon it with the أ, because it would have been transferred from the [the cat. of] the v. to [that of] the n.” (Tsr) : (3) a n., when
the ٌ is preceded by a sound quiescent, as in ُلْخُتَ (Aud), because the ُث in them, being preceded by a quiescent, becomes, as it were, not for feminization, but put only to co-ordinate the bils. with trils., being for co-ordination with ْقُلٌ [368] and ُحُلُّ [307, 689] (Tsr). And it may be retained [in its own form (Tsr)], or be changed [into ّ (Tsr)], if it be [attached to a َ, when the ُث is] preceded by (1) a vowel, [which is only Fathā (Tsr),] as in ُقُمْرَ date and ُمُكَرََرَ tree (Aud), to distinguish it from the rad. ُث, as in time [below] and ُبيت tent (Tsr): (2) an unsound quiescent, [which is only an ِ (Tsr),] as in ُصَلاَة prayer (Aud), ُكَرََرَ poor-rate, alms, and ُذَات [below] (Tsr); and [as] ُمُسَلَّات female Muslims (Aud) and ُأَرْلَات [below]: because the unsound quiescent [in ُصَلاَة, etc.,] is constructively like the mobile, since it is in the position of the latter, and is converted from it [684, 719]; and because the ِ [in ُمُسَلَّات etc.,] proceeds from Fathā, and is on a par with the mobile letter, for which reason, with it, two quiescents [may] concur [663], as in ُكَوْرَاب beasts [256], contrary to what is the case when the quiescent is sound (Tsr). There is no dispute that the verbal ُث of feminization is a ُث in pause, and also that its o. f. is ُث [607]. But, as for the nominal [263], its o. f. is disputed.
For $S$, Fr, IK, and most of the GG hold that the $\text{ذ}$ is the $o.f.$, as in the $v.$: but that, in pause, it is converted into $\text{s}$, to distinguish the nominal from the verbal $\text{ذ}$; or the nominal [أذ], which is for femininization, as in $\text{عَفْرِيَت}$ [385], from that which is not so, as in $\text{عْفَرِيَت}$ $\text{مَلِيِّنَت}$ and $\text{عَتَّكْبُرُوت}$ [399, 678]: while the reason why it is converted into $\text{s}$ is that, in the $s$, there are more faintness and softness than in the $\text{ذ}$; so that, in the state of pause, which is the position of rest [640], the $s$ is more appropriate, for which reason, in pause, the $s$ is added to what does not contain it, I mean the $s$ of silence [615, 644], as in $\text{ذَأُنِّي}$ and $\text{قُلُلِّا}$ [648]: and the reason why the nominal, and not the verbal, is varied by conversion is that the nominal is original, because it is affixed to that [word] of whose femininization it is the sign; contrary to the verbal, which is affixed to the $v.$, to indicate the femininization of its $ag.$ [607]; and alteration is more appropriate in what is original, because of its stability. But Th says that the $s$, in the feminization of the $n$. is the $o.f.$; and that, in continuity, it is converted into $\text{ذ}$, because, if it were left in its state, as a $s$, one would say $\text{رَايْتُ شَجَّرِهَا} I \text{saw a tree, with}$ Tanwin; and, in pause, the Tanwin would be converted into $1$, as in $\text{ذَأُنِّي}$ [640]; so that, in pause, it would be liable to be mistaken for the [attached gen.] fem. [pron.] $\text{عَا} [161]$: and therefore, in continuity, the $s$ is converted into
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and afterwards, when one comes to pause, it returns to its o. f., vid. the commend. And, according to S also, the reason why the Tanwīn [in the acc. of the n. made fem. by the essim] is not converted into 1, after conversion of the essim into the fem., is fear of confusion (R) with the fem. (MAR). But the preferable mode is pause with the fem. in (1) the sound pl., like مَسْلِبَاتُ (Aud) and هَنْدَاتِ (Tsr): (2) what resembles it, vid. (a) the quasi-pl. n., [which has no sing. of its own crude-form (Tsr),] like واكلاواتَ (17) (Aud), which has no sing. of its own crude-form [257], but only a sing. of its sense, vid. دُتَ [below] (Tsr): (b) the pl. used as a name, (a) actually, like عَرْفَاتُ and أَذْرُعَاتُ (Aud), which are actually pl. of عَرْفَةُ 'Arafat, the halting-place of the pilgrims, and أَذْرُعَةٌ Adhria, a town of Syria (Tsr): (b) constructively, like هَيْهَاتُ [below], which is constructively pl. of هَيْهَةُ, [its o. f. being هَيْهَاتُ, the i of which, vid. the i, is elided; and its measure being عَلَبُ, orig. عَلَلَتْ (Tsr)]: and is afterwards used as a [verbal n., literally] name of a u. (Aud); so that its sense becomes بَعْدًا (Far off is)! [187]: though هَيْهَاتُ is said [by some] to be a sing., its o. f. being هَيْهَةُ, on the measure of عَلَلَةِ, reduplicated, like قَلَفْتُ [332] (Tsr). The reason why the [well-known, usual (Jrb), preferable (Tsr),] mode is
pause with the [not otherwise (Jrb),] is that, since they mean to have two augments in the perf. pl. fem. (Jrb, Tsr), as we have explained in its place [234] (Jrb), and they are unable to add the ٰ or ی with the ٰ because, if added [with the ٰ], it would be converted into Hamza [683], therefore they add the ّ with the ٰ because the ّ [sometimes] becomes a subst. for the ّ as in [١٣١٢ ] and (Jrb) [689]; and it then becomes the sign of feminization, and does away with the necessity for saying مُسْلُوْنَاتُ as pl. of مُسْلُوْنَة; so that, since this ّ imports pluralization and feminization [234], and does away with the necessity for the sign of feminization affixed to the sing., it is [preferably] retained in pause, and is not changed into ٰ (Jrb, Tsr): while they deal with what is co-ordinated with the pl. in the same way as with the pl. [itself], because, since they treat it like the pl. in inflection [17], they treat it so in other particulars (Tsr). But pause with change [of the ّ (A) into ٰ (A, Tsr)] has been heard in the sayings [of some of them (A), transmitted by Ktb from Tayyi (Tsr), گیف آلّیاَنَ و آلّبنَا How are the sons and the daughters? (R, Jrb, Fk),] گیف آلّیاَحّ و آلّحَواَ How are the brothers and the sisters? [690], and گیف آلّبنَا مِن آلّسَرْدَاه The burial of daughters is one of the noble deeds (Aud, A), with change of the ّ of the pl. into ٰ,
[in pause (Jrb),] by assimilation to the pure ﺹ of feminization (Jrb, Tsr): while and ﺹ have been heard (A); and ﺹ XXIII. 38. [187, 195, 504] is read by Ks and Bz (Aud), with change of the ﺹ into ﺹ (B, Tsr). Some report that this is the dial. of Tayyi; but [IHKh (H.Kh),] the author of the Ifsāh [bi Fawā'id al-Iṣdāh (H.Kh),] says that it is anomalous, not to be copied (A).

As for ﺹ [above], it has two dial. vars., Fath and Kasr of the ﺹ [195]. Those who pronounce [the ﺹ] with Fath make ﺹ a sing., and pause upon it with the ﺹ; while those who pronounce the ﺹ with Kasr make ﺹ a pl., and pause upon it with the ﺹ (IY).

The [statement] reported from Ks is that those who pronounce the ﺹ with Kasr pause upon ﺹ with the ﺹ; while those who pronounce the ﺹ with Fath pause upon ﺹ with the ﺹ or ﺹ (Tsr). But [the GG say that (Jrb)] ﺹ, if held to be a pl., is paused upon with the ﺹ; and, if held to be a sing., is paused upon with the ﺹ (M, Jrb, Tsr): so in the [M and] Jrb (Tsr).

IH, however, says, in the CM, that [this is matter of assumption, since (Jrb)] ﺹ, being a verbal n., cannot be truly said to be sing. or pl.; while that [pause upon it with the ﺹ or ﺹ] is only because of its resemblance in form, not in number, to [a n. ending in] the ﺹ of feminization (Jrb, Tsr). We have mentioned its
predicament among the verbal ns. [187, 195]. And here we mention that, whether it be pronounced with Damm, Fath, or Kasr of the ت, its o. f. may be مهية; but that pause upon it with the ی is rare, because it is co-ordinated with us., on account of its being a verbal n.; while conversion of its ت into ی is nevertheless allowed, because it is assimilated, in form, to such as قتنة clucking (R). When a man is named یهاة, according to the dial. of those who change [the ت into ی in pause], it is like یل‌کهة [18], being diptote because of the quality of proper name together with feminization; but, when یهات is used as a name, according to dial. of those who do not change, it is like یرقات [17], being infl. like the perf. pl. fem. when used as a name (A). And apparently یولات [above] is like it, because the two dials., change and absence of change, occur in it also (Sn). And like it, in admitting of both modes, is [their saying (IY)] إستاصد الله یرقاتهم God extirpate their roots! or یرقاتهم their root! (M). For یرقة root, pronounced with Fath [of its ت in the acc. (R, Jrb)], is [held to be (IY)] a sing. (IY, R, Jrb), co-ordinated with 392 (R), like سعالة [248, 272] (Jrb), the ی in it being for co-ordination with [392] (IY), as is the case in يعري (IY, R) and ذنزرى [272, 375], according to those who pronounce them with Tanwin
and pause upon it is with the $s$; while $\text{عِرَطَّات}$ roots, pronounced with Kasr [of its $\text{ت}$ (R, Jrb) in the acc. (R)], is [held to be (IIY)] a pl. (IIY, R, Jrb), the ! in it being the one accompanying the $\text{ت}$ of the pl. fem., as though it were pl. (IIY) of $\text{عِرَطُق}$ root (IIY, R), the masc. being pluralized with the ! and $\text{ت}$, notwithstanding the occurrence of a broken pl. for it, i. e., $\text{عِرَطُق}$, as is said, notwithstanding $\text{بُون}$, in the pl. of $\text{بُوان}$ [261] (R); [or] of $\text{عِرَطَة}$ (Md, KF); and pause upon it is more properly with the $\text{ت}$, as in the case of $\text{مُسلَّسَات}$ [above] (R). And, in other formations [than the sound pl. and what resembles it (Tsr)], the preferable [mode] is pause with change (Aud) [of the $\text{ت}$] into $s$, for distinction between the $\text{ت}$ of feminization and the rad. $\text{ت}$, as in $\text{عَمَت}$ [above] and $\text{مُوت}$ death, this being the reason assigned by S: or, as is said (Tsr), for distinction between it and the $\text{ت}$ of feminization affixed to the v. (Jrb, Tsr, Fk), as in $\text{ضَرَّبَت}$ [607] (Tsr); while they do not reverse [the distinction, assigning the $\text{ت}$ to the n., and the $s$ to the v.], because, if they said $\text{ضَرَّبَت}$ for $\text{ضَرَّبَة}$, the $s$ would be confounded with the objective pron. (Jrb, Tsr, Fk): so says Jrb, confining himself to this reason; [and he is followed by Fk] (Tsr). But [Akhh asserts that (R), in the less chaste mode (Fk),] some [of the Arabs (M, R, Jrb)] pause [upon such as $\text{رَحْمَة}$]
(Fk) with the ح (M, R, Jrb, Fk), without change, as
\( \text{رضي الله عنهم} \) (Fk), which is a wide-spread dial., transmitted
by Akh (IY), whence [their saying وَعَلَيْهِ السَّلامُ وَالرَّحْمَةُ and upon him be peace and mercy], and (IY, Jrb)]
the saying of the poet بُلِّ حِيْرَتِكَ تِمْهَاءَ عَلَى [183, 640, 690]
(M, Jrb) : while an [additional] instance of pause with omission of change [into ِ (Tsr)] is the reading of Nafi',
Ibn 'Amir, and Hamza XLIV. 43. [below]
(Aud), with the ح (Tsr); and the [other (IY, Jrb)]
poet [Abu-nNajm (Tsr, YS)] says
وَلَهُنَّ نَجَالَاتٌ يَكُنْنَى مَسْلَمُتُ مِنْ بَعْدِهَا وَبَعْدِيَةٍ وَبَعْدِمَا (IY, R, Aud, Jrb, Fk) And God saved thee, by my
hand, O Maslama, after, and after, and after the souls of the people had become near the top of the wind-
pipe, and the free-born damsel was well-nigh being
called a handmaid (MN), where he does not change the ح into ِ in [all three of] them (Tsr). What is meant by
\( بَعْدِيَةٍ \) and \( بَعْدِمَا \), a ِ being supposed to be substituted
for the ِ (IY, Jrb, MN, Tsr, YS), so that it becomes
\( بَعْدَمَا \), since the ِ is sometimes substituted for the ِ, as
in [175, 181, 690], meaning (IY) and
فَمَا (Jsh); and the ِ being then changed into ح, to
correspond with the remainder of the rhymes (IY, Jrb,
MN, Tsr, YS): this is the reasoning of [TY and] Jrb (Tsr). Or, [as LJ mentions (Tsr),] the ы is changed into s; and the ы then changed into ə, by assimilation to the ə of feminization; so that it is paused upon with the ə (Tsr, YS): he mentions that he suggested this to his master F, who accepted it (Tsr). And, according to this dial., [says AH, some words, as in (Fk)]

XLIV. 43. Verily the tree of AzZakhšūm [above] (A, Fk).

XLIII. 31. What! shall they part out the mercy of thy Lord?

(Fk), Емра́тъ нун əмра́тъ лу́тъ LXVI. 10. The wife of Noah and the wife of Lot, and the like (A), are written in the Codex (A, Fk) with the ə (Fk). Our master, the Sayyid, relates that every əмра́тъ, mentioned in the Qur with her husband, is written with the extended ə (Sn). Therefore Nāṣī, Ibn ʻAmīr, ʻĀṣim, and Ḥāmza pause upon them with the ə; while Ibn Kathīr, IA1, and KS pause upon them with the ы (A).

The ə, if written as a ы [in the Codex], is paused upon by all the [Seven] Readers with the ы: but, if written as a ə, is paused upon by some with the ы, for observance of the o.f.; and by others with the ə, for observance of the Uthmānī orthography: so says our master, the Sayyid (Sn). Most of those [Arabs] who pause [upon such as əмра́тъ] with the ə make it quiescent.
even if [the n. ending in] it be an acc. pronounced with Tanwin (A). Apparently these [Arabs] do not say, in [pause upon] the acc., رَأَيْتُ أَمْتَا I saw a handmaid, like رَأَيْتُ أَمْتَ [640], with the ٍ; but رَأَيْتُ أَمْتَ, as in رَفَّدَا الْحُرَّةِ الْأَلْحَمْ [above], because it is made to accord with أَمْتَا with the ٍ, which is the o. f. in pause (R). But some of them pause upon the [n.] made fem. by the ٍ, when it is an acc. pronounced with Tanwin, as they pause upon the [n.] bare [of the ٍ], when it is an acc. pronounced with Tanwin [640] (Sn). There is a dispute about دَاثَ [above] in such as عَلِيمٌ بِذَاتٍ الصُّدُورِ III. 115. [Well-acquainted with the contents of the breasts (K, B) of the hypocrites (K)]: for Akh, Fr, and IK say that it is paused upon with the ﺃ, because, being pre. [115], it is always intermediate; while KS and Jr say that it is paused upon with the ٍ, because [the ﺃ in] it is a ﺃ of feminization, so that you say ﺃِ ﻗَداً: so says Hf (Tsr). The ﺃ not for feminization is not altered [in pause], the saying of some ﻤَعْذَةٌ عَلَى ﺍﻟْفِرَاذِ We sat by the Euphrates being anomalous (A).

§. 647. Continuity is sometimes treated like pause [648, 649] (M, R). This mostly occurs in poetry (IY, R), because of the inducing exigency (R); and is not
found in a case of choice (IY). The poet [Manṣūr Ibn Ḥabba al-Asadī (MN, Jsh)] says

[691] (IY, R), describing a wolf that meant to catch a gazelle (Jsh), When he (the wolf) saw that there was no ease, and no glutting of his appetite, [in the pursuit of the gazelle (MN),] he turned aside to an Arta tree of a curving tract of sand, and lay down (MN, Jsh) to sleep (Jsh), where he substitutes a .tight for the ight of ight, and retains it in continuity (IY); [and] hence ight [below]. It is not peculiar to [metric] exigency (M): but sometimes occurs in prose (R); and corresponding instances in prose, by assimilation to poetry, have been mentioned before (IY), as (1) ight [159, 321] (M, R), and the whole of the nums., in which that is necessary, as we have mentioned (R); and hence their saying, transmitted by S, in the num., ight [321, 648], where they substitute a ight for the ight [of ight ] in pause, and then throw the vowel of the Hamza [of ight ] upon the ight, and elide the Hamza, on the principle of the reading ight ight (K, B), the vowel of the Hamza

1. The believers have prospered [16], which occurs only in continuity (IY): (2) XVIII. 36. [521] (M, R), in the reading of Ibn ‘Āmir (IY, R), with retention of the ight, orig. ight (K, B),
being thrown upon the ن of لُكْنِي, the Hamza elided, and the ن incorporated into the ن; whereas analogy requires the ٰ of آٰ ٰنَا to be elided in continuity, because it is put to make the vowel plain in pause [161], like the ٰ in جَسَابِیة LXIX. 19. and جَسَابِیة LXIX. 20. ٰ

[below]: Zj says "Retention of the ٰ [آٰنَا] is excellent here, because, the Hamza being elided, the ٰ becomes a compensation for it", meaning in لُكْنِي (IY): (3) [similarly (IY)] II. 260. [166] (IY, R), with retention of the ٰ of آٰنَا [161]: جَسَابِیة LXIX. 19. [22, 638, 648, 679] and جَسَابِیة LXIX. 20 My reckoning [648], in continuity, according to some readings (R). Continuous speech is [thus] given that [predicament (IA, Aud, A)] which belongs to pause (IM), vid. quiescence—with or without Raum or Ishmām—and reduplication [640], transfer [640, 641], and importation of the ٰ of silence [644, 648] (Tsr, Sn); seldom, [as compared with its absence (Tsr),] in prose; and extensively in poetry (IM), because this is the place of irregularity (Tsr). The following are exs. of that:—(1) in prose, (a) [the readings of others than Hamza and Ks (Aud, A)]

نَمْ يَتَسَهَّلْ رَأْنَظُرُ II. 261. It hath not been altered by the lapse of years: and look [644] (IA, Aud, A) and

فِي هُدْهَاءِ هُمْ أَقْتَدُهُ فَلَّ VI. 90. Then by their guidance
suffer thou thyself to be led: say (Aud, A), with expression of the s of silence in continuous speech (Aud).
(a) [above] (Tsr): مَا أَغْنى عَنْي مَالِيَةُ هُذَا
(b) عَنْي سُلطَانِيَةُ خُذْرَةٌ
(c) LXIX. 28–30. My wealth hath not availed me: my power etc. [615, 648]: (d) the saying of some of Tayyi
(IA, Aud, A), where the
is doubled, notwithstanding that it is conjoined with the letter of unbinding (IA, A): (a) it is orig. القَصَبَ, with a single ب; but, being assumed to be paused upon, the ب is doubled, on the principle of their saying in pause,
[640], with reduplication; and then the letter of unbinding is put, vid. the ↓; while the reduplication of the ب remains (Aud) in continuity, by assimilation of continuity to pause in respect of reduplication (Tsr): (b) آَنْتَوَا نَادِيَ آَلِهَ [183] (A), where there are two anomalies,
(a) affixion of the, and to مَن in continuity (MN); whereas analogy requires مَن آَنْتَمْ, because, in continuity, the form of مَن does not vary [in number or gender] (Sn): and (b) mobilization of the [affixed] ن, which is [properly] quiescent (MN). The GG say that the poet, in such as عَيْهِلَ, the القَصَبَ [640, 648], treats continuity
like pause. They mean that, the letter of unbinding being the [letter] paused upon, since it is not put except to be paused upon, that [rhyme-letter, here the ج or the ب], which precedes it, is not paused upon, but is in the interior of the sentence; and this [reduplication of it] is treating continuity like pause (R). And, [says S (R)], one that I trust has told me that he heard an Arab say أَبْيَضَ أَيْبَضَّ Give me a white one, meaning أبيض (S, R); but affixing the s as he affixes it in هُنَّة, when he means هُنَّ 161 (S), the s being for silence: which is a most hideous anomaly, because the s of silence is affixed only to that [letter] whose vowel is uninflectional [648]; and also [because] he mobilizes the reduplicated letter not on account of a letter of unbinding, [mobilization on account of which would be allowable,] as we have mentioned [640] (R). Some people pause with quiescence of the rhyme-letter [usually] conjoined with a letter of prolongation, [i.e., an l or a م or ى (Sn),] as in

حَلَّلَ الْقُوَّمَ عَذَّرَ وَالْعَتَابُ [608]. But the Hijazis retain the letter of prolongation, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether they intend to quaver or not (Sn),] saying ُرَى الْعَتَابَا: while the Tamimis, if they [intend to (Sn)] quaver, do likewise, [i.e., retain the letter of prolongation (Sn)]; and, if not, put Tanwn as a compensation for it, [in order to discontinue the
quavering (Sn),] unrestrictedly, [i. e., after a ṫamma. Fatḥa, or Kasra (Sn),] as in

سَقَيْتُ الْئَفْيَةَ أَيْتُهَا الْحَيَاٰمَٰنَ

[1],

يَا صَائِحِ مَا هَاجَ الْعِيْونَ الْذُّرْقِينَ

[by AlʿAjjāj (S),] O my companion, what has excited the streaming eyes?, and

كَمَا تَنَّوَّلَ بِجَالِبَيْنَا وَكَانُ قَلِينَ

[577, 608] (A).

§. 648. The second [position (Tsr) of the s of silence] is the interrog. ما governed in the gen. (Aud) by a p. or pre. n. [181, 615] (Tsr). For, when it is governed in the gen., [and is not compounded with د (Tsr),] as in

عَمَّ وَفِيَمَ

[where it is governed in the gen. by a p. (Tsr),] and in

مَجِبَيْمَ مَجُّثَ

With what coming, i. e., How, [a question as to the quality of the coming (Tsr),] camest thou?, [where it is governed in the gen. by the pre. n. (Tsr),] its! must be elided, to distinguish it from the enunciatory, [which is the conjunct and the cond. (Tsr),]

سَأَلَتْ عَيْبًا سَأَلَتْ عَنْهُ

ما I asked about what thou askedst about [or عَنْ مَثْلِ مَا آلَحْ about the like of what etc., where ما is conjunct.; and in

بِما تَفْرَحُ أَفْرَحُ

At whatever thou rejoicest, I will rejoice and

كُلَّمَا
Whenever thou comest to me, I will honor thee, where ما is cond. (Tsr): so that, when you pause upon it, you affix the ُ, for preservation of the Fatha indicative of the [elided (Tsr)]] [below]. And the ُ is necessary if the genitival op. [of the interrog. ما (Tsr)] be a n., as in مكية الله [above] and ِ َتَضَاءَ ِمَا ً َتَضَثَى How did he exact? [640], where you say مكية مه and ِ َتَضَاءَ َتَضَاءَ ; and preferable if it be a p., as in ِ َتَسْتَأَ ِلَونَ LXXVIII. 1. [181], where [it is reported (K) by] بز [that Ibn Kathir (K)] reads ِّ َتَمَه (K),] with the َُ (Aud) of silence (K, Ts r), either because he treats continuity like pause [647]; or because he pauses [upon ِّ َتَمَه Of what (question they among themselves)?], and begins afresh with ِّ َتَستْأَ ِلَونَ ِّ َتَمَهِ أَلْبَى أَلْعَظِيمِ LXXVIII. 1, 2. They question among themselves of the great tidings, a [previous] ِّ َتَستْأَ ِلَونَ , [on which ِّ َتمَه depends,] being understood, because expounded by what follows it (K). The difference is that the ما governed in the gen. by a p. is conjoined with it [181]; while the prep. is not independent in its meaning [497], so that it is like part of the ما [644]; for which reason the ُ is [merely] allowable, [not necessary, because the conjunction of ما with the prep. prevents it from being considered until. when the ] is elided]: whereas the pre. n. is independent in its
sense, so that the َنَ with it is like a separate [word]; and it is unil., for which reason the اء is necessary with it [615] (Tsr). The third [position (Tsr)] is every [word] permanently uninfl. upon a vowel of uninflectedness [159], and not resembling the infl., like the ى of the 1st pers. [161], ِهِ, ِهِ, َعْر بُ, ِهِ, and according to those who pronounce them with Fath [below] (Aud) in continuity; and like the َل of the 2nd pers. [below] (Tsr). The Revelation has ما مَهَبِهْ CL. 7. What it is, and مَالِيَة َسُلطَانِية LXIX. 28. and LXIX. 29. [below]; and the poet [Hassän (MN, Tsr) Ibn Thābit al Anṣārī (MN) as ِSaḥābī (Tsr)] says

إِذَا أَمَّامَا تَعَرَّضَ عَنَّى الفُلْدَم * فَنَا إِنْ يُقَالُ لَهُ مِنْ هَوْةَ [below] (Aud) When the lad grows up among us, it is not said of him "Who is he?", إنْ إِنْ, being red., as in [563] (MN). But the اء is not affixed to such as زَهَّبٌ جَأَرْبُ (1) Zaid came, because زَهَّبٌ is infl.; [and the vowel of inflection, being known through the op., does not need to be made plain by the َاء of silence (Tsr)] : (2) Strike thou and لَمْ يُضَرْبَ He struck not, because the َن is quiescent; [and the َاء is affixed only to make the vowel plain (Tsr)] : (3) َلَا رَجَلَ [99] (Aud), with Fath (Tsr), and َيَا رَضِد [48] and َمِنْ بَعْدُ and َمِنْ قَبْلِ [201] (Aud), with Damm (Tsr), because their uninflectedness
is accidental, [not permanent; so that the vowel in them resembles the vowel of inflection, because it supervenes on account of something resembling the op. (Ts)]:

while [201] is anomalous, the $s$ being affixed to what is accidentally uninfl., since $تْحَثْ$ belongs to the cat. of $تْحَثْ$ and $بَعْدُ$: so say F and IM; but as to this there is a dispute [before] mentioned [201] (Aud); and some say that the $s$ in $عَلْقَة$ is a subst. for the $و$, the o.f. being $عَلْقَة$ (Ts): (4) the pret. v. [403], like [the trans. (Ts)] $سَرَّب$ [and $رِكْب$ rode (Ts)], and [the intrans. (Ts)] $قَعَدَ$ sat [and $قَامَ stood$ (Ts)], because of its resemblance to the aor. in its occurring as an ep. [144], conj. [177], enunc. [26], d. s. [30], and prot. [419] (Aud), as the aor. likewise occurs. In short the quasi-inflectional vowel of uninflectedness is found in four sorts, the sub. of $لا$ [99], the aprotthetic voc. [48], the advs. cut off from prothesis [201], and the pret. v. [403]: and as to [affixion of the $s$ of silence to] it there are three opinions, (1) disallowance, unrestrictedly, which is the opinion of S: (2) allowance, unrestrictedly, because the vowel is inseparable: (3) [allowance of] affixion when there is no fear of ambiguity, as in $قَعَدَ$ He sat; and disallowance if ambiguity result, as in $مِنَ كَتْبَة$ [below], because the $s$ is liable to be mistaken for the obj. (Ts). In pause upon the uninfl. [ns. (IX)], you say (1)

أَنَا (1) 84a
with the ٰı [161, 497]; or أَن with the ُه [690] (M), in place of the ٰı, because their outlet [732] is one, whence: the saying of Ḥātim ُهَذَا قَرْدِي أَنْ This is my way of bleeding, mine [696]: (a) this ٰı, in its being imported, in pause, to make the vowel [of the final] plain, is like the ُه in LXIX. 19. [22, 638, 647, 679] and LXIX. 20 [647]: (b) hence their saying, in pause, ُهَكَلَ [with the ٰı], or ُهَكَلَ ُهَكَلَ with quiescence; but, when they continue, ُهَكَلَ ُهَكَلَ [191] with Fath of the ُه, without an ٰı: (c) the Arabs do not pause; upon any thing in their language, with the ٰı, to make the vowel plain, except in these two positions, I mean ُهَكَلَ and أَنَا [615] (IV): (2) ُهَوُ with quiescence; or ُهَوُ with affixion of the ُه (M): (a) pause upon the pron. ُهَوُ he [161] is mostly with the ُه, to make the vowel of the ُه plain; and so is pause upon ُهَيَّ she: you say ُهَيَّ, not eliding anything from it, as you elide in the case of the decl. [643]; and the poet says ُهَيَّ [above], cited by S: but some of the Arabs pause with quiescence, saying ُهَوُ and ُهَيَّ, contrary to أَن, which is not paused upon with quiescence; so that, in answer to "who did?", one does not say ُهَأَن ِأَن, as one says ُهَوُ he or ُهَيَّ she: for أَن ُهَأَن, in addition to the paucity of its letters, has for its final ُهَن, which is faint, and is not a letter of inflection here, like the final of ُهَنَّ.
hand and blood; so that, on account of the faintness of the ن, the paucity of the letters, and the fact that the final of the is not a letter of inflection, an l is imported in pause, and is inseparable from that [expression], contrary to and ِعَلَى, since their final is a letter of prolongation and softness, which is plainer than the ن:
(b) this is according to the dial. of those who pronounce ِعَلَى and ِعَلَّى [above]; while those who make [the, and ى] quiescent [below] pause only with quiescence, not otherwise (IY): (3) ِهِمَا [175]; and ِهِلَّة these or ِهِلَّة [174], when it, [i.e., ِهِلَّة (IY),] is abbreviated (M): (a) this ُ in ِهِمَا and ِهِلَّة is affixed, with the l, in pause, because of the faintness and lowness of the l; but the better [mode] is to pause without a ُ:
(6) those who prolong [the final of ِهِلَّة], and add a Hamza, [saying ِهِلَّة,] pause upon the Hamza with quiescence: (c) this ُ does not follow any of the quiescents, except the l, because of its faintness; so that you do not say ِهِرَّة for ِهِرُّه, nor ِعَيَّة for ِعَيَّه [above], according to the dial. of those who make the, and ى quiescent [above], because the l, being faint, on account of its remoteness [732], is more in need of being made plain (IY): (4) I honored thee or ِأَكْرَمْتُكَ [below] (M):
(a) in the case of the ُ of the pron. [161], as in ِأَكْرَمْتَكَ I honored thee [masc.] and ِأَغْطَٰيْتَكَ I gave thee [fem].
there are two modes, pause with quiescence, as أَكْرَمْتُكَ [above] and أَعْطَيْتُكَ [above] and أَعْطَيْتُهَا, from avidity for the vowel, because the ل is pronounced with Fath in the masc., and with Kasr in the fem., so that the vowel distinguishes the masc., from the fem.; and they want the distinction and explanation in pause as much as in continuity: (b) some intensify the distinction, affixing to the ل an ِ in the masc., and a ى in the fem.; and then affix the ی of silence [to the ِ or ى], saying أَكْرَمْتُكَا in the masc., and أَكْرَمْتُكَ in the fem., because distinction by a consonant and a vowel is more intensive and corrob. than distinction by a vowel alone: but the better of the two dials. is not to affix the letter of prolongation to the ل (IY): غُلَامِي (5) my manservant and ضَرْبَنِي He struck me [below], with quiescence, or غُلَامِيَة and ضَرْبَنِيَة, with affixion of the ی [to make the vowel plain; pause upon the ى being in two modes (IY)], according to those who mobilize [the ى with Fath (IY)] in continuity [161] (M); whence the reading of the majority مَا أَفْتَنَى عَيْنِي مَالِيَةً غَلَامِكَ عَيْنِي سَلَطَانِيَةً LXIX. 28, 29. [615, 647] (IY): and ضَرْبَنِ غُلَامُ and ضَرْبَنِ, according to those who make [the ى] quiescent in continuity, whence the readings of API LXXIX. 15. My Lord hath honored me
and LXXXIX. 17. My Lord hath degraded me, [with pause (IY)]; and the saying of Al A'ashā [Maimūn Ibn Kais (MN, Jsh)]

وَمِنْ شَأْنِي قَاَسِفٌ رَجْحَةٌ ﷺ إِذَا مَا أَنْتَسْبِتْ لَهَ آَنْتَرْنَ

And from a hater, whose face is scowling, who, whenever I claim kindred with him, refuses to acknowledge me (M), and, before it,

۪نَهْلَ يَمَتْعُى أَرْتِبَى آْلِيَلا١ دُ مِنْ حَذَرِ الْبَوْتِ أَنْ يَأْتِيَنَّ

۪أَلِسَ أَخْرُ الْبَوْتِ مُسْتَرْقَقًا٢ عَلَى٠ وَأَنْ قَدْ أَنُسِّنَ]

[Then shall my roaming about the countries, from fear of death, defend me from the chance that it should come to me? (Jsh)] Is not the brother (i.e., messenger) of death sure of me, even if I say "He has granted me a respite"?, meaning يَتَأْمُنَّي and أَنْتَرْنَ, and أَنْسَلْنَ: (a) those also who make the ۪قُ يَّ مُوِسَتَقَّيَنَّ pause in two modes, the better being retention of the [quiescent] ۪قُ; while the other is elision of it, as هُدَا ۪قُلَامَم. This is my manservant and ۪خَرْبَنَ [above], meaning ۪خَرْبَنَ and ۪خَرْبَنَ: (b) elision of the ۪قُ in the case of [the pron. attached to] the v. is good, because the ۪قُ, being always preceded by a ۪ن [170], is indicated by the ۪ن; so that there is no ambiguity, for which reason such elision is frequent in the ۺعُ: whereas, when you say ۪هُدَا ۪قُلَامَم.
[above], pausing upon it with quiescence, one does not know whether is meant to be pre. to the ی, or to be a prothetic, for which reason some disallow such elision, on account of the ambiguity; while S allows it, because it is made plain by the pause (IY): (c) Ibn `Amir and the KK read أَكْرَمَنْ and أَهْلَانَ, without a ی, in continuity and pause; and the like is reported from IA[above]; while Näfi' agrees with them in pause (B): and [Z says in the K that] أَكْرَمَنْ and أَهْلَانَ [above], with quiescence of the ِن, are read in pause, according to those who omit the ی in continuous speech, deeming the Kasra sufficient without it (K): (6) *He struck you, ضربكم* He struck them, ضربهم upon them, and ضربهم by them; and من from him and ضربه He struck him [above]: with quiescence, according to those who, in continuity, affix [the conj. to the م or ِن], or [simply] mobilize [the م or ِن with Damm or Kasr] (M): (a) as for ضربهم, ضربهم, and علّفهم and ضربهم, you pause upon them with quiescence of the م, not otherwise; and elide the ِن or ی from it [161], because they are aug., and are often elided in continuity [161], as *He struck you before, ضربهم* He struck them, O youth, ضربهمْ با فَتْيَهُ عَلْيِهِمْ دَائِرَةً السُّوَمْ IX. 99. *May misfortune fall upon them!*, and ضَمْنِ يُسْتَعَانُ Of them is help sought, for a kind of lightening, from frequency of usage, because of
the heaviness of the combination of two دامما with the \( \text{ض} \) in [below], and of two كسرة with the \( \text{ی} \) in [below] and the like (IY): [for] according to those who do not affix the conj., in continuity, to the \( \text{م} \) of the pl., there is no dispute that pause upon it is with quiescence; while, according to these also who affix the conj., in continuity, elision of it is necessary in pause, because what is often elided in continuity, vid. the \( \text{و} \) and \( \text{ی} \), must be elided in pause, as in منّ and علّیة [below] (R): (b) they differ in opinion about the \( \text{ی} \) in such as ضرّبهم [above], and the \( \text{ی} \) in such as پهپ [above], some saying that they are part of the n. itself, and others that they are aug.; though they are agreed that, in the fem. [sing.], the \( \text{i} \) is part of the n. itself: and they differ about the opinion of S on that [matter]; but the [opinion] apparent from his language is that the \( \text{و} \) and \( \text{ی} \) are not part of the n. [161]: (c) similarly pause upon منّ and ضرّة also is with quiescence [of the \( \text{ی} \)] (IY): (d) we have mentioned [161] that the 3rd pers. [sing., masc. or fem.] of the attached acc. or gen. pron. is abridged from the 3rd pers. [sing., masc. or fem.,] of the detached nom., by elision of the vowel from the \( \text{ی} \) of هر [and the \( \text{ی} \) of هر, and by conversion of the \( \text{ی} \) of هر into ی] (R); [so that] the o. f. of منّ and ضرّة is conjunction of [the \( \text{ی} \) in] them. with a letter of
prolongation, as زرن، and ْمنه، that being proved by
the existence of [the letter of prolongation correspond-
ing with] it in the fem., as ْمنه and زرن (IV) : the ال
occurs, [says S (IV),] with what follows it, here in the
masc., as it occurs, with the ] following it, in the fem.
(S, IV) : (e) Zj holds that the conj. after the ال is not
part of the o. f. of the word ; and this appears to be the
opinion of S : and Zj adduces, as an argument for it, the
elision of the conj. in pause; but this is not strong,
because the letters of softness, that form part of the
word itself, are sometimes elided, as in الانتا [643] ; and,
as for the necessity for elision of the conj. in pause, and
not of the ى of الانتا، it is because the conj. is one of
those things that, in the state of continuity, have a share
in elision, as in مئ III. 5. and في III. 91. [below]: (f)
since they intend to lighten the attached [pron.], on
account of its being like part of the preceding word,
they consider ; and, if the ى be preceded by a quiescent,
as in ْمنه and َعليه، they do not put the quiescent، or ى
in continuity: so that they do not say, according to the
most frequent [dial.], ْمنه and َعليه، because the ى
and ى are heavy; and because the ى, on account of its
faintness, is like the non-existent, so that, if they said
that, two quiescents would, as it were, concur (R):
[thus even] in [continuous] speech they often elide the
or ة (conjoined with the ژ) : and, when the ژ is preceded by a letter of prolongation and softness, elision of the ژ, or ة is [held by S to be] better than retention, because the ژ proceeds from the same outlet as the ژ [732], and the ژ resembles the ژ, and ة, so that it is as though they fled from the combination of likes, and therefore elided the ة or ة ; and, for that reason, ژ. XVII. 107. And We have revealed it, part by part, [according to the measure of events (K, B)].

If thou bear down upon him, he will loll out his tongue [from breathing hard (B)]. VII. 175. And they sold him [640] for a mean price, and put a collar of iron upon his neck are the better of the two readings : and, according to that [opinion], and are more appropriate than [ژ and عننهر with] elision ; so that III. 5. [593] is the more appropriate of the two readings : but some make no distinction between the letter of prolongation and any other quiescent, preferring III. 5. [below] and ژ. A calamity afflicted him ; and this [opinion] is adopted by Mb and Sf ; and, according to me, is correct, because, the ژ being faint, and عننهر virtually contain [a combination of (Jh on
the pron. 8] two quiescents, like أُپِسَ (IY): S prefers retention of the conj. after the 8, when the preceding quiescent is a sound letter, as in مَنْهُ and أَصَابَتْهُ; and elision of it, when the preceding quiescent is an unsound letter, as in قَدْرُتْهُ VIII. 14. Then taste ye it, عَصَة VII. 104. His rod, and فِيْهِ II. 1. About it: but Mb [followed by Sf and IY] makes no distinction between the sound and unsound quiescents before the 8; and this is the truth, since the quasi-concurrence of two quiescents is realized in all; and the majority of the Readers act in accordance with it, as مَنْهُ آبَيْتُ III. 5. and فِيْهِ آيَاتُ بَيْنَتُ III. 91. In it are manifest signs [above]; and, if S had reversed [his preferences], it would have been more suitable, because the combination of two quiescents is lighter, when the first of them is soft, than it is when the first of them is sound [663]: (g) they do not elide [the 1] from عَلِيْهَا upon her and مَنْهَا from her, though there also contain a quasi-combination of two quiescents, because of the lightness of the 1; so that this is the counterpart of their omission, in the most frequent [diaL.], to convert the Tanwin, in pause, into a letter of prolongation in the nom. and gen., and their conversion of it into 1 in the acc. [640]: (h) if the 8 be preceded by a mobile, as in خَلَّمَة and خُلَّمَة [161], the conj. is indispensable, except when a poet is constrained
to elide it, as in the saying [of Ḥanzala Ibn Fātik (S)]

And he knew for certain that, if the horsemen should overtake him, he would be killed, and, after him, the cuttings of the, i.e., his, palm-trees would have a dresser, or fecundator, other than him (MAR], and the saying of AlMutanaabbi

In the mouths their tongues faltered with it, and the couriers on the roads, and the pens in the writings, where he does not affix the ی to the س in س, but contents himself with the Kasra, by poetic license (W)]; so that the elision of the conj., in such cases, is like the elision of the ی in [643] (R) : and what is stronger than this has been transmitted from the Arabs, like the saying of the poet

And I drink water, when there is not in me any thirst for it, except because its springs are the sources of the torrent of her valley; and this is like the reading [of Ḥamza, Abu Bakr, and IA].

Will render it unto thee and (B) III. 68.

Will not render it unto thee, with quiescence of the س (W): (i) all of this that we have mentioned is the state
of the *pron.* of the 3rd *pers.* sing. *masc.* in continuity: but, when it is paused upon, the *conj.* must be omitted, whether it be retained in continuity, as in لَهُرٍ and *لِهْرِى* [161], by common consent, and in عَلَيْهِ and مِنْهُ [161], according to some; or not, as in مَنْهُ and عَلَيْهِ [161], according to most: that is because it is a property of their language that they elide in pause what is not elided in continuity, as in غُلَامِي and مَرْتَنِي [above]; so that they invariably elide this letter, whose elision is often authorized in continuity, as in عَلِيْهِ and مَنْهُ: and, [after elision of the *conj.*,] quiescence of the *s* is unavoidable in pause, whether the preceding letter be quiescent or mobile: (j) some disallow Raum or Ishmām in the case of the *s* of the *pron.*, when it is preceded by *Damm* or *Kasr*, as in ْيَعْلَمَة II. 273. *Knoweth it* and ُبَعْلَامَة by *his manservant*; and similarly when it is preceded by *ا* or *ى*, as in II. 70. [640] and ْمَنْ يَأْتِيُهُ XI. 41. *On whom shall come*: that is (a) because the quiescent *s* is so extremely light that it becomes like the non-existent; so that, when, in pause, it is preceded by *a* *Damma* or *ى*, it is as though you pronounced the final, pausal, letter with *Damm*, or put *a*, at the end, since the *s* is like the non-existent, on account of its faintness; and if, immediately after the *Damma* or the *ى*, you pronounced [the *s*] with Raum, i.e., uttered part of the
Damma [of the s], or with Ishmām, i.e., compressed the lips, [as though to sound the Damma of the s,] these modifications would not be plain [as belonging to the s], since the hearer or the seer might account that part of Damm, or that compression of the lips for Ishmām, to be part of the first Damm, or part of the first compression of the lips, since a thing is not plain after its like, as it is after its contrary: and so may one say of Raum after the s preceded by a Kasra or ۉ: and also (b) because Raum and Ishmām are [intended] to make the vowel of the s plain: whereas, on the hypotheses mentioned, that making plain is not needed, because the s, which is preceded by a Damma or ۚ, is not pronounced with any vowel but Damm; while that which is preceded by a Kasra or ۉ, is not pronounced, in the most frequent [dialect], with any vowel but Kasr [161]: (k) when the s pronounced with Damm follows a Fatḥa, as in إن غُلاقَة verily his manservant, or a sound quiescent, as in مَنَة [above], Raum or Ishmām is allowable, without dispute [640]: (l) some allow them after the s of the pron., unrestrictedly, whether it follow a, or ۉ or any other consonant; and whether it follow a Fatḥa, Damma, or Kasra: even though they be not so plain as they ought to be (R): (7) هُنِّي, [even] according to those who say فُلُهِيَ أُمَّةٌ أَلِيُّ This is the handmaid of God
(M): (a) the in [تهي and (R)] рі is [not an aug.; but only (IY)] a subst. [690] for the in [تهي and (R)] рі [171, 174] (IY, R), the proof of which is that you say ذٰٰلَیی in the dim. of ذٰٰلَیی [293], as you say in the dim. of ذٰٰلَیی: nor is the in for feminization, like the in [265], because the in is aug., and you find it a in continuity [646]; whereas the in is a in continuity and pause, and is the of the word: (b) the reason why it is pronounced with Kasr, and conjoined with the , is that, being in a vague indecl. n., it is assimilated to the of the pron., which [like this ] is preceded by a Kasra, as in مُرَّتُ یٰ اب.. I passed by him and نظَرْتُ إلى ُغلامٍ I looked at his manservant (IY): [thus] the after the is on account of the assimilation of the to the of the masc. pron. preceded by a Kasra, [from the impletion of which a is engendered,] as in and ُغلامٍ, in the most prevalent [dial.], as before explained [161]; except that the of the pron., notwithstanding its being preceded by a Kasra or , is sometimes conjoined, according to the people of AlHijaz, with the , as and ُعَلَیهم [161], because the [attached] gen. pron. is orig. the detached nom. [pron.], as above mentioned; whereas [the in] ُهذُهٰ or is not conjoined with at all.
(R): S says “I do not know any one pronounce it with ד, because, though they assimilate it to the s of the pron., still it is not the pron.; so that they assimilate it to the most frequent pronunciation, which is Kasr of the s, when preceded [like this s] by a Kasra” (IY): (c) some of the Arabs assimilate it to the m of the pl. [161]; and therefore do not put the conj, saying هذة آمة الله in continuity and pause (R): [for] I have heard some Arabs, whose Arabic is trustworthy, say هذة آمة الله, making [the s] quiescent (S); but this, though the o.f., is rare in usage: and some of them elide the ی from it in continuity, but preserve its Kasr (R): (d) pause [upon it (R)] is with quiescence of the s (IY, R), and omission of the conj. (R), not otherwise (IY), without dispute (R), the ی being elided in both dialvs.: as for those who make it quiescent in continuity, the matter is obvious, according to them, the states of continuity and pause being equal: while those who conjoin it with the ی [in continuity] elide it in pause, as they elide it from پهپس and علیه [above]; and, since elision of the ی is permissible in پهپس and the like, notwithstanding that its augmentativeness is disputed [above], the elision here is more appropriate, because the augmentativeness is certain (IY): (8) دیه and علیه (IY]), with quiescence; or دیه and علیه (IY)), with the s (M): (a) the
is preferable in the case of these _ps._, because the _l_ in _m_ is elided, while the Fatḥa remains as an indication of the elided; and therefore, grudging that pause should elide the Fatḥa, and thus the indication and the indicated should [both] be removed, they affix the _s_ of silence, upon which the pause falls, while the Fatḥa is preserved [above], as is done in _أُمَرُةٍ_ and _أُمَرُةٍ_ [644]: but some of the Arabs pause with quiescence, without a _s_; while it is argued [on their behalf] that pause is accidental, and that the vowel is restored in continuity, [so that the removal of the indication is only temporary]: (b) some of them make the quiescent in continuity, as in _بَيْنَ أَبَا أَلْسَوْدَ أَرْمَحُ_ [181]; but that belongs to the _cat._ of treating continuity like pause, by poetic license, as in _عَيْشَهُ_ and _الْفَصِّلَا_ [640, 647] (IY), as _تُلْتَهَرُ بَعْدَهُ_ [321, 647, 663] has been heard (K on LXI. 2): _مِثْلَ مَّا مَّيْكَى_ M. and _مِثْلَ مَّا مَّيْكَاى_ M. _مَّيْكَاى_ M. _مَّيْكَاى_ M. _مَّيْكَاى_ M. _مَّيْكَاى_ M. Like what art thou?, [pause being (IY)] with the _s_, not otherwise (M): (a) _مِثْلَ مَّا مَّيْكَاى_ and _مِثْلَ مَّا مَّيْكَاى_ are _ns._, detached from what follows them; while _مَا_, after elision of the _l_, becomes _unil._; and therefore, disliking that, they affix the _s_, in order that the pause may fall upon it, and the _n._ be not excluded from the formations of _ns._ (IY).
§. 649. The single \( \text{نا}, \) [of corroboration is light and weak; so that, when preceded by a Fathā, it (IY)] is changed, in pause, into \( \text{ل}, \) \[497, 614, 684\] (M), like the Tanwin [below], because of its resemblance thereto, both of them being ps., whose place is [at] the end of the word (IY). You say for لنسفَعن in XCVI. 15. \[153, 497, 610, 684\] (M); and, in the imp., \( \text{اضرِبُها}, \) for لَطَرَبَةٌ \[614, 684\] (IY). Al Ašhā [Maimūn Ibn Kāis (Jsh)] says, [in an ode praising the Prophet (IY, Jsh),]

وَلَا تَهْلَكْ هَذَا النَّصْبُ الْمُنْصَبِ لَا تَنْسَكْنَهُ ﷺ \[497, 684\] (M) Then beware of dead bodies; be sure thou do not approach them: and do not thou take a sharp arrow to bleed a camel for the guest. And [beware of (Jh on نصب)] this idol set up; be sure thou do not propitiate it by sacrifice: and worship not the devil, but God do thou worship (Jsh), meaning قَلْبُهُا (Jh, IY), but pausing with the \( \text{فِ.} \), as you say ﷺ رَآیَتُ ۗ زِیدًا \[640\] (Jh); and hence the saying of the other

أَبُوُکَ يِزِیدُ وَلَوْلِیدُ ۗ وَمَنْ يَكُنْ ﷺ هُمَا أَبَوَا لا يَدْنَ لَّوْلِیدُ وَيَكَرُّمُا

Thy sire is Yazīd, and thy grandsire is Al Walīd; and whoso is such that they are his sire and grandsire will not be lowly, and shall surely be noble, meaning ﷺ وَيَكَرُّمُا: and it is said, on the saying of Imra al Kāis

86 a
that the meaning is, *Do thou tarry*, because, say they, the address is to one, that being proved by his saying

أَصَاحُ تَحَرَّى بَرَقَا إِرِيكَ رَمَيْصَةٍ # كَلِمَةٍ أَلِيدَيْنِيَّ فِي حَيْبِيّ مُكَلَّلٍ

[O my companion, thou seest, meaning look thou at, lightning, whose gleam I show thee, like the waving of the hands, in a pile of cloud surmounted by a crown, its upper part being like a crown for its lower part (EM)]; but that he pauses with the ِلَّا, treating the state of continuity like pause [647]: while some explain L. 23. [193, 233] as *orig.* ِلَّاِلِّيِّنَ Do thou cast, arguing that the address, in that, is to an Angel, the Keeper of the Fire (IY). And, [if what precedes this ِلَّا be pronounced with ِدَمْمُ or ِكَسْرَ, as (IY)] in

Will ye surely strike, O my people? [and ِلَّاِلِّيِّنَ تَصْرِبُونَ يَا أُمُّرَاةَ Wilt thou surely strike, O woman?, then, if you pause (IY)], you say ِلَّاِلِّيِّنَ تَصْرِبُونَ (IY)], by restoring the ِلَّا of the *pl.* [and the ِلَّا of the 2nd *pers. sing. fem*] (M). For the predicament of this ِلَّا is [like] that of the Tanwīn [above]: therefore, as you substitute an ِلَّا for the Tanwīn in the *acc.* [497, 640], so you substitute an ِلَّا for this ِلَّا, when what precedes it is pronounced with Fāth ; and, as the Tanwīn is suppressed in the *nom.* and *gen.* [640], so
this ن is suppressed, when what precedes it is pronounced with Damm or Kasr. And, when the ن is suppressed, the ٝ, which is the pron. of the pl., is restored [614], because of the removal of the quiescent after it, vid. the ن of corroboration. And the ـن also, which is the sign of the ind., is restored [614], because, it was elided only on account of the uninflectedness of the v., [consequent] upon the attachment of the ن of corroboration to it [402, 406, 610]: and, since the cause of uninflectedness is removed, inflection is restored, because of the removal of its preventive, and the presence of its requirer [404], vid. resemblance [of the aor. to the n.]; and then the ن, which is the sign of [inflection in the 2nd pers., pl. masc. and sing. fem., of] the ind. [405], is restored. Y used to substitute ا, or ی for the single ن [of corroboration], when preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm or Kasr, respectively, by analogy to the ن [preceded by a letter] pronounced with Fath, saying for إِخْشَصُ ـن Do ye dread, and إِخْشَصُ ـین for إِخْشَصُ ـین Do thou [fem.] dread, which is analogous to [the practice of] those who substitute [ا, or ی] for the Tanwin [640] in the nom. or gen., [respectively]. But S does not allow that (IY).
§. 650. The oath is common to the n. and v. [625]. It is a prop., verbal, as حَلَفْتُ بِاللَّهِ I have sworn by God or أَقْسَمْتُ إِنَّ الْلَّهَ has known or أَقْسَمْتُ إِنِّي الْلَّهَ God has known or يَعْلَمُ الْلَّهُ God knows, or nominal, as [27, 29] لَعْبَرَ اللَّهُ Assuredly thy father's life or لَعْبَرَ أَبِيَّةَ Assuredly God's life, and يَعْلَمُ الْلَّهُ God's oath [29] or أَمَا أَنْعَمَ النَّبِيَّ [below] or أَمَا شَيْءَ الله [651], and أَمَا أَنْعَمَ النَّبِيَّ God's trust [below], and عَلَى عَهْدِ الله [29], whereby a prop., aff., as لَا أَعْفَعُ لَنْ أَنْعُمَ Assuredly I will do, or neg., as لَا أَعْفَعُ لَنْ أَنْعُمَ I will not do [652], is corroborated [654] (M). The verbal prop. in the oath is أَحْلَفْ بِاللَّهِ I swear by God or أَقْسَمْ بِاللَّهِ, and the like. And, since these vs. are not self-trans., they put a prep., vid. the ب [653, 654], to convey the idea of swearing to the sworn-by [below] (IY): Khl says "You put these ps. [653] only because [by means of them] you attach your swearing to the sworn-by, as by means of the ب you attach [your passing implied in] مَرَّتْ (S, IY) to Zaid in your saying مَرَّتْ [503] (IY), except that the v. [sometimes]
occurs understood in this cat. [651, 653], and that the oath is a corroboration” (S). There are some vs., such as [Jh, KF)] أَعْلَمُ أَنْ هُوَ يَكُنُّ (I testify, [meaning I swear, by such a thing (Jh, KF),] I know, and I have sworn [above], that contain the sense of the oath, and are therefore treated like أَحَلْفُ، the v. occurring [as a correl.] after them, as afterُ بِلَّهِ. By God. The nominal prop. is عُمَّرُ أَبِيُّ and لَعْبُرُ أَبِيُّ, where is an inch, the l in it being the l of inception [604]; while the enunc. is suppressed [29, 651], constructively قُسِّيَيْاً mine oath or حَلَفَيْيَا, because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the sworn-to [below], on which account the suppression is inseparable [from it], as the suppression of the enunc. is inseparable [from لَوْلَا زِيدُ لَكُنَّ نَكَّدَ] [29], because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the correl. (IV). The meaning of يَسِينُ اللَّهِ is what God has sworn by, vid. XCI. 1. [588], XCII. 1. [498, 657], والْسِّكَى XCIII. 1. By the forenoon [657], and the like; or the oath that is [sworn] by His Names, as [below] رَبُّ الْكَعْبَى, By the Lord of the Ka’ba, والْخَالِقِي By the Creator, and the like: and the sense is يَسِينُ اللَّهِ يَسِينَيْيَ, God’s oath (is mine oath) [29] (R).
And hence 

[876]

according to S (R), which is peculiar to the oath (ML), inasmuch as it is not used elsewhere, being thus distinguished from occurring in the like of 

The oaths of the people are true, or faithful, about which there is no dispute at all, since it is a sing. (IY, R, ML) n. (IY, ML), applied to denote the oath (IY); not a p., contrary to the opinion of Zj and Rm (ML), who say that it is a prep. (DM); and not pl. of , contrary to the opinion of the KK [below] (ML): derived from (IY, R, ML), i. q. *بَرَكَة*, blessing (IY, R, DM), as though they swore by God's blessing (IY) always (ML) (a) governed in the nom. [653, 655], by inchoation, its enunc. being [necessarily (DM)] suppressed (IY, ML), because known, as in the case of [above], constructively or , and the like (IY), i. e., *بَرَكَةُ اللَّهِ بِيَيِينِيَةُ* God's blessing (is mine oath) (R); and (b) pre. to the name of God: contrary to the opinion of (a) IDh, who allows it to be governed in the gen. by the jurative p., [vid. the , as *زَيَيِينِيَةُ اللَّهِ* By the oath of God (DM)]; (b) IM, who allows it to be pre. to the [653] and the of the pron. [651]; and (c) IU, who allows it to be an enunc., the suppressed being the
inch., i.e., قَسْبَيْيُ أَيْمَنُ الْلَّهِ (Mine oath is) God's oath (ML): and its Hamza is [orig. (R)] conj. [651, 667] (R, ML), contrary to the opinion of the KK [below] (ML), as is proved by the fact that Kasr of its Hamza [below] is allowed; though, from frequency of usage, Fath of the Hamza [668] is more prevalent. But it seems improbable that the Hamza should be pronounced orig. with Kasr, and then with Fath for lightness, because there is no اَنْفُلَعْ with Kasr of the Hamza among ns. or vs.; and it also seems improbable that اَنْفُلَعْ should be an original sing. (R). According to the KK [651], أَيْمَنُ الْلَّهِ is pl. of أَيْمَنَ الْلَّهِ oath (R, DM), so that أَيْمَنُ الْلَّهِ is like أَيْمَنَ الْلَّهِ [above] (R): and its Hamza is disj. (R, DM); but is made conj. for lightness, from frequency of usage, as Khl says of the Hamza in the determinative ال [below] (R). Their argument is that this measure is peculiar to the pl., like أَفْلُسُ and أَكْلُبُ [237] (DM), which is refuted by the fact that Kasr of the Hamza [below], and Fath of the م, are allowable, [so that إِيَمَنُ is said (DM)]; whereas the like [pronunciation] is not allowable in the pl., such as أَفْلُسُ and أَكْلُبُ [above] (ML), so that إِيَمَنُ is not said (DM): and by the saying of [Abū Miḥjan (TTB, Syt)] Nuṣaib [Ibn Rabāḥ alBalawi (Jsh)]]
Then said the party of the people, when I entreated them, "Yes"; and a party said "By God's oath, we know not" (Jsh), where he elides its ٌ in the interior [of the sentence] (ML), after the ل of inception (Jsh); though the KK may say that it is exclusively distinguished [among pls. of this measure] by that [elision], because of frequency of usage (DM). The ل of inception is prefixed to it, as [to عُمْر] in لعمر الله [above]; and hence فقال فريق القوم أحق [above]. And its Hamza is pronounced with Fath, because this ٌ is indecl., not being used except in the oath alone; so that it resembles the پ., and is therefore pronounced with Fath [of the Hamza], by assimilation to the Hamza prefixed to the determinative ل [above]: but ي has transmitted إِيَّسُ اللهِ [651] with Kasr of the Hamza [above]. As for امانة الله, it also is governed in the nom. by inchoation, the enunc. being suppressed [651, 655] (IY). What is meant by امانة الله is what He has enjoined upon His creatures, vid. obedience to Him, as though it were a trust committed by Him to them, that it was necessary for them to render entire unto Him: the Kur has إِنَّا عَرَضْنَا اِلْاَمَانَةَ عَلَى الْسُّوْرَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَالْجِبَالِ فَأَمَانَ اَن يَكْحَلَّنَّهَا وَأَشْفَقُنَّ مِنْهَا وَحَصْلَهَا
XXXIII. 72. Verily We offered the trust; [meaning obedience (K, B),] to the heavens and the earth and the mountains; and they refused to undertake it, and were afraid of it. And man undertook it: verily he was wrongful, ignorant (R), where obedience is named trust, because it [must be present, as the trust (K)] must be rendered (K, B). And on the ْعَهْدِ َذَٰلِكِ [below] is governed in the nom. by inchoation, while ْعَلَى is its enunc.; the form being like ْبَلْسَ َذَٰلِكِ [28], but the sense being

*I swear by God* (IY). One property of the two *props.*, [the oath and its correl. (IY),] is that, [since one of them is corroborated by the other (IY),] they are equivalent to one *prop.* [compounded of two terms, such as the *inch.* and *enunc.* (IY)], like the two *props.* of the *prot.* and *apod.* [419] (M): so that, as, when you mention the *inch.* alone, or the *enunc.* alone, it does not import any material sense, so, when you mention one of the two *props.*, as َأَلْفِ بِاللَّهِ [above], without the other, it is like your saying ُرَيْدٌ Zaid alone in lack of material sense (IY). And suppression of the second [prop. (IY)], upon indication, is as allowable here, [e.g., in your saying to one that has thrown himself into harm َكَلَّمْتُ, Thou hast perished, by God,
(assuredly thou hast perished), meaning [IY], as it was there (M), e.g., in

"I shall be a wrong-doer, if I do, (I shall be a wrong-
doer) [419] (IY). The correl. of the oath is suppressed
when the oath (1) intervenes as a par. [1] (IH), i.e.,
occupies the middle [of the sentence (R), between the
parts of the prop. that indicates the correl. of the oath (Jm)], as

"Zaid, by God, is standing [below] (WIH, R, Jm) and

"Zaid, by God, stood, and, in the Nahj al-Balaghah, (Q.

They have, by God, met God [575, 577] (R); or (2) is
preceded by what indicates it (IH), as

"Zaid is standing, by God [below] (WIH, R, Jm) and

"Zaid stood, by God (R): because [in these
two cases (Jm)] the oath is independent of [repetition of
(WIH)] the correl. (WIH, Jm), on account of the
presence of what indicates it (Jm). This sentence that
the oath is intermediate in, or posterior to, is, as respects
the sense, the correl. of the oath; and is a quasi-compensa-
tion for that correl., like the correl. of the
condition in

"I shall honor thee, if thou come to me, as before mentioned [419] (R). But the
prop. mentioned, though, according to the sense, a
correl. of the oath, is, according to the form, named
only the indicator of the *correl.*, not the *correl.*, for which reason the sign of the *correl.* of the oath [652] is not necessary in it (Jm). Sometimes the jurative *prop.* is followed by a context indicative of the *correl.*, which is therefore suppressed [333], although this context is not, like the two [indicators above] mentioned, a *correl.* in respect of the sense, as لَا نَفَعِّلُ وَلَيْنَا عُشْرُ LXXXIX. 1. [(I swear) by the daybreak and the first ten nights of Dhu-lHijja, where the sworn-to is suppressed (K, B)], i.e., لَا نَفَعِّلُ وَلَيْنَا assuredly they shall be taken, and shall be punished, because indicated by LXXXIX. 5. [207] (R). Suppression of the *correl.* of the oath is (1) necessary, when the oath is preceded, or enclosed, by what stands instead of the *correl.*, as زَيْدُ وَاللَّهُ قَاتِمُ [above]: (a) if you say لَعَنَّاهُمْ وَزَيْدُ وَاللَّهُ and زَيْدُ قَاتِمُ or زَيْدُ وَاللَّهُ إِنَّهُ قَاتِمُ. Zaid, by God, is such that verily he is standing, or Zaid is such that, by God, verily he is standing, what follows the oath may be either (a) an *enunc.* to what precedes the oath, [the *correl.* being suppressed, because indicated by what encloses the oath (DM)]; or (b) a *correl.*, the aggregate of the oath and its *correl.* being the *enunc.* [of the *inch.* (DM)]: (2) allowable, in other cases, as رَأَنَّا لَعَبَاتِ LXXIX. 1. *[By the—bands of Angels vehemently tearing out] the souls from the bodies, (assuredly ye
shall be raised from the dead), the sworn-to being suppressed (K), i.e., لَنْ يُعْيَشُنَّ, as is indicated by what follows it (ML), vid. the mention of the resurrection (K). Suppression of the jurative prop. is very frequent [651], and is necessary with the jurative ps. other than the ب [653]: and, wherever لَنْ يُعْيَشُ or لَنْ يُأْفَعَلْ or لَنْ يُأْفَعَلْ occurs, when not preceded by a jurative prop., there a jurative prop. is supplied, as لَأَعْلَمُ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ [below] and لَأَعْلَمُ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ [below] or لَأَعْلَمُ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ must be a correl. of an oath, or not (ML). Sometimes the jurative prop. is suppressed, because indicated by an adv., one of the regs. of the v. occurring as correl., as عَرَبَ عَرَبُ جَأَمِئَ [below] and لَأَعْلَمُ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ [below] [206], from the frequency of the usage of عَرَبَ عَرَبُ جَأَمِئَ with the oath, together with the fact that its sense is ever [206] and decidedly, so that it contains such a corroboration as imports the sense of the oath. And, on account of its importing the sense of the oath, it sometimes precedes its op., standing in the place of the jurative prop., even if its op. be conjoined with a p. that prevents an op. from governing what precedes it, like the ن of corroboration [610] and [the neg.] مَا [498, 546], as عَرَبَ عَرَبُ جَأَمِئَ.
Never indeed will I come to thee and عَرْضُ مَا آتِيْكَ
Never will I come to thee, the object being that عَرْضُ should supply the place of the oath. But sometimes
it it used otherwise than in the oath, as

هَذَا قَنَاطِيْ بِبَا أُولِيّتِ مِنْ حَسَنِ
لَا رَزَّت عَرْضُ قَتِيرٌ أَلْعَيْنِ مُكْسَوْدًا (R)

(R), by Rabí‘a Ibn Makrūm ad-Dabbī, This is my praise, because of that good which I have conferred—
May I never cease to be cool in eye, envied! (AKB).
One of the ps. of assent also stands in the place of the jurative prop., vid. جَبِيرْ ِi. q. نَعْمَمْ [556], the connecting link being that assent is a corroboration and confirmation, like the oath: you say جَبِيرْ لَأَنْعَمْ Yea, assuredly I will do, as though you said نَعْمَمُ وَاللَّهُ لَأَنْعَمْ Yes, by God, assuredly I will do. But sometimes جَبِيرْ is put without any oath, as in "رَتَّلَّسَ عَلَى عِلَمِ الدُّرُّ السِّمَاعِ [556]. It is uninfl. upon Kasr, but is sometimes pronounced with Fath; and sometimes it is pronounced with Tanwin, by poetic license, as in وَقَةَلَّتْ أَسِبْتَ آلام [556], which is cited as evidence by those who hold it to be a ن. [556]. Sometimes the mention of the oath is deemed sufficient, without mention of the sworn-by [below], as in

فَأَقِمْ لَوْ شَئْتَ أَتَائَا رَسُولُهُ ﷺ ﺼَوْانَ وُلْكِنْ لَمْ نَجِدْ لَكَ مُدْنِعاً
[651, 652] (R), by Imra al Kais, Then I swear, if any thing, meaning any man, but thou were such that his messenger had come to us, (we would have repulsed him). But we did not find any way of repulse for thee (AKB), i. e., فأَقَسَّمْ يُمَا يَقَسَّمُ يَوْمُ Then I swear (by what is sworn by). And often the correl. of the oath, if corroborated by the ن [611, 613], is deemed sufficient without the oath, as لَأَصْرَبْكَ Assuredly I will strike thee, because the ن has [certain specified] positions, and does not occur in pure enunciation, as [612]; but, as for such [phrases] as لَقَدْ سَبِّعَ اللهُ III. 177. Assuredly God hath heard and لَّزِيدُ تَقَتَّمُ [above], there exists no evidence that they are correls. of the oath, contrary to the opinion of the KK [652]. And sometimes حقاً يَقِينًا certainties قَطْعًا decidedly, and what resembles them, stand in the place of the oath, as حقاً لا نَفَعَنْ Truly, I will assuredly do. And so does كَلَّا [598], when not [denoting] reprehension, as كَلَّا لَيْسُنَّ CIV. 4. Now, assuredly etc. [406]. And so also does the obligation of a vow, as بلَهُ عَلِيَّ كَذَا لا نَفَعَنْ Such a thing is a vow to God, binding upon me, assuredly I will do; or of a covenant, as عَاهَدْتُ للهِ لا نَفَعَنْ I have covenanted with God, assuredly I will do, and عَلَىَ عَهْدُ للهِ لا نَفَعَنْ [above] (R). The object
of the oath is corroboration of what is sworn to, whether aff. or neg., as وَأَلَّهَ لَا أُفِنُم seen By God, assuredly I will stand and وَأَلَّهَ لَا أُفِنُم seen By God, assuredly I will not stand, where you corrobore your announcement, in order to remove doubt from the person addressed. This involves three things, a corrob. prop. [652], a corroborated prop. [652], and a n. sworn by (IY). The corrob. prop. is the oath (M), vid. أَقَسُم [above], أَحَلَف, and the like, such as أَعْلَمُ and أَشَهَد, and similarly لَعْبُرُ اللَّهِ and إِيَّاينَ اللَّهِ (IY). The corroborated [prop. (IY)] is the sworn-to (M). If it be a v., the oath applies to it, as أَحَلَفُ بِاللَّهِ لِنَتْنَلِفَ I swear by God, assuredly thou shalt depart; but, if it be a p., followed by a sub. and pred., what the oath applies to, in sense, is the pred. [652], as وَاللَّهُ إِنْ زَدَأ لَنْتْنَلِفَ By God, verily Zaid is departing and وَاللَّهِ لَرَبِّنَا تَأْمُرُ By God, assuredly Zaid is standing, where the oath corroborates the departure and the standing, not Zaid (IY). And the n. whereto the oath is made to adhere [653], in order that it may thereby be magnified, and rendered solemn, is the sworn-by (M), which is every name or ep. of God, and the like, vid. what is magnified [657], according to them, as

فَأَقَسَّمَتْ بِأَلْبَبِ أَلِدَّةِ طَافَ حَرْثُهُ ﴿٣٧﴾ إِنَّهُ بَنَوْةٌ مِّنْ قَرْشِي وَجَّرِيعٍ
[652] (IY), by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulma Rab'a alMuzani, Then I have sworn by the House (meaning the Ka'ba) that men, who built it, of the tribes of Kuraish and Jurhum, circled round (EM), because they were wont to magnify the House. The Prophet forbade swearing by any but God [651]: but, in the Kur, the oath by His created things often occurs, to express magnification of, and veneration for, the command of the Creator, since in magnification of the work there is magnification of the Worker; and hence CIII. 1, 2. [518, 469, 652], والداريابِ ذَرَوًا LI. 1. By the winds scattering the dust about (K, B)], وَالسَّاهِدِ ذَا التَّحْكِيَةُ, LI. 7. [368], and C. 1. [246, 652] (IY).

§. 651. The oath being frequent in their speech, they take many liberties with it, and study [different] kinds of abbreviation. Hence (1) the suppression of (a) the v. [653] in بالله (M), meaning أَحْيَف فِي اللَّهِ (I swear) by God, the jurative v. being often suppressed [650], because it is known, and can be dispensed with, as بالله إن آلسْرِل لطَلْمَ عَظِيمٍ XXXI. 12. (I swear) by God, verily polytheism is a great wrong, according to one of the two constructions: (b) the sworn-by [650], which they sometimes suppress, contenting themselves with the indication of it by the v., as أَقْسِم لَنْ أَعْلَنَ I swear (by God), assuredly I will do, meaning أَقْسِم يَلَّا للهَ,
because it is frequently used, and the person addressed knows what is meant: the poet says 

\[\text{قَاتِمُ فَهَّنَ أَلْهَمُ} \] [564, 652], and another says 

\[\text{قَاتِمُ لَوْ أَلْهَمُ} \] [650, 652]:

(a) the jurists say that, if a man said 

\[\text{أَقْسَمُ وَإِنَّ أَلْهَمُ} \] I make oath or 

\[\text{أَقْسَمُ وَإِنَّ أَلْهَمُ} \] I swear or 

\[\text{أَقْسَمُ وَإِنَّ أَلْهَمُ} \] I bear witness, and afterwards broke the oath, the expiation of a violated oath would be incumbent upon him, because his expression is turned to the sense of 

\[\text{أَقْسَمُ بِأَلْهَمُ} \] I swear (by God) and the like, since the Muslim is obliged, when he swears, to swear by God, for which reason the Prophet says 

\[\text{مَنْ كَانَ حَالَهَا فَلْيَقَلْ فَلْيَقَلْ بِأَلْهَمُ أَوْ فَلْيَقَلْ بِأَلْهَمُ} \] Whoso is about to swear, let him swear by God, or let him hold his peace [650] (IV): (c) the enunc. [of the inchoatival prop., as (IV)] in 

\[\text{كُفَّرَ} \] [29, 650] and its congeners (M), 

\[\text{كُفَّرَ} \] [650], [the pre. ns. in] all of which are inches., whose enuncs. are suppressed, for abbreviation, because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the correl. (IV), the sense being 

\[\text{لَعَبَرْكَ مَا أَقْسَمُ بِهِ} \] Assuredly thy life (is what I swear by) (M), [or] 

\[\text{مَمَّا أَقْسَمُ بِهِ} \] (is part of what I swear by) (K on XV. 72), [or] 

\[\text{قَسَبَي} \] (is mine oath) (B), whence XV. 72. [521], as though He swore by the continuance, and life, of the prophet, [in order to honor him (K),] for which reason Ibn 'Abbās says "God has not sworn by 
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the life of any other than the Prophet (peace be upon him!)" (IV): (a) if the n., that you make an inch., be specifically assigned to the oath, as in اَيُّنُ اللَّهُ [650] and لَعْمَرَكَ [29], suppression of the enunc. is necessary, as before explained in the cat. of the inch. [29], because that expression indicates the particular enunc., vid. مَا أَقْسِمْ بِهِ, while the correl. supplies the place of the enunc.: but, if it be not specifically assigned to the oath, as in يَبِينُ اللَّهُ and عَهْدُ اللَّهِ and اَمَانَةُ اللَّهِ [29, 650], you may suppress the enunc., as اَمَانَةُ اللَّهِ لَنَعْلَمَ God's trust (is what I swear by), assuredly I will do and عَهْدُ اللَّهِ God's covenant etc., and يَبِينُ اللَّهُ God's oath etc.; or express it, as عَلَى اَمَانَةِ اللَّهِ God's trust is binding upon me, [assuredly I will do.] and عَلَى عَهْدِ اللَّهِ God's covenant is etc., and عَلَى يَبِينِ اللَّهِ God's oath is etc.: and similarly you say الْكُبْرَةُ لَنَعْلَمْ The Ka'ba (is what I swear by), assuredly etc., and الْمُصْحَفُ الْكُبْرَةُ لَنَعْلَمْ The Holy Book (etc.), or الْمُصْحَفُ الْكُبْرَةُ يَبِينِي لَنَعْلَمْ The Ka'ba is mine oath, assuredly etc. [and الْمُصْحَفُ الْكُبْرَةُ يَبِينِي اللَّهَ The Holy Book is mine oath, etc.]: (b) Fr says that, if the inch. be an abstract n. [3], as in اَيُّنُ اللَّهُ and لَعْمَرَكَ, then the correl. of the oath is its enunc.; and there is no need to supply another enunc., because لَعْمَرَكَ is
an oath, and also is an oath, so that the former is [identical with] the latter: but this is of no account, because the عِمْر i. q. بِقَاء continuance is the sworn-by, while لَفْعَلْنَ is the sworn-to; and this cannot be [identical with] that: and so may one say of أَمْوَةَ أَلْلَهِ and أَيْسَ أَلْلَهِ and the like (R): (d) the ن of [below], and its Hamza [650, 667, 669] in the interior [of the sentence] (M): (a) hence it is understood that [in Z's opinion, as here implied,] the elision of the Hamza of أَيْسَ in the interior [of the sentence] is one of the liberties taken by them in the oath, analogy requiring its retention in the interior [of the sentence]: but that is derived from the theory of the KK [650], that the word is a pl., and its Hamza disj.; being made conj. only from frequency of usage; and is the view of IK and IDh: while, according to us, the matter is not so (IX): (b) as for أَيْمُ أَلْلَهِ and أَيْمُ أَلْلَهِ, with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza, together with ءَامَنَ the م, they are contracted from أَيْسَ, with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza [650]; and sometimes أَيْمُ أَلْلَهِ is said, with conversion of the Hamza pronounced with Fath into s. [690]; and sometimes the ن is elided, together with the أَيْمُ أَلْلَهِ and أَيْمُ أَلْلَهِ, with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza, are said: (c) what is contracted from أَيْسَ is
used only with the word أَيُّهَا, as أَيُّهَا the kufa; not with أَيْسُ, as is used therewith [650] (R): (d) Y asserts that the l of أَيْمُ is conj.; and so the Arabs treat it, pronouncing the l with Fath, as they pronounce the l in أَرْجَعَ [599] with Fath [668]; and similarly [the Hamza of] أَيْسُ: the poet says فَقَالَ نَزِيقُ أَيْسُ [650], which we have heard from the Arabs thus [recited] (S): (e) the ن of مُن and مُن [653]: (f) the jurative p., without compensation, in أَلَّهَ and أَلَّهَا the [503, 514, 515, 655]; and, with compensation, in أَلَّهِ, أَلِلَّهِ [552], Oَلِلَّهِ; and أَلِلَّهِ [656]: (2) substitution of a ب for the jurative p., [i.e., the ب (IY),] in أَلَّهَ [506, 653] (M), as XII. 85. [454] and XII. 91. [575] (IY): (3) their preference for Fatha over Damma, which is better known in عَبَرْ لَا تُعْلَمْ [29, 650]: (a) عَبَر continuance, life, has three dial. vars., (a) عَبَرُ with Fath of the ع, and quiescence of the م; (b) عَبَرُ with Damm of the ع, and quiescence of the م; and (c) عَبَرُ with Damm of both [ع and م]: (b) you say أَطَّالَ أَلَّهَ عَبَرْكَ God prolong, or lengthen, thy life! or عَبَرْ لَا عَبَرْنَ عَبَرْنَ: but, when you come to the oath, you use only the [dial. var.] pronounced with Fath of the ع, because it is the lightest of the three dial. vars.; while, the oath being frequent, they adopt the lightest [form] for it (IY).
§. 652. The oath is of two kinds, either an adjuration [654], as

\[\text{عُمَرُكَ آللَّهُ} \, \text{I have besought God to prolong thy life or I have entreated thee by thy confession of God's eternity,} \]

[41] and \[\text{يَاللَّهُ} \, \text{Part I, Notes, p. 42 A}, \] and sometimes \[\text{عُمَرُكَ} \, \text{650, 651}; \] or not an adjuration. The correl. of the adjuration is a command, prohibition, or interrogation, as

\[\text{يَدْينِكَ هَذِهِ ضَسْتُ إِلَيْكَ لِبَلَّيْنِ} \, \text{654} \, (R), \text{by the Majnūn of Lailâ, addressing her husband, (I adjure thee) by thy faith, hast thou drawn Lailâ close to thee, a little before dawn, or hast thou kissed her mouth? (Jsh). It is [sometimes] headed by \text{إِلَيْكَ} or \text{لِبَلَّيْنِ}, as \text{I have adjured thee by God [above], etc. [95] or لَمْ يُفْعَلَ} [559]. But in [Part I, p. 42 A] is red. [564]. And sometimes one says in adjuration \text{ياَلَّهُ} [I adjure thee] by God, assuredly thou shalt do [above], where the correl. is an enunciation, in the sense of a command (R). The oath [that is not an adjuration (Jm)] is correlated [547, 549] (M, IH), i.e., confronted (R), meaning answered (R, Jm), with [a correl. containing (WIH) three things (M)], the J and \text{إِن} , [when the correl. is aff. (WIH),] and the neg. p.
By God, assuredly I will do and verily thou art going and I have not done and I will not do (M). Since the oath and the correl. are, each of them, a prop. [650], which is an expression for every independent phrase, standing by itself; but each of them has some dependence upon the other; therefore cops. are unavoidable, to connect one of them with the other, as the cond. p. connects the prot. with the apod. [419]: so that two ps. are assigned to affirmation, vid. the ل [600] and إن [517]; and two to negation, vid. ما [546] and لا [547]. The reason why these [four] ps. [below] must occur as [cops. for] a correl. of the oath is that the sentence is begun with them. And, on that account, the في [540] does not occur as [a cop. for] a correl. of the oath, because the sentence is not begun with it (IY). The correl. [of the oath (R)] is either a nominal, or a verbal (WIH, R) prop. (WIH); and is either aff. or neg. (R). If it be a nominal prop., then, (1) if aff., it is attended by إن أَنْذَرُ, as إنّ الزَّيْدَ [427]; or the ل, as الَّذِي نَزَّدَ قَائِمٌ [650]; and sometimes by both combined, as الَّذِي إنّ الزَّيْدَ لَقَائِمٌ, for corroboration, and for connection of the correl. with the oath (WIH): the Kur has حَمَّرَ وَأَلْبَابِ الْبَيْسِيِّ إِنّا أَنْذَرْناهُ.
XLIV. 1, 2. Hā-Mim. By the clear Scripture, verily We revealed it in a blessed night [518], CIII. 1, 2. [518, 469, 650], and [the corroboration in] the correl. [headed] by إِنَّ أَلَّمُانِسَانَ لَرَيْبٌ كَفَرُونَ C. 6. Verily man to his Lord is ungrateful after C. 1. [246, 650]; and [the corroboration in] the correl. [headed] by إِنَّ falls upon the pred. [650], because it is in the sense of the v. (IX) : (a) the aff. nominal [prop.] is headed by إِنَّ, uncontracted [517] or contracted [525]; or by the ل [600]: (b) this ل is the ل of inception [604], importing corroboration, there being no difference between it and إِنَّ, except as respects the government [of the latter]; and the oath is answered with them because they import that corroboration for the sake of which the oath is uttered : (c) the ل introduced after إِنَّ [521, 604] also is orig. the ل of inception; and therefore this ل, i. e., the ل of the correl. of the oath, is not prefixed to anything except what the ل occurring after إِنَّ is prefixed to: (d) the opinion of the KK is that the ل in the like of لَرَيْبٌ قَاتَمُ [650] also is [the ل of] the correl. of the oath, the oath before it being supplied; and, this being so, there is no ل of inception in existence, according to them: but the better [opinion] is that the ل in لَرَيْبٌ قَاتَمُ is the ل of inception importing corroboration, the oath not being supplied, as is done by the KK, because the o. f. is that there
should be no supplying, while the corroboration sought from the [supplied] oath is realized from the ل (R): (2) if neg., it is attended by مَا or لَا, as By God, Zaid is not standing or فَآ نُتْمِ ا [107], and لَا لَكَ فِي الْدَّارَ وَلَا عَمَّرَ. By God, Zaid is not in the house nor 'Amr [100] (WIH): the Kur has أَوْلَمْ تَكُونُوا أَقْسَمْتُمْ منْ كُبْلِ مَا كُنْتُمْ مِنْ زَوالِ XIV. 46. What! and had ye not sworn before, there should not be for you any removal? (II), i.e., by death (K, B): (a) the neg. nominal [prop.] is headed by مَا [38, 107, 546], op. according to the people of AlHijaz, and inop. according to others; (b) the ل of exemption [36, 99, 547], in its various states; (c) إِنْ By God, Zaid is not standing (R). If it be a verbal [prop.], then, (1) if aff., (a) when its v. is a pret., it is attended by the ل, with وَلَّهَ لَقَدْ قَلَمَ, as [427]; or without it, as وَلَّهَ لَقَدْ قَلَمَ [below]; and sometimes by قُدَ alone, as XCI. 9. [433, 575, 600] (WH), where the ل is suppressed because of the length [of the interval between the oath and correL.] (B): (a) with the aff. pret., the best way is to combine the ل and وَلَّهَ لَقَدْ حَرَجَ [577], as [600] (R): [for.] when the ل is prefixed to the pret., the phrase is not good unless قُدَ be with it, as وَلَّهَ لَقَدْ قَلَمَ [above], because قُدَ approximates the past to the present, as
By God, assuredly ye have known, we have not come to do evil in the land and XII. 91. [575] (IY): (b) in the case of النعم and پیتیس, however, the ل alone is put [604], since تَن is not prefixed to them, because of their aplasticity [575], as

(895)

by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulma, _An oath, an oath_ being [governed in the acc. as (EM)] an inf. n. [corrob. (AKB)] of ُاقسستُ [650], assuredly such that _most excellent are the two chiefs have ye been found to be, in every state, easy and hard!_ (EM, AKB), meaning by “the two chiefs” AlHarith Ibn ‘Auf and Harim Ibn Sinan (EM): (c) and ُلَقَامُ [above] is allowable, but not frequent, whence ُإِذَا ُلَقَامُ ُبَنْصَرِي ُلَقَامُ [23] (IY), the ل in ُلَقَامُ being [the ل of] the correl. of an oath understood, constructively ُحَلَفَتْ ُلَهَا ُلَقَامُ (T); and ُإِذَا ُلَقَامُ ُلَقَامُ [below] (IX): [for,] if the sentence be long, or there be some exigency of metre, restriction to one of them is allowable, as XCI. 9. [above], where the ل is not put because of the length [of the sentence]; and ُسُلَفَتْ ُلَهَا ُلَقَامُ [575, 577, 600] (R), where the connection is affected by the ل, without تَن, because of the exigency of the
metre (AKB): but [the suppressed] قن must be supplied after the ظ, because the ظ of inception is not prefixed to the bare pret. [577, 604]; and restriction to the ظ is more frequent than the converse: (d) as for such as فأقسم أن لَو ألتقيتَا آلمع [564, 651], the opinion of S is that is subsidiary [to the oath], like the ظ [599, 601] in لِتَنَ جَعَلَتِهِ لاَكُرُمَتِهِ (By God,) if thou come to me, assuredly I will honor thee; and, in that case, the ظ in لَكَان is [the ظ of] the correl. of the oath [600], not [the ظ of] the correl. of لَو [602] (R): and similarly the correl. would belong to the oath, if أَيْنَ were absent, as in By God, if thou stoodest, assuredly I would honor thee (AKB); so that, in فأقسم قو [650, 651], the correl. of the oath, [constructively, as mentioned by Fr and others, كَفَغُنِّيتَا, on the evidence of مدَنِّي (AKB),] is suppressed (R), not the correl. of لَو, this being required by the rule for the combination of the oath and condition [427] (AKB): (b) when its v. is an aor., it is attended by the ظ, with the ظ of corroboration, as لله لَا تَوقَمَّ [613]; and, extraordinarily, without it, as لَا تَقَمَّ (WIH): (a) the aff. aor. is mostly headed by the ظ, and terminated by the ظ, as لله لَا أضْرِبَ: By God, assuredly I will strike; unless the ظ be prefixed to a prepos. reg. of the aor., as in III.
152. [75, 613], which contains the J alone; or to a p. of amplification [578], as in XIX 67. [600], in which case likewise you do not put the ن, contenting yourself with one of the two signs of futurity, and dispensing with the other: (b) it seldom happens that the aor. is devoid of the J, the ن being deemed sufficient, as in وقتميل مرة النب (600): (c) according to the BB [613], it is not allowable to content yourself with the J, and dispense with the ن, except in a case of metric exigency [614]: but the KK allow it, without any [such] exigency; and, agreeably with their opinion, it is related that Fr allows the J and ن to be interchangeable; the poet [Zaid al-Fawāris Ibn Ḥusain Ibn Dirār aḍ-Ḍabbī (T, AKB)] says

تُنَالِي أَبُو أَرْسِ حَلَفْةُ لِبَرْدِنَى ﻣَلُوءٌ ﺃَنْ،ْ ﺃَلِى ﺃَنْ،ْ ﻛَانَهُ ﻣَفَآَكِر

(R) Ibn Aus swore an oath, assuredly he would [take me prisoner, and then grant me grace, and (AKB)] restore me to women as though they were pokers or spits (T, AKB), because of their being burnt by love for, and grief over, me: then I did with him the like of what he purposed to do with me (AKB): (d) all of this is if the aor. be future: whereas, if it be present, the majority allow its occurrence as a correc. of the oath; contrary to the opinion of Mb, [who disallows it,] because the present, being actually in existence, does not need to be corroborated by the oath; and properly it should be allowed, since many an existing [matter, when] not
witnessed, is deniable: [Ks, says (AKB)] Fr [in his commentary on XVII. 90. (AKB).] has cited [to me the verse of AlKumait Ibn Ma'ruf (AKB)] لَيْتَنْ تَلَقْ فَدْ [613] (R), where the sense is assuredly my Lord (now) knows (AKB); and you say وَآَلِلَّهِ لَيْسَ لِيُصِلِّي بِيْنَهَا By God, assuredly Zaid is praying, where you must content yourself with the ] , and do not put the ن , because it is the sign of the future (R) : (e) BD says "If the aor. be in the sense of the present, it is corroborated by the ] , without the ن , because the latter is peculiar to the future, as وَآَلِلَّهِ لَيْفَعَلْ زِيدَ أَلْلَهِ. By God, assuredly Zaid now does, or is now doing: this usage is disallowed by the BB, who, in its stead, avail themselves of the [nominal] prop. headed by the corrob. [p.], as وَآَلِلَّهِ إِنَّ زِيدَ لَيْفَعَلْ أَلْلَهِ By God, verily Zaid now does, or is now doing; but is allowed by the KK, whose opinion is attested by the reading of Ibn Kathir لَأَقْسِمُ بِيْنِيْمَ آَلِلِيْمَةِ LXXVI. 1. Assuredly I swear etc. [566] and the saying of the poet cited by Fr لَيْتَنْ تَلَقْ [above] " (AKB): (2) if neg., (a) when its v. is a pret., it is attended by مَا [546] or لا [547], as وَآَلِلَّهِ مَا قَلَّمْ زِيدَ By God, Zaid has not stood or لا قَلَّم will not stand (WIH): (a) the neg. pret. is [headed] by مَا, as وَآَلِلَّهِ مَا قَلَّمْ زِيدَ [above] (R): the Kur has وَآَلِلَّهِ رَبِّنَا مَا دُنَا مُشْرِكِينَ.
VI. 23. *By God, our Lord, we have not been polytheists and have not said* (IY) : (b) *if negatived by* نَّ أَ نَّ (550), *the pret. is converted to the sense of the future, [being then pret. in form, future in sense (AKB).] as in the saying [of AlMu‘ammal Ibn Umail alMuḥaribī (AKB)] [547, 615], i. e., لَّا تُقْدِبُهُمْ حَسْبَ الْبَيْحِينِ أَلْلَهَ, so that repetition of the نَّ is not obligatory, as also it is not obligatory when نَّ is prefixed to the deprecatory pret., as in لَّا رَحْبَةً أَلْلَهَ May God not have mercy upon him!, because, in both positions, the pret. is in the sense of the future; whereas, in any other [position], نَّ must be repeated, as in LXXV. 31. [547]; though, in poetry, it sometimes occurs not repeated, as in تَنَّى أُمَّ سُبْبَيْتَ الْعَقْبَةَ [547]; while in الْعَقْبَةَ XC. 11. *Yet he hath not attempted the mountain-road it is not repeated because of the repetition in the exposition of, vid. فَلَّا رَبِيَّةٌ أَوْ إِطْعَامٌ فِي بَيْتِ ذِٰی مَسْفَعَةٍ يَتَبَيَّنُ ذَا مَقْرِبَةٌ الْعَقْبَةَ أَوْ مُسْكِينَا ذَا مَقْرِبَةٌ XC. 13-16., [i. e.,} (K)] freeing of a captive, or feeding, on a day of hunger, an orphan [339] near of kin, or a needy man cleaving to dust, [the occurrence of نَّ, in XC. 11., in place of لَّم being good, on account of the multiplicity of what is meant by العَقْبَةَ (B).] as though فَلَّا نَّ أُمَّ رَبِيَّةٌ وَلَا إِطْعَامٌ
Yet he hath not freed a captive, nor fed [an orphan or (B)] a needy man were said (R), so that َلا is repeated in sense (K): (b) when its v. is an aor., it is attended by َما or َلا, [the latter] with the َن of corroboration [612], as ُرَبُّ َلا أَنفَعِلْ. By God, assuredly I will not do; or without it, as َلا أَنفَعِلْ I will not do (WIH): (a) the aor. is negatived by َما or َلا or َإنْ in the Kur, is LIX. 12. [599, 650], where َلا يَّخَرِجُونَ and َلا يَنَصُرُونَهُم are the correl. of a suppressed oath, not the correl. of the condition, as is proved by the existence of the َن [of the ind.]; whereas, if they were the correl. of the condition, they would be apocopated [405] (IY): but َما and َإنْ, when not restricted by [something indicative of] future time, apparently denote negation of the present [546, 550]; so that Mb [above] does not allow ُرَبُّ َلا أَقْوم. By God, I do not stand or َإنْ أَقْوم [427], because it is apparently a present, while his opinion is that the sworn-to is not a present: (b) negation of the aor. by َكُن or َتَنْ is not allowable in the correl. of the oath, because the Arabs negative it by what may be suppressed, for conciseness, as will be mentioned [below]; whereas the op. p. is not suppressed, while its government remains; and, if they annulled the government, the
suppressed *neg.* would not be specified (R) : (c) correlation of the oath with لَنُّ or لَمْ is very rare, as in the saying of Abû Tâlib [549], and in نَعَمْ وَخَالِقَهُمْ لَمْ تَفْقِمْ عَنْ مَثَلِهِمْ منْصِبَةَ. *Yes, by their Creator, not a bearer of noble children has given birth to the like of them!* said by an Arab in reply to "Hast thou sons?"; though this [second *ex.*] may be by suppression of the *correl.*, i. e., إنَّ لَيْ بَنيِنَّ (Verily I have sons), the *neg. prop.* being afterwards begun (ML on لَنُّ). If the sworn-to be the *correl.* of a future condition preceded by an oath, the *cond.* instrument is often conjoined with اَلْيَاpronounced with Fath, named subsidiary [599, 601], i. e., subordinating, and specifically assigning, the *correl.* to the oath, not to the condition [427], as رَأَسْتُ لَنِينَ أَنْتِنَيْ لَآنيِنَك. *By God, if thou come to me, assuredly I will come to thee, where* إنَّ أَنتُيَنَيْ without a لْ is allowable. If, however, the oath be suppressed, and supplied, the subsidiary لْ is most often put, to give notice of the supplied oath from the beginning of the matter; but sometimes the condition occurs without it, as VI. 121. [601] (R). The *neg. [p. (M, WIH) لْ (IY)] is [allowably (WIH, R)] suppressed (M, WIH, R), because indicated by the circumstances of the case (WIH), from the [*neg. (WIH)] *aor.* [above] (WIH, R), not from the *pret.* or
nominal prop. [below] (R), in the correl. of the oath (IV, R), as XII. 85. [447, 454, 547], i. e., لا كثمر (IV, WIH); whether the aor. be لا يزال and its sisters [447, 454], as in [454, 547, 655] (R), or any other, as in [504, 653] (R), constructively لا يبقى (AKB), [and] in the saying of the [Hudhali (IV)] poet

(902)

By God, a pasturer upon herbs, intensely black in the back, rising five in his age, hoarse in braying, will (not) outlast the days!, meaning a wild he-ass (IV). It is not suppressed from (1) the nominal prop. [above], because the nominal is less used in the correl. of the oath than the verbal, and suppression is for the sake of lightening; (2) the pret. [547], because the aor. is more used than the pret., while the form of the aor. is heavier. And hence suppression of the neg. p., otherwise than in [the correl. of (AKB)] the oath, is allowable from لا يزال and its sisters, as تنفك تسمع الله [454] (R), constructively لا تنفك (AKB), because, negation being inseparable from them [447], they are not liable to be mistaken for affirmation (R): and, in poetry, has been heard in the case of other aors., as إذا ما [547]: though IM explains this by the assumption of a supplied oath, i. e., "(By God,) ye
will (not) find him”; and Dm says that apparently his opinion is more probable (AKB). As for the saying, however,

فُلَأَ وَأَبَيِّ دَهْمَا َّ رَأَيْتُ عْرَبَةً * عَلَى قُومِهَا مَا قَتِلَ الْرَّيْبَ قَادِحٌ

[Then she (Dahmá, the name of a woman) shall not, by Abú Dahmá, cease to be exalted above her people, so long as a striker of fire shall twist a fire-stick! (AKB)], the neg. [p. in it (AKB)] is not suppressed; but is separated from the v. (R), by the prep. and gen., i.e., the jurative prop. وَأَبَيِّ دَهْمَا (AKB). Properly فَلَأَ or ما should not be separated from لَّ and its sisters by an adv. or its like, though that is allowable in the case of other vs., as لَّ أَلْيَمُ جَعَتْنِي وَلَا أَمِس. Not to-day didst thou come to me, nor yesterday, because the neg. p. is compounded with لَّ and its sisters to import affirmation; and فَلَأَ وَأَبَيِّ دَهْمَا [above] is anomalous (R on the Non-attributive Verbs). The same opinion is adopted by IHsh in the ML, except that he does not restrict this separation as anomalous, or even rare; but, seemingly, according to him, it is regular: he says, in the discussion on the parenthetic prop., “It occurs between............. the neg. p. and what it denies, as لَّ أَلْيَمُ أَخَّرَ تَرَأَيْتُ عْرَبَةً َّ رَأَيْتُ عْرَبَةً َّ رَأَيْتُ عْرَبَةً َّ رَأَيْتُ عْرَبَةً َّ رَأَيْتُ عْرَبَةَ [1] and فَلَأَ وَأَبَيِّ دَهْمَا [above]”. His Commentator IMH says that فَلَأَ may be a refutation, the neg. p. being suppressed, and there being no par. (AKB).
But [R says that (AKB)] it is not a case where the neg. p. is suppressed, as in XII. 85. [above], on the theory that it is renderable by فَلَآ أُبَيِّنَ دُعْمَانَ لا زَالَتْ. Then no, by Abû Dahmâ she shall (not) cease, because such suppression has not been heard except from their aors. (R on the Non-attributive Verbs). He means [this as] a refutation of Fr, who, in his Commentary, adopts the opinion that the neg. p. is suppressed from it, saying that لا is sometimes understood with oaths, as فَلَآ أُبَيِّنَ دُعْمَانَ آلِه (above) and أَلْحَمَّةَ يَيَسِينَ آلِهَ آلِه, i.e., لا زَالَتْ (AKB). The sign of affirmation may not be suppressed in the aor., because it is mostly two signs, the ج and the ن, as has been mentioned; so that suppression of one would entail suppression of the other, and thus suppression would be multiplied. And it is decreed that the [neg. p.] suppressed from the aor. should be لا, not ما, because لا is used more than ما in negation of the aor. (R). IU holds the verse [last cited] to be a case of suppression of the neg. ما; but quotes its first hemistich differently, saying “And hence the suppression of the neg. ما, which is very rare, as in لُعَبْرَ أَبَيِّ دُعْمَانَ آلِه. By the life of Abû Dahmâ, she has (not) ceased to be exalted above her people, so long as a striker of fire has twisted a fire-stick!, meaning ما زَالَتْ”. and so is it quoted, and explained, by IUUK in
the Commentary on the Tashil, except that he says "i.e., 

she shall (not) cease", [which involves "shall twist"] (AKB). None of these [four] ps. [above] may be suppressed, except ٥ alone, because (1) ١٠٥٠..
prep., as I swear by God, etc. [654] (IV). And, after suppression of the v., which you have made to adhere to the sworn-by, they sometimes put, in place of the ب, four ps., the ل, and the ت, and two preps., vid. the ل and م in your saying لَيْلَةُ الْمَجْرَمَة. By God, the end shall not be delayed! [498] and مَيْنُ رَبِّي اَلْقَدْرُ [499] By my Lord, assuredly etc. [500], from desire for peculiarity [654] (M). The ل is a subst. for the ب [501], because they mean to allow themselves some latitude [in the choice of a p.], on account of the frequency of oaths [652]; while the ل is nearest to the ب, because of two matters, (1) that it issues from the same outlet, since both are from the lips [732]; and (2) that, the ل, denoting union [539], and the ب denoting adhesion [503], they approximate one to the other, because the thing, when it adheres to another, is united with it: so that, since the ل agrees with the ب in sense and outlet, it is made to accord with, and to act as a subst. for, it; and is used so frequently that it predominates over the ب, for which reason S mentions it first. In the oath, then, the ل is a subst. for the ب; and is op. with the government of the latter, unlike the rest of the cons., because the con. ل is itself inop., being only indicative of the suppressed op. [131, 538], for which reason, instead of قَالَ لَيْلَةُ الْمَجْرَمَةَ Zaid and 'Amr
stood, you may say قَامَ زَيْدٌ قَامَ عَمَرٌ Zaid stood, and 'Amr stood, where it is combined with the op. ; whereas, if it were the op., it would not be combined with another op.: while the jurative ـ, is not like that, because it is not combined with the بـ; so that, when you say, وَيَزِيدَكَ and by Zaid, this ـ is not the jurative (IY). The بـ and the ـ contain the sense of wonder (M), as XII. 91. [575, 651] and لَهُ يَبْقَى آلَهَةٌ [508, 652] (IY): and sometimes the بـ occurs otherwise than in wonder (M), as XXI. 58. [498, 611] (IY); but not the ـ L: S cites لَهُ يَبْقَى آلَهَةٌ [above], by 'Abd Manāt al-Hudhaiš (M). The بـ is a subst. for the ـ, [506, 651], being often substituted for it, as in تُرَأَتْ تُكَبَّرُ and تُرَأَتْ [689], which [substitution] is so frequent as to be almost regular (IY). The ـ occurs in the sense of the ـ, being peculiar to the word الّلّهُ [504], in great matters. And so does مَنْ, pronounced with Kasr, and sometimes with Damm, of the م، Kasr being more frequent; and peculiar to the expression رَبِّي my Lord [499]. It is held (1) by S to be a prep., standing in the place of the بـ; the Damm of the م، being to indicate the alteration of its meaning, and its exclusion from its cat., as you say of the proper name شَبْسُ آبِنُ مَالِك Shums Ibn Malik, with Damm of the شـ: (2) by some of the KK to be contracted from آيٰن when
pronounced with دامم, and from يَبَيِبن when pronounced with كسر of the م: but this requires consideration, because is peculiar to الكعبة or [650], and to [above]; though there is nothing to prevent one from saying that its predicament is altered upon its contraction. Its uninflectedness, however, is adducible as a proof that it is not curtailed from أمـن [or يَبَيِبن], because contraction of the infl., and its reduction to two letters, do not necessitate uninflectedness, as [we see] in يَد hand and كَم blood. And one should rather say that مَنُ in their sayings مَنِ الْلَّهِ with دامم, and مَنِ الْلَّهِ with كسر, of the م and و, [used] with the word الْلَّه alone, is [identical with] the prep. مَنُ used with رَبِّي; the فِن being made to imitate the م in دامم and كسر, because of the two quiescents [664, 666]: and that مَنِ الْلَّهِ [in مَنِ الْلَّهِ] [499], with two فَتْحَات is [identical with] مَنِ الْلَّهِ [in مَنِ الْلَّهِ], with كسر of the م and فتح of the و, the م being made to imitate the و [in فتح], from desire for lightening; although the فتح of the و arises accidentally, because of the two quiescents. It is said, however, that all three [vars.], i.e., with دامم, كسر, and فتح of both م and و, [used] with the word الْلَّه, are contracted from منِ الْلَّهِ. As for the abridgment of منِ الْلَّهِ, with
two Ḍammas, from أَيْمَس، it is plain. But, as for those \textit{vars.} with Kasr or Fath of both letters, I see no reason for their being contracted from it, because أَيْمَس، according to the GG, must be in the \textit{nom.} [650, 655], by reason of hearsay; and, since contraction does not necessitate uninflectedness, whence comes the Kasr or Fath of the \\n\\nIf, indeed, أَيْمَسُ اللهِ occurred, in the three cases, \textit{nom.}, \textit{acc.}, and \textit{gen.}, as يَبِينُ اللهِ occurs in the \textit{nom.} and \textit{acc.}, according to all, and in the \textit{gen.} also, according to the KK [655], then one might say that the \\n\\nwas made to imitate the \\n\\nin Fath or Kasr. And مَيْنَ اللهِ with two Fathas may be contracted from يَبِينُ اللهِ, by making the م imitate the \\n\\nin [in Fath] after the contraction; but not ميْنَ اللهِ with two Kasras, by making the \\n\\nimitate the م [in Kasr], because the vowel of inflection is not removable for the sake of alliteration. Sometimes مَيْنَ اللهِ with Ḍamm, and مَيْنَ اللهِ with Kasr, of the م are said, being contracted from مَيْنَ and مَيْنَ [651], according to what S says. It is said \textit{[by others]} (1) that they are contracted from أَيْمَس، in which case there is a difficulty in \textit{[accounting for]} the Kasr of the م: (2) that the one with Kasr is contracted from يَبِينُ: (3) that both are \textit{subs.} for the م [687], like the \textit{ث} [above], because the م and م are labial [732], for which reason
they are peculiar to the word بُلْهُم, like the بُتَّ [506]; but this requires consideration, because the word of one letter does not occur, in their language, pronounced with نَتْم (R).

§. 654. The بُتَّ, because of its originality [508, 653], enjoys three privileges, not shared by any other [jurative p. (IY)], (1) prefixion to [the explicit n., as بُلْهُم يَلْعَبُكَ By God, assuredly I will do; and (IY)] the pron., as بُلْهُم يَلْعَبُكَ By Him, assuredly I will worship Him and بُلْهُم يَلْعَبُكَ By Thee, assuredly I will visit Thy House (M): whereas the other ps. are prefixed only to the explicit n., not to the pron.; and بُلْهُم يَلْعَبُكَ is not allowable, nor بُتَّ (IY): the poet says

أَلاَّ نَآَدَتُ أَمَمَةً يُحَتِّمَالاَّ لِتَتْحَرِّنَيْ فَلاَ يَكَّ بِكَ مَا أَبَأْلِي

Now Umāma has proclaimed her departure, that she may grieve me. Yet no, by thee, I care not (M), cited by AZ (IY): (2) expression of the v. with it, as بُلْهُم حَلْفُ بِاللهِ [650] (M), أَحْلِفُ بِاللهِ, and أَقْسَمُ بِاللهِ; whereas you do not say بُتَّ, أَحْلِفُ وَاللهِ, nor بُتَّ, أَقْسَمُ تَأْلِهِ, and the like (IY): (3) [that you apply it to denote (IY)] conciliatory [and propitiatory (IY)] adjuration of the man [addressed (IY)], as بُلْهُم لَّمَّا زَنجُي (I adjure thee) by God, only that thou visit me [95, 559, 652]
and (I adjure thee) by thy life, inform me (M); whereas you do not say , nor , because that occurs only in the [non-adjuratorial] oath (IY). These conditions, and the ps. for which they are prescribed, are combined by some one in the [following mnemonic] verses

\[\text{In the case of an explicit [n.], with suppression of the jurative v., together with omission of adjuration, swear with the , and these conditions are prescribed in the case of the , and add its being made peculiar to }\]

In this case, Ibn Harma says

\[\text{[below]} (M) (I beg thee) by (the power of) God, thy Lord, if thou enter, then say to him “This is Ibn Harma, stopping at thy door”, where the is dependent upon a suppressed v., as though he said [below], which is suppressed because indicated by the circumstances of the case; and the sense is [IY]: and the [other (IY)] poet says [652] (M), i.e., as though he said
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(I beg thee) by (the truth of) thy faith (that thou tell me rightly, and let me know the real fact). But this is not an oath; for, if it were an oath, it would need a correl. [650], and would be answered with what oaths are answered with [652]. And, if you say "Then what do you make of the poet's saying

أَيَا حَيْيَّ حَيّ فِي الْخَلْوَةِ كُلِّهَا # أَيْ بَلَلَّ هَلْ لِيِّنِي يِبِينِي مِنْ عَقْلِهِ

O best of living beings, in creation, all of it, what! (I ask thee) by God, will there be for me any sense in mine oath?, where he names it an oath, because he says "هل لىّ يِبِينِي آخِرِهِ?", the reply is that the full phrase is will there be any sense in mine oath (if I swear that thou art the best of living beings in creation)?, not that he regards this phrase [(I ask thee) by God] as an oath (IY). In holding this [kind of phrase] to be an oath [652], R is following IM. "We do not know", says AH, "any one that takes the course of naming this an oath, except IM: but, in one of the Commentaries on the Book, when عَمَّرْتُك [652] عِمَّرْتُك and تَعِيدَك, and تَعِيدَك [Part I, p. 44 A] have been mentioned, there is a declaration to the effect that some of the GG assert these [expressions] to be oaths; so that IM agrees with those who say that: whereas, according to our school, the juratory prop. is only enunciatory [below]". And this [declaration] is confirmed by the
fact that IJ says "The oath is an originative prop., whereby another prop. is corroborated [650]: then, if the latter be enunciatory, the oath is non-adjuratory; and, if it be requisitive, the oath is adjuratory". IU expresses himself strangely, saying, in the small Commentary on the Jumāl, "The oath is every prop., whereby another prop. is corroborated, both of them being enunciatory"; whereas the correct doctrine is that the jurative prop., [though] not its correl., is originative, as IJ [above] and others say: but it is urged, in his excuse, that his meaning is that, when the two props. are combined, they constitute a sentence admitting of being [pronounced] true or false. Then, after his definition, he says "When there occurs what is in the form of the oath, but [is followed by a prop. that] does not admit of being [pronounced] true or false, it is to be explained as not being an oath, as بَلَّالٍ لِّيَنْبَغِيكَ آللَّهُ [above] and سَوَيَّنَا حَمَّالَهُ آللَّهُ [652], the like of which is not an oath, because the oath is not conceivable except where faithfulness or faithlessness is conceivable". And he says, in the Commentary on the Ḳāf, "As for these two verses, they are not oaths, because the two props. [هَلْ مَسَّتَا الْعَمْلِ إِنَّ دَخَلَتَ الْعَمْلِ] do not admit of being [pronounced] true or false; but what is meant thereby is only conciliation [below] of the person addressed, the full phrase being أَسْأَلَكَ بِاللَّهِ and أَسْأَلَكَ بِدِينِكَ [above],
except that they understand the v., because it is indicated by the sense". "And", says he, "three things will prove to you that By God, has Zaid stood? or if Zaid stand, then honor him, or the like, is not an oath:—(1) that the p. peculiar [653] to the oath does not occur, in place of the ب , in the language of the Arabs, who do not say تأَلَّيْلَهُ إِنَّ قَامَ آَلَحَا, nor أَقِسَّمْ بِاللَّهِ هَذَا الْحَيَّ, that, when they express the v. whereon the ب depends, it is not one of the jurative vs., أَقِسَّمْ بِاللَّهِ هَذَا الْحَيَّ not being said; (3) that the oath is not devoid of faithlessness or faithfulness, and that is not suitable except in what is qualifiable as true or false". His saying that the like of this is conciliation [above], not an oath, is obviously correct; and there is no doubt that [the notion of] its being an oath is distasteful. But the language of IHsh apparently imports that it is an oath, because he names it أَقِسَّمُ أَسْتَعْطَافِي conciliatory [or adjuratory] oath (AKB). The correl. of the non-adjuratory oath must be enunciatory [above]; and the correl. of the adjuratory oath originative, as in بَرِّيْكَ حَلَّ صَبِبتَ آَلَحَا (I adjure thee) by thy Lord, hast thou drawn etc? and

َعِيْشُكَ يَا سُالِمِي آَرَنِي ذَى صَباَبَيِ

َأَبِي غَيْرَ مَا يَرَوْصُكَ فِي أَلْسَرِ وَاٰلِجُهَرِ
[(I adjure thee) by thy life, O Salma, have mercy upon an ardent lover, who has abstained from everything other than what pleases thee, in secret and openly (Jsh): and whatever is transmitted to the contrary is to be paraphrased (ML).

§. 655. The jurative p. is sometimes suppressed, for abbreviation, because strongly indicated. In that respect it is of two kinds, [inop. and op.]:—(1) they suppress it, and make the jurative v. govern the sworn-by in the acc.; (2) they suppress the prep., but maintain its government, taking it into account when suppressed, as they take it into account when expressed, in order to notify that the suppressed [prep.] is meant [to be understood]: so that أَلْلَهُ لَا أَفْرَمَنَّ (By) God, assuredly I will stand is said, transmitted by S, meaning وَأَلْلَهُ and بِلِلَّهِ (IY on §. 656). The [jurative p. (IY)] بـ is (1) [often (IY)] suppressed [514, 651] (M), as أَلْلَهُ لَا أَفْرَمَنَّ with the acc. [651]: (a) they hardly ever suppress this p. in the oath with [expression of] the v.; and do not say أَسْمَ أَلْلَهُ أَحْلِفُ أَلْلَهَ, nor أَسْمَ أَلْلَهُ; but suppress the v. and p. together: (b) analogy requires suppression of the p. first; so that the v., coming in contact with the n., governs it in the acc.: and then the v. is suppressed, by extension [of the suppression], because of the copious circulation of oaths (IY): (c) the sworn-by is then governed in the acc.
by the [jurative (IY)] v. understood (M), vid. أَحْلَفُ, أَقَسْمُ, and the like; for, when they suppress the p., either by poetic license, or for a kind of abbreviation, they make that v. self-trans., as [they make the v.] in VII. 154. and [514] (IY): the poet [Dhur-Rumma (IY, N)] says

َاَلْلَّهُ ﺃُنْتَ ﺍٌلْهَ ﺃُنْتَ ﺍٌلْهَ

[below] (M) Now many a one is there towards whom my heart, (I swear by) God, is sincere! And (many) a one whose heart towards me is among the gazelles coming from the right!, which the Arabs sometimes deem ill-omened, i.e., is running away from me, like the swift gazelles! (N), meaning أَحْلَفُ ﺑِاٍلْلَّهِ (IY); another says نَقْلَتُ ﺑِيِبِينِ أَلْلَهِ [454] (M), orig. أَحْلَفُ ﺑِيِبِينِ أَلْلَهِ (AKB); and another says

إِذَاَمَا الْخَضَرُ تَأَدِّمُهُ ﺑِنَّاْمَةٍ ﺁٍلْلَهِ ﺍٍلْيَرَيدُ

[below] (M) Whenever thou seasonest the bread with meat, then that, (I swear by) God's trust, is the dish called أَحْلَفُ ﺑِاٍلْلَّهِ تَرِيدُ (N), which [last verse], they say, is spurious: (d) if you wish, you understand a trans. v., such as أَذُرُّ I mention, أَشْهَدُ I call to witness, or the like: IS says that only a trans. v. is understood;
but the proper way is the first, because, when you understand a trans. v., it is not of this cat., [i. e., jurative] (IY): (e) the يَمِين and أَمَاَةَةِ [here] are also related in the nom., [فَقَلَتْ يَمِينُ اللَّهِ] Then said I, God's oath (is mine oath, or what I swear by) and فَذَاَلَّ أَمَاَةَةَ اللَّهِ أَلَى then that, God's trust (is binding upon me) (IX),] as inches whose enunc. is suppressed [29, 650, 651] (M), the full phrase being مَا أَقَسَمْ رَبِّي يَمِينُ اللَّهِ أَلَى and similarly أَمَاَةَةَ اللَّهِ كُرْمَةٌ لِي (IY): (2) understood [503, 515, 651] (M), for a kind of abbreviation, because frequently used (IX), like the لَّا أَبُوَّكَ in لَّا أَبُوَّكَ (M) and لَّا أَبُوَّكَ لَّا عَبَّكَ, meaning لَّا أَبُوَّكَ لَّا عَبَّكَ, as لَّا أَبُوَّكَ لَّا عَبَّكَ [508, 206], where the prep. ل and the determinative ل are suppressed, while the rad. ل remains. This is the opinion of S: but is disapproved by Mb, who asserts that the suppressed are the determinative ل and the rad. ل, while the one remaining is the prep. ل, which is pronounced with Fath in order that the ل may not return to ل, and also because the o. f. of the prep. ل is Fath [504]. And sometimes they say لَّا أَبُوَّكَ [206] (IY). When the original jurative p., i. e., the ب, is suppressed, then, if no subst. for it be put [656], the preferable [construction] is the acc. governed by the [supplied] jurative v. [556]. But the word
Allah [below] is exclusively distinguished by allowability of the gen., notwithstanding the suppression of the prep., without compensation [651]. (R). In V. 105. [656], 

*By* God, without prolongation, is transmitted from AshSha'bi (K, B), according to what S mentions, that some of them suppress the jurative prep., and do not put the interrog. Hamza as a compensation for it (K). And the KK allow the gen. in every sworn-by [653], wherefrom the prep. is suppressed, even though it be without compensation, as *الْعَدْنَىْ لَا تَعْلَىْ* (By) *the Ka'ba*, assuredly etc., and *الْبُصَاحَةِ لَا تَبْينَ* (By) *the Holy Book*, assuredly I will come. The inch. whose enunc. is suppressed, if conjoined with the J of inception, as in لَعْبُرَكْ [650], must be in the nom.; and so, says Jz, must [ ] *آيَّسَ آلَّهَيْنِ* [650, 653], even if not conjoined with the J, because of hearsay from them. But every [sworn-by], except the [inch.] conjoined with the J, and except [ ] *آيَّسَ آلَّهَيْنِ* in [650, 653], may be governed in the acc. by the jurative v. understood, as *عَهْدُ آلَّهِ* (I swear by) God's covenant and *الْبُصَاحَةِ* (by) *the Ka'ba* and *الْبُصَاحَةِ* (by) *the Holy Book*, and similarly *يَلَّانَ لَا تَعْلَىْ* (I swear by) Thee, assuredly etc.; and, in such expressions, the acc. is more frequent than the nom.; while *قَفْلَتْ تَبْينَ آلَّهَيْنِ* is related with the nom. and acc. [above]. Jz says that,
in the word الله [above], only the acc. and gen. have been heard; but An allows the nom. also, in accordance with analogy (R). In XXXVIII. 85. [27]

is read with (1) the two حق's (N) in (a) the acc. Then, (I swear by) the truth—and the truth I say, meaning and I say (not aught save) the truth—assuredly I will fill, the first being a sworn-by [wherefrom the jurative p. is suppressed, so that it is governed in the acc. (N)], like in إن علمي الله أن الله Verily incumbent upon thee, (I swear by) God, is that etc. (K), or, in another version, إن علمي الله آله [154]; and like آمنة [in] فدانا آمنة الله آله [above], and [آمنة] الله in [above] (N): (b) the nom., the first being an inch. whose enunc. is suppressed like لُمْرك [above], i.e., فآلي حقَّ تسبى [27]; (c) the gen., Then, (by) the truth, etc., the first being a sworn-by whose jurative p. is understood, like الرحمن أقول الله [503, 515, 651]; while نأول حقَّ : آلل لله لافعلن i.e., And I say (not aught save) الحقَّ, is a lit. imitation of the sworn-by, its sense being corroboration and strengthening: (a) this construction, [by which the second حقَّ is treated as a lit. imitation of the first,] is allowable in the acc. and nom. also; and is a fine,
beautiful construction: (2) the first in the nom. or gen., with the second in the acc., the explanation of which is according to what we have mentioned (K).

§. 656. The is [sometimes] suppressed; while the premonitory $p$. in $لا هَا الله $ [552], the interrog. Hamza in $هَا الله [below], or the disjunction of the conj. Hamza in $هَا الله [651] is put as a compensation for it (M). And they say $يَا هَا الله $ [556] (IY). The word $هَا الله is exclusively distinguished by receiving [the premonitory (AKB)] $ها or the interrog. Hamza as a compensation for the [suppressed] prep. (R). The language of Kh in the CAj, [where he says “The $يَ$ is sometimes, though rarely, changed into $ها$, as $هَا الله$, with the disj. or conj. Hamza, and, in both cases, with retention or elision of the $يَ$.”] apparently means that the $ها$ here is [not a premonitory, but] a jurative $p$. [653]; and that it is a subst. for the $يَ$ [506]: and this is more appropriate, in respect of its freedom from suppression of the prep. with maintenance of its government [515]; while what is mentioned by [R here and] IHsh [652] is more appropriate for the reason that invariability is more suitable for $p$s. (Amr on $ها$). And similarly, in $هَا الله$, disjunction of the Hamza, in the interior [of the phrase], is made a compensation for the prep.; as though the Hamza were elided because of
[the position of the interior in] the interior [669], and were afterwards restored as a compensation for the jurative p. [653]. Z holds these ps. to be subs. for the , perhaps because they are peculiar to the word , like the , [which is a subst. for the , (506, 651, 653)]. When you put the premonitory as a subst. [for the jurative p. (AKB)], you must put the word  after the sworn-by, [whether the be governed in the gen. by the supplied p. (AKB),] as in [552] and [556] (R), meaning (by) God in both [exs.] (AKB); or [by pre. to it (AKB),] as in (R), by Zuhair Ibn Abl Sulmà, threatening AlHārith Ibn Warká aSaidāwī, who had made a raid upon his people, Know thou, now a.surely the life of God, this (is what I swear by), solemnly (being, says Am, governed in the acc. as an inf. n. corrob. of what precedes it, because the sense thereof is I swear): then measure (thy steps) by thy stride, and look where thou enterest (AKB). Apparently the premonitory p. belongs to the dem. [174, 552]; but is made to precede the sworn-by, upon suppression of the p., in order to be a compensation for it. When is prefixed to , there are four modes [of pronunciation]. The
most frequent of them is retention of its ٰ, and elision of the conj. Hamza from ﷴالله; so that two quiescents meet together, the ٰ of ﷴءا, and the first ٰ of ﷱالله (R); and therefore you say ﷴفَالله (IY). Analogy requires elision of the ٰ [of ﷴءا], because such [a concurrence of two quiescents] as that is pardonable only in a single word, like ﷴالصَّالِين I. 7. [539, 663]; while in two words, elision is necessary, as ﷴمَا آلِلَّهُ and ﷴدَرَّسُ اللَّهُ [pronounced ﷴتَدرَّسُ اللَّهُ and ﷴمَا آلِلَّهُ]: but here the ٰ is mostly not elided, in order that it may be a quasi-premonition that the ﷴءا belongs to ﷴءا [below], with elision of the ٰ of ﷴءا, suggests the notion that the ٰ is a subst. for the Hamza of ﷴاللَّه, as in ﷴوَأَّتُهُ لَمْ تُهْرِبْتُ (ibn ٨٠). The second [mode], which is intermediate in rarity and frequency, is ﷴمَا آلِلَّهُ ٰدَا [pronounced ﷴمَا آلِلَّهُ ٰدَا], with elision of the ٰ of ﷴءا, because of the two quiescents, as in ﷴمَا آلِلَّهُ ٰدَا and ﷴمَا آلِلَّهُ ٰدَا [above]. The third, which is below the second in frequency, is [ﷲ ﷴءا] with retention of the ٰ of ﷴءا, and disjunction of the Hamza of ﷴاللَّه [669], notwithstanding its being in the interior [of the phrase], as a premonition that ﷴءا ought to be with ﷴءا, after ﷴاللَّه, in which case the Hamza would not occur in the interior. The fourth, which is transmitted by F, and is the rarest of all, is ﷴءَا آلِلَّهُ with elision of the conj. Hamza [from ﷴاللَّه], and Fath of the ٰ of ﷴءا,
after conversion of it into Hamza, as in ❮I. 7. 665❯. Khl says that ❮665❯ is part of the correl. of the oath; and is enunc. of a suppressed inch., i. e., ❮665❯ (assuredly the matter is) this; or an ag. [of a suppressed v.], i. e., ❮665❯ (assuredly) this (shall be the case) or ❮665❯ (shall not be the case); while the correl. that comes after it, whether aff. or neg., as ❮665❯ Now, (by) God, (assuredly the matter is) this, or (assuredly) this (shall be the case), assuredly I will do or ❮665❯ [Now, (by) God, this (shall not be the case),] I will not do, is a subst. for the first: but that this phrase is not to be taken as a model; so that one does not say ❮665❯, meaning ❮665❯ (assuredly I am) thy brother. But Akh says that ❮665❯ is part of the oath, either an ep. of the ❮665❯, i. e., ❮665❯ (by) This, i. e., the Present, the Overlooking, God; or an inch., whose enunc. is suppressed, i. e., ❮665❯ this (is mine oath): while afterwards the correl. either is put, or is suppressed [650] with a context [indicative of it]. As for the interrog. Hamza [581], it denotes either dis-approval, as in the saying of AlHajjaj about HB ❮665❯ What! (By) God, shall one of my slaves indeed rise up, and say so and so?; or interrogation, as in the saying of the
ment and inquiry, so by the distinction of the Hanaza here, 669] to distinguish between the two matters, announce [two modes] with He made unlawful of the two females [Jesus]. As you proceed in the Hanaza (хи), God, as the scribe, etc. and the may be prayed without a Hanaza of interro-

gation, as [The] Hanaza then (хи), God, assuressly such a thing has taken place? What is this house? and he says: [The] Hanaza: You say to a person „Hast thou sold the outer place, and wherein it follows a proceeded by the

as for distinction of the Hanaza of ср. [т] that is in a part-

and pronunciation of the Hanaza in ср. (К, Р), and

sinners (1X), „If we hide (Р), with pause upon [The]

testimony. What is (хи) God, verily then are we

witted from Abraham (К, Р), [т] that is a reading [т] who was not selected, because of the beauty of (Р), there is a reading [т] not idle, but because of the ambiguity, not preserved, and is not idle, because of the ambiguity; not preserved, and is idle in [т] than ср. and the like [66], 668, 669] frequent mode of pronunciation; if softened, as is the more

When the interro- жа is prayed to ср., the Hanaza is

Is it (хи) God, whom there is no other god said „This is the head of Allāh [т] of Thalif, when the latter

Prophet to Allāh in Maslīd, when the latter

924)
you distinguish between compensation and its omission (IY). The *interrog*. Hamza here is not a compensation for the jurative *p.*; because it is separated from *لا الله* by the *con.* *ف* . But, according to Akh, the *ف* in *ف الله* is *red.* [540]. The proof that these three [things, the *هَا* , the *interrog*. Hamza, and the disjunction of the *conj*. Hamza in *هَا الله* ] are *subs.* is (1) their interchangeability with the jurative *p.* (R): (a) the *ب* , *ف* or the *هَا* may not be combined; so that one does not say *هَا الله* , nor *هَا الله* : and [similarly] the *interrog*. Hamza [or the disjunction of the *conj*. Hamza] is interchangeable, but not combinable, with the jurative *p.* (IY): (2) the inseparability of the *gen.* with them, to the exclusion of the *acc.* ; whereas, without compensation, the *acc.* is more frequent, as before stated [655] (R).

§. 657. It is said that the second *و* , such as *و الله* , *و الله* , *و الله* , *و الله* . By the *forenoon* [650] and the *night* admits of being either copulative or jurative; but the correct [opinion] is the first, otherwise each [oath] would need a *correl.* [506] ; and one thing that makes this manifest is the occurrence of the *ف* in the beginnings of Chapters .LXXVII. and LXXIX. (ML), because, the *ف* there being necessarily a copulative *p.* , the *ف* here must be so (DM). When the *ف* is repeated
after the jurative, as in [539], while some say that it is the jurative, [506]. But the first [opinion] is stronger, (1) because, if the , were jurative, it would be a subst. for the [506, 653]; and would not import coupling, and connection of the second sworn-by, and what follows it, with the first: but the passage would be constructively

\[
\text{أَفْسَمُ بِاللَّهِ أَفْسَمُ بِالنَّهَارِ أَفْسَمُ بِنَا}
\]

I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created; so that there would be three oaths, each of them independent; and, a correl. being indispensable for each oath [650], three correl. would be required: while, if we say that two correl. are suppressed, the remaining one being deemed sufficient, then [the reply is that] suppression is contrary to the o. f.: and therefore it only remains for us to say that the oath is one thing, and the sworn-by three; while the oath, not the sworn-by, is the requirer of the correl.; so that one correl. suffices it, and the passage reads as though

\[
\text{أَفْسَمُ بِاللَّهِ وَالنَّهَارِ وَمَا خَلَقَ إِنَّ الْحَي}
\]
swear by the night, and the day, and That Which hath created, verily etc., were said: and (2) because you say, displaying the coupling, 

By God, then God, assuredly I will do and 

By Thy life, again Thy life, assuredly etc. 

[134, 540]; but do not say 

أَقِمْ يَا لَّهُ أَقِمْ يَا لَّهُ لَا تَتَّقِنَّ 

I swear by God, I swear by the Prophet, assuredly etc.; while conformity to what is authorized in their language is more proper. An objection to its being the copulative, is taken on the ground that this entails a coupling [of two regs.] to [two regs. of] two [different] ops. [with one p.], because 

الْيَتْرَبُّوْنَ 

is then coupled to 

الْيَتْرَبُّوْنَ 

while the con. is one [533] (R), by means of which [131] you govern. the acc. and the gen., as in 

I passed yesterday by Zaid, and to-day 'Amr (K on XCI. 4). Z replies by saying [in the K on XCI. 4] that the, is a quasi-compensation for the jurative p. and v. together, because the v. is not mentioned with it [506 653, 654], on account of its frequent usage in the oath; so that, not being combined with the v., it is a quasi-compensation for the v. also, as it is for the p.; and thus 

الْيَتْرَبُّوْنَ 

is, as it were, coupled to [two regs. of] a single op., vid. the, [in 

زَأَلْلَّهُ إِذَا يَقِيمُ ]

But, according to this, says I, he must
disallow. Is wear by the night when it covereth, and the day when it becometh clear; whereas the Kur has LXXXI. 15-17. [538], where, though the passage does not involve [a coupling to] two regs., still the in אֲחִילָהְוֹ אִפְּרַכְתִּי, being a subst. for אֱשָׁמַךְ and the בֵּ, does, as it were, govern the gen. and the acc., which is the [contingency] feared: and, says he, the reason why this [construction] is allowable [in XCII. 1—3.] is only that it is like Verily in the house etc. [1, 538]. According to our suggestion [below], however, that the full phrase is עַלְמַךְ אֵלִילִי אִפְּרַכְתִּי. By (the greatness of) the night when it covereth, the op. of אֵלִילִי, and likewise of אִפְּרַכְתִּי, is really the supplied [inf. n.] עַלְמַךְ [331], for which the, acts as a subst.; and this is a single op., the phrase being constructively עַלְמַךְ אֵלִילִי. By (the greatness of) the night at the time of its retiring [or rather עַלְמַךְ אִפְּרַכְתִּי at the time of its covering], so that the op. of the gen. and acc. is one (R). It is said that the אִפְּרַכְתִּי [that follows the oath] in such as XCII. 1. [204, 498] does not contain the sense of condition, since the correl. of the condition either comes after it, or is indicated by what precedes it [419]; while the אִפְּרַכְתִּי here is not followed by anything, expressed
or supplied, suitable for being a correl.; nor preceded by anything indicative of a correl. of a condition, except the oath: so that, if ]a[ were cond., the phrase would be constructively when it covereth, (I swear), the oath not being absolute, but dependent upon the covering of the night, which is the opp. of what is intended. If one says "Then, since ]a[ is a bare adv., what governs it in the acc.?", I reply that ]a[ may be said, not improbably, to be an adv. to the sense of greatness and majesty indicated by the oath, because one does not swear by any thing except because of its great state [650]; so that ]a[ is dependent upon the supplied inf. n., according to what we have mentioned [342], vid. that the inf. n., on being strongly indicated, may govern when supplied [498], and especially in the case of the adv., which is satisfied with a tinge, and suspicion, of the v. [294, 342], as is notorious; and therefore the full phrase is [above], like I marvel at Zaid, when he rides, i. e., at his greatness, where greatness is understood, because one does not marvel except at what is great in some sense, as one does not swear except by what is great in some sense or other (R on the Uninflected Adverbs).
CHAPTER V.

THE ALLEVIATION OF THE HAMZA.

§. 658. The Hamza is a hard, heavy letter, uttered from the farthest part of the throat (ΙΥ, Jrb). It is a rising in the chest, produced with an effort, being the farthest letter in outlet [732]; and that is heavy upon them, because it is like vomiting (S). Since the Hamza is the innermost letter in the throat, [and has a disagreeable rising, that acts like vomiting (R),] its pronunciation is [deemed (ΙΥ)] heavy (ΙΥ, R) upon the tongue (R), since its utterance is like retching (ΙΥ); and therefore, [because of that heaviness (ΙΥ, Jrb),] alleviation of it is permitted (ΙΥ, R, Jrb) by some people (R), for a sort of improvement (Jrb). Alleviation is the dial. of most of the inhabitants of AdHijaz [641, 642], and [especially (R)] of Kuraish (ΙΥ, R, Jrb). The Commander of the Believers, 'Alî (God honor his face!), is reported to have said: "The Kurân came down in the language of Kuraish, who are not fond of raising the voice; and, were it not that Gabriel (peace be upon him!) brought down the Hamza to the Prophet (God bless him, and give him peace!), we should not pronounce it." But others sound it true (R). Sounding true is the dial. of Tamm and Kais (ΙΥ, Jrb), who pronounce it [fully], like the rest of the letters (Jrb). Sounding true is the ι, as in the rest of the letters.
and alleviation is a [sort of (IY)] improvement (IY, R), because of the heaviness of the Hamza (IY). It is common to the three kinds [625]. There are three modes of alleviating: the Hamza, (1) change; (2) elision; (3) putting it betwixt and between [211], i.e., between its outlet [732] and the outlet of the consonant that its vowel is connected with (M). The original [mode] is betwixt-and-between, because it is an alleviation with remanence of the Hamza to some extent; then change, because it is a removal of the Hamza with compensation; and then elision, because it is a removal of the Hamza without compensation (Jrb). Change [of the Hamza] is cessation of its rising, so that it becomes soft; and then passes into ۳ or ۵, according to its vowel, or the vowel of what precedes it. And, for that reason, Mb. used to omit it from the letters of the alphabet, and not reckon it with them, but make the first of them the م, saying: "The Hamza does not remain uniform, nor do I reckon it with the letters whose ways are known, remembered." Elision is emission of it from the expression altogether [663]. And putting it betwixt and between means [putting it] between Hamza and the consonant that its vowel is connected with, so that you put it between Hamza and ل when it is pronounced with Fath, between Hamza and ۳, when it is pronounced with Damm, and between Hamza and ۵ when it is pronounced with
Kasr (IY). Betwixt-and-between is [said by some authorities to be (R)] of two kinds (R, Jrb), (1) well known (Jrb), [vid.] what has been mentioned [above by Z and IV] (R), i.e., between Hamza and the consonant of its vowel, as you say سْكُل was asked, between Hamza and ى (Jrb): (2) [not well known, i.e. (Jrb),] between Hamza and the consonant of the vowel of what precedes it (R, Jrb), as you say سْكُل was asked, between Hamza and ى (Jrb). This second [kind, commonly called "strange,"] is, even according to the saying of these authorities, not found in every position; but [only] in specified positions, as in سْكُل and مَسْتَهْرِدُوْن [below], as will be mentioned (R). According to the Kk, the Hamza of betwixt-and-between is quiescent; but, according to us, it is mobilized with a weak vowel inclined towards the quiescent. In most cases, therefore, it does not occur, except where the quiescent may occur; so that it does not occur in the beginning of the sentence (Jrb). The condition of alleviation is that the Hamza should not be inceptive (SH). By its [not] being inceptive [667] IH does not mean that it should [not] be in the beginning of the word, because it is alleviated in the beginning of the word, by elision, as in XXIII. 1. [16, 647]; and conversion, as in VI. 70. [below]: but he means that it should [not] be in the beginning of the sentence [above], in which case it is not alleviated.
because its change is regulated by the vowel of what precedes it, and similarly its elision is [effected] after transfer of its vowel to what precedes it, and likewise the strange betwixt-and-between is regulated by the vowel of what precedes it; whereas, in the beginning of the sentence, nothing precedes it: and, as for the well-known betwixt-and-between, [it also is impracticable in the beginning of the sentence, because] its Hamza approximates to the quiescent; whereas the inceptive [letter] is neither quiescent, nor approximate thereto [667]. Nor is the Hamza, in the beginning of the sentence, alleviated in any other mode than these three, because the inceptive [letter] is light, since heaviness is in the finals. In some positions, indeed, the Hamza, in the beginning of the sentence, is converted into ّ, as in ْهَيْتَانَ ْهَبْرُّدُتْ, and ْهَبْرُّدُتْ, [690] ْهَبْرُّدُتْ; but that is an anomalous conversion (R). The Hamza is either one [658, 660] or two [659, 661, 662] (Jrb). And, [if one (Jrb),] it is [either (R, Jrb)] quiescent or mobile (SH). The quiescent Hamza is of one kind, being preceded only by a mobile, because two quiescents do not come together [663]; unless indeed the [mobile] Hamza, when preceded by a quiescent, be made quiescent for pause [642], its predicament in which case will be mentioned [below]. The vowel of what precedes the quiescent Hamza is (1) in the same word as the Hamza, which is then (a) in
the middle, as in رأس [and I read (II)], well, and believer; (b) at the end, as in لم يقرأ ولم يكن I did not read, and لم يكن I was not bad, and لم يكن I did not teach reading: (2) not [in the same word], as in إلى الهدى أتَنا VI. 70. To guidance, [saying to him (K, B),] "Come thou unto us," آلذى أَوْقِين Al. 283. [Then let] him that hath been entrusted [repay], and يَقُول أَكْذُن لى IX. 49. That saith "Give me leave" (R). Th quiescent [Hamza] is changed into the consonant of the vowel of what precedes it, [i. e., is converted into ٰ if precedes by Fatha, into ى if preceded by Kasra, and into ٰ if preceded by Damma (Jrb, MASH),] as رأس [and ٰ I was evil; [and لم يقرأ ولم يكن VI. 70. [below], إلى الهدى أتَنا II. 283., and يَقُول أَكْذُن IX. 49. (SH): whether the quiescent Hamza and the preceding mobile be in one word, as in رأس [and I was evil, 1st pers. pret. of سأ, aor. يَسَوَّر; or in two words, as in VI. 70., II. 283., and IX. 49. (Jrb): [and whether the Hamza be in the middle, as in ٰ وأب [and ٰ I was evil, and ٰ ٰ I was evil, and ٰ ٰ I was evil; or at the end, as in ٰ وأب ٰ ولم يقرأ ولم يكن ٰ ولم يكن: their predicament being one (MASH): because the unsond letter is lighter than Hamza (R, MASH), and
especially when the vowel of the letter before the Hamza is homogeneous with the unsound letter (R). The Hamza is not put betwixt and between, since it has no vowel, between whose consonant and Hamza it might be put. Nor is it elided (R, MASH), because there would remain nothing to indicate it (MASH); since Hamza is elided only after its vowel is thrown upon the preceding [consonant], to be an indication of it; while the vowel is thrown only upon the quiescent, not upon the mobile (R). In VI. 70. [above], the conj. Hamza is elided from the beginning of the imp. [669]; and then, two quiescents coming together, the ٌ of ٍالْهَدْئِى is elided [663]; so that the expression becomes ٍإِلَى ٍالْهَدْئِئْىْبَا with a quiescent Hamza after the ُ; and then the Hamza is converted into ١: [similarly,] in II. 283., the conj. Hamza is elided [669], and then the ى of ٍالْهَدْئِى [663]; so that the expression becomes ٍالْهَدْئِئْىْبِنَ, with a quiescent Hamza after the ُ; and then the Hamza is converted into ى: and, in IX. 49., the conj. Hamza is elided [669], so that the expression becomes ٌيُقْرِئُوْىَكَنَ; and then the Hamza is converted into ٌي. Having finished with the quiescent Hamza, IH [now] begins upon the mobile (Jrb). The mobile Hamza is [of two kinds, being (R)] preceded by either a quiescent or a mobile (R, Jrb). If it be preceded by a quiescent, then that
quiescent is either in the same word as the Hamza, or in another word; and, if in the same word, is either a sound or an unsound letter; and, if an unsound letter, is either a ١ or ی, or an !; and, if a ١ or ی, is either aug. or rad.; and, if aug., is either non-coordinative or coordinative (Jrb). The mobile [Hamza (R, Jrb)], if preceded by a quiescent, (1) when the quiescent is a non-coordinative aug. ١ or ی, is converted into a ١ or ی, respectively; and, [when so converted (Jrb),] has the preceding ی or ی incorporated into it, as ١ خبطیة [orig. خبطیة fault (Jrb)]; ١ مقرؤة, [orig. مقرؤة read (Jrb)]; and ١ أَفُسُس(AH), orig. أَفُسُس (Jrb), dim. of أَفَوَس۝ pl. of أَفِسَنَات axe (R, Jrb): (a) the alleviation here is by change, which is prescribed because betwixt-and-between is not possible, since its Hamza is approximate to the quiescent; so that it would entail a concurrence of two quiescents, what precedes the Hamza being quiescent: nor [is] elision [possible], by transfer of the vowel of the Hamza to what precedes it, because of their dislike to mobilizing a consonant that has no right to a vowel; while mobilization of it is rendered unnecessary by recourse to conversion, which, as above shown, is superior to elision: (b) this [alleviation by] conversion and incorporation is merely allowable (Jrb); and the saying [of some GG (Jrb)] that it is obligatory in یِبی
prophet and creation [278] is incorrect, because with Hamza is read by Nāfi' in the whole of the Kur, and with Hamza by Nāfi' and Ibn Dhakwān (Jrb); but it is frequent (SH) in them (Jrb): S says (R), change is made obligatory in them [even] by those who [ordinarily] sound [the Hamza] true; [and this is not done to every thing like them, being only learnt by hearsay (S)]: but, [says he (R),] it has reached us that some [inhabitants of AlHijāz (S)], who sound [the Hamza] true, say  and ; though that is rare, corrupt (S, R), meaning “rare, corrupt” in the language of the Arabs, not “corrupt” in analogy, it being authorized among the Seven Readings; and similarly he holds alleviation to be obligatory in the inf. n., like prophecy, prophetic office: but IH, seeing that and with Hamza are authorized among the Seven, decides that alleviation of them is not obligatory; and similarly with Hamza occurs among the Seven: whereas S holds that to be corrupt, notwithstanding its being so read; and perhaps, according to him, the Seven Readings are not canonical, otherwise he would not decide that to be corrupt which [by its canonicity] would be authenticated as part of the noble, ancient Kurān, far above corruptness! (R): (2) when the quiescent is an! , is alleviated by the well-known betwixt-and-between
(SH): so that you put it between Hamza and І, if the Hamza be pronounced with Fath, as in سأَلَلْ questioned and قَرَأْتُ reading; between Hamza and ی, if it be pronounced with Damm, as in قَسَأْلُ asking one of another and تَلَوَّم reconciliation; and between Hamza and ی, if it be pronounced with Kasr, as in قَأْلُ sayer [below] and بَآْعَل seller: (a) elision by transfer of the vowel to the І is disallowed, because І does not receive a vowel; and conversion with incorporation is disallowed, because І is not incorporated, nor incorporated into [739] (Jrb); while the strange betwixt-and-between is not possible, since what precedes the Hamza has no vowel: so that no mode remains but the well-known betwixt-and-between, [which is allowable,] because its Hamza, though it approximates to the quiescent, is in every case mobile; while recourse to this [mode] is compulsory, when alleviation is intended, because the doors of the other modes of alleviation are closed (R): (3) when the quiescent is a sound letter (SH), as in مَّسَأَلَةْ question and ۡحَبَّ [641, 642] (Jrb), or an unsound letter other than that [ І or non-coordinative aug. І, or ی, vid. a rad. ی, or ی, as in ۡسُرَ ِء evil and ۡشَيۡء thing, or a coordinative aug. ۡی, or ی, as in ۡجَوَابَة Jau'aba, name of a water, and ۡجِيَلَ the she-hyena, where the ی and ی are for coordination with ۡجُفُّرَرِّ (392) (Jrb)], has its vowel transferred
thereeto, and is elided, as مَسَّة [663] and حَبَّ [below], شَيٌّ and سُر [below], and جَبْرَة and جَيْل [360] (SH), because elision of the Hamza is most effective in alleviation; while one appurtenance of the Hamza remains to indicate it, vid. its vowel transferred to the preceding quiescent (Jrb); (a) the Hamza is not put betwixt and between, lest a quasi-concurrence of two quiescents be entailed, the Hamza being put betwixt and between only in a position where a quiescent would be allowable in its place, except with the I alone, as in قَآْل [above], as we have mentioned, because of the compulsion [before noted]; nor do they change it into an unsound letter, without, or after, transfer of its vowel, because, says S, they dislike to include these words among the formations having ج and ق [for their جَس (S)]: (b) the KK and some of the BB, like AZ, allow conversion of the Hamza into an unsound letter, without transfer of its vowel, in various ways, without rule or system, saying رَفْ رَسْل for سَرَفْ نَفْل جُنَّات I darned, as they say, in the case of the quiescent Hamza preceded by a mobile, رَفْ وَ رَفْ وَ for رَفْ وَ and نَشَأَتْ for نَشَأَتْ I grew up, and تَرَى I read; but all of this, according to S, is corrupt: (c) the KK allow as regular the conversion of the Hamza pronounced with Fath, exclusively, into I , after transfer of its vowel to the preceding
quiescent, as كَبِئْسَةٌ مُّرَأَةٌ for woman and truffles (S)); and S transmits that, but says that it is rare: (d) transfer of the vowel is not allowable in the conj. of إِنَّطَرَ was bent, or curved, because they require the ن of إِنْفِعَلَ [491] to be invariably quiescent (R): (e) [all of] this is when the quiescent is in the same word as the Hamza (Jrb); and, [if it be not, then also the vowel of the Hamza is transferred to the quiescent, and the Hamza is elided, whether the quiescent be an unsound, or a sound, letter (Jrb.)] as أَبُو يَوْبَ [for أَبُو يَوْبَ the father of Job (Jrb)], [for أَبُو يَوْبَ the author of their matter (Jrb)], [for أَبُو يَوْبَ I seek for his matter (Jrb)], and قَاضِرَ بِيَكَ (SH) for the judges of thy father; and similarly مَنْ أَبُوَّ بِيَكَ Who is thy father?, مَنْ أَبُوَّ مَنْ أَمْكَ for Who is thy mother?, مَنْ أَمْكَ for كَمْ يَلُكَ How many are thy camels? (Jrb): (f) the cat. of سُؤُلٍ سُؤُلٍ [above] also occurs incorporated (SH), as مَهَّلُ سُؤُلٍ and سُؤُلٍ (MASH), the non-aug and i being assimilated to the aug., as in مَهَّلُ وَ خَطْيَةٌ [above], and incorporated, like them [into the converted Hamza]; but the well-known [mode of alleviation] is the first (Jrb): (g) that [transfer of the vowel with elision of the Hamza (Jrb)] is (a) obligatory in the cat. of يَرَى
sees, [orig. يَرَى, like يَرُتْي grazes (Jrb),] and of oْرَى shows, from frequency (SH) of usage (Jrb), since يْرَى, according to the o.f., is hardly ever used as aor. of رَأى saw, or أْرَى as pret. and aor. in the conjug. of إِنْفَعَلُ (MASH); contrary to يَنْتَى goes far away, [aor. of نَأى (Jrb),] and to أْنْتَى sent far away and يَنْتَى sends far away (SH), which are treated like other words as regards allowability of alleviation, because they are not so frequent as يَا, etc. (Jrb): (α) every word composed of أْرَى, whether from رَأى sight, أْرَى knowledge, opinion, or رَاى vision, dream, when you prefix another letter to it, for the formation of its paradigm, and its, is quiescent, must have its Hamza elided, after transfer of the vowel thereof [to the quiescent أْرَى], from frequency of usage, except أْرَى aspect, مَرأى outward appearance, and مرأى mirror; but in poetry such as

عَرى عَينَيُّ مَا كَلِمَ تَرَايَةُ * كَلَالَا عَالِمٌ بِالْتَرْهَابِ

(by Surāka Ibn Mirdas alAzdi. alBārīkī, I make mine eyes see what they have not seen: each of us is knowing in falsehoods (SM),] sometimes occurs: (β) the Hamza [of أْرَى, when conjoined] with the interrog. Hamza, is often elided, notwithstanding the mobility of what precedes it, in such as أْرَى [below], as [will be]
mentioned (R): (b) frequent in the cat. of اسم ask, [orig. اسم (Jrb),] because of the two Hamzas (SH): (α) they transfer the vowel of the second Hamza to the س; and dispense with the conj. Hamza [428] (Jrb), because of the mobility of what follows it (Mb): and that, say the GG, is more frequent than جر bellow for الجار (Jrb): (β) اسم being used more frequently than such as اسم, its alleviation, by transfer of the vowel of its [second] Hamza to the preceding [letter], and elision of the [same] Hamza, is frequent, contrary to such as اسم; but, if the alleviation were frequent, [as IH suggests,] because of the two Hamzas only, اسم would be like it: (γ) IH says that, after transfer of the vowel of the [second] Hamza to the س, and elision of the [same] Hamza, elision of the conj. Hamza [also] is obligatory [660], although the vowel of the س is accidental, because what requires alleviation to be frequent in اسم is the combination of two Hamzas; while the [second] Hamza اسم is [constructively] remaining [in اسم], since its vowel is remaining upon the س; so that the conj. Hamza is necessarily elided: (δ) Sf says that one of the GG, meaning Akh, transmits اسم, like اسم [660]; but states that what he transmits is vitiated by [the fact] that no one says اسم They fought together
Reject thou [664]: and he distinguishes between إِنْسَنْ and الْحَمْزَةُ by [saying] that the س [in the latter] is orig. mobile, as in سَأَلَ asked; whereas the determinative ل [in the former] is orig. quiescent: while S says that the distinction between them is that the Hamza of the determinative ل resembles the disj. Hamza of أَحْمَرُ in being pronounced with Fathā when inceptive [668]; and in being retained in interrogation, as سُلَيْلُ [669], and in [the voc.] يَا للهُ [52] also (R). Here begins the explanation of the mode of pausing upon the final Hamza, which is mobile in continuity. A similar explanation has not been indicated in the case of the quiescent [Hamza], because, in respect of alleviation, the predicament of the final Hamza quiescent in continuity is the same in the state of pause as in that of continuity (Jrb). The final mobile Hamza is paused upon either according to the method of those who sound [the Hamza] true, or according to the method of those who alleviate [it]. The predicament of the first [method] has been fully explained in the chapter on Pause [641, 642]. And the second method is first to alleviate the Hamza, because the state of continuity is anterior to that of pause, while the heaviness of the Hamza is realized in the state of continuity. The Hamza is therefore alleviated according to the proper mode, which, [when the Hamza is not...
preceded by an ٰ۰ ] is either transfer and elision, as in ﴿５۰﴾ [above]; or conversion and incorporation, as in ﴿۰۰﴾ free and ﴿۰۰﴾ مَقْرُورٌ [above]: so that ﴿۰﴾ خَبَر remains, with the ٰ ٰ ب mobile, like ﴿۰﴾ دَمَّ blood; and is then paused upon with mere quiescence, or with Raum, Ishmām, or reduplication ﴿۰۱﴾ ٰ۰, ٰ۰﴾ [641, 642]; and ﴿۰﴾ ٰ۰ and ﴿۰﴾ مَقْرُورٌ remain, [with the ٰ or ٰ ] doubled; and are then paused upon with quiescence, Raum, or Ishmām: while the alleviation of ﴿۰﴾ ٰ۰ and ﴿۰﴾ ٰ۰ in [above] is, as we have mentioned, by transfer and elision, which is the o. f.; or by conversion and incorporation, according to the saying of some; and, in either case, quiescence, Raum, or Ishmām is allowable; but not reduplication ﴿۰﴾ ٰ۰. This is [the rule of pause after alleviation] when the Hamza is not preceded by an ٰ: but, if the final Hamza be preceded by an ٰ, then, as we have mentioned, the alleviation is by the well-known betwixt-and-between: and, when you have so alleviated it, and afterwards mean to pause upon it, then, (1) if you observe, and retain, in pause, the alleviation that was in the state of continuity, vid. the well-known betwixt-and-between, only pause with Raum is allowable, because reduplication of the Hamza is not allowable [640]; while with mere quiescence and Ishmām; which also is quiescence, betwixt-and-between is not allowable, because betwixt-and-between is not found
except with something of the vowel: (2) if you do not observe in pause the alleviation of continuity, and mean [to employ] the well-known mode of pause, vid. quiescence, you reduce the Hamza, that was orig. mobile, but after the alleviation is put betwixt and between, to quiescence, the concurrence of two quiescents being allowable, because it is in pause [663]; and then, the alleviation of betwixt-and-between being annulled by the reduction of the Hamza to quiescence, you intend [to employ] another [mode of] alleviation; while elision is not practicable, since that occurs only with transfer of the vowel to what precedes the Hamza, whereas no vowel is transferred to the ٧; so that nothing remains but conversion of the quiescent Hamza into ٧, because the preceding ٧ is like Fatha; and thus it becomes like [the ٧ in] لَمْ يَقْرَا [above]: but, in addition to quiescence, neither Raum nor Ishmām is allowable, because the vowel was upon the letter for which this ٧ is a substant., not upon the ٧ [itself], so that the latter should be pronounceable with Raum or Ishmām, as we said of pause upon the ّ of feminization [640]; and also because Raum is [achieved] by retaining part of the vowel, whereas the pure ٧ does not admit of that. This [second] mode, I mean pause with quiescence, and [with] conversion of the Hamza into ٧, is more frequent in this cat. than [the first mode, i. e.,] pause with Raum by putting the Hamza betwixt
and between. And, when you convert into † the Hamza, which is preceded by an †, you may (1) retain the two † s, because two quiescents are admissible in pause; and then you draw a long sign of prolongation, supposed to represent two † s: (2) slide one of them, because of the combination of two likes; and then you draw a short sign of prolongation, supposed to represent one †. But, if the [n. whose final is] Hamza be an acc. pronounced with Tanwin, the Hamza is not final; so that these varieties are not found in it; but the Tanwin is converted into †, as † دعاء prayer and † عشاء nightfall [640] (R).

The discussion is [still] upon the mobile Hamza (Jrb). If it be preceded by a mobile, it is [of (Jrb)] nine [kinds (Jrb)], being pronounced with Fāṭ, Kasr, or Damm, and, in each case, preceded by [any of] the three [vowels], as (1) سأل asked, (2) مائة hundred, (3) مرجول limited [661], (4) ستم was disgusted [661], (5) مستهزئين scoffers, (6) سئل was asked, (7) سوف pitiful, (8) مس꺼ب heads (SH). And the predicament mentioned in the case of the [Hamza] attached [to the preceding mobile] holds equally good in the case of the detached, the exs. of which are (1) قَال أَحَمَد said, (2) بَعَلَم أَبِيك by the manservant of thy father, (3) يَا هَذَا غَلَام أَبِيك Verily this is the manservant of thy father, (4) قَال اِبْرَاهِيم Ibrāhīm said,
by the manservant of Ibrāhīm, (6)

This is the property of Ibrāhīm, (7)

verily the manservant of thy sister, (8)

by the manservant of thy sister, (9)

This is the property of thy sister, (R).

The regular mode [of alleviation] in its case is betwixt-and-between, because this involves alleviation of the Hamza with a remnant of its effect, to be an indication that the o.f. of the word is [with] Hamza. But betwixt-and-between is not possible in two cases, vid. when the Hamza is pronounced with Fath, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Du'mm, as in مَرْجَلْ; or Kasr, as in مَانَة: because, in the well-known betwixt-and-between, the Hamza would approximate to an ِ preceded by Du'mma or Kasra, which is disliked (Jrb). When you intend to alleviate the Hamza, whether it be attached [to the preceding mobile] or detached, then, (1) if pronounced with Fath, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in مَاثَرْ, it is converted into a pure ی, because of the impracticability of eliding it, since it is elided only after transfer of the vowel, whereas no vowel is transferred to a mobile: while softening [below] also is impracticable, since the Hamza would become [intermediate] between Hamza and ِ; so that, as the occurrence of ِ after Kasra is impossible,
they do not allow the similitude of the to also to occur after it: (2) if pronounced with Fatḥ, and preceded by a letter pronounced with ʿAmm, as in موجل, it is converted into a pure ʿ, for a reason like what we have mentioned in the case of ماتا [above]. There remain seven exs., in all of which, according to S, the Hamza is softened by the well-known betwixt-and-between: not by elision, because what precedes it is mobile: nor by conversion, as in the two exs., because the intention to alleviate is realized by the softening of the Hamza betwixt and between, while the general rule is that a letter should not be excluded from its natural constitution; whereas, in the two exs., conversion is quasi-compulsory, as we have mentioned. The meaning of "softening" [the Hamza] is pronouncing it between Hamza and the consonant of its vowel, and making the vowel, that is upon it, slurred, soft; so that the Hamza is quasi-quiescent, although you do not [actually] make it quiescent. And, for this reason, the Hamza preceded by a quiescent is not softened, lest there be a quasi-combination of two quiescents: though indeed that [quasi-combination] is allowable, when recourse to it is compulsory, vid. when the Hamza is preceded by an ʿ [above], because the remaining modes of alleviation are [then] impracticable, as we have mentioned; and because the ʿ [663], being a letter of prolongation more frequently than the rest of the soft letters, is available, like
the mobile, as a support [for the quiescent after it], as
will be seen] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two
Quiescents. The KK hold that the softened [Hamza] is
[actually] quiescent. But S adduces an irresistible
argument for its mobilization, vid. that, when following
a quiescent, it is softened, in poetry, in the position
where, if two quiescents were combined, [the metre of
(MAR)] the verse would be broken, as in the saying
of AlA'ishâ.

أَلَّا رَأَيْتُ رَجُلًا أَعْشَى أَضْرَبَيْنَِّي ۖ رَبِّ أَلْسَنِيَّ وَذَهَرَ مَتَسَلَّلَ خَيْبٌ
(R) Is it because she has seen [me to be] a man blind,
by night, whom the vicissitudes of fortune, and a
destructive, disordered, time, have afflicted? (MAR).
But, according to Akh, [the Hamzas in] the seven [exs.]
are softened with the well-known betwixt-and-between,
except two of them, the one pronounced with Damm,
and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in
II. 13. 661]; and the one pronounced with Kasr, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm,
as in سَيِّلٌ [661]: the first, says he, being converted into
a pure ى، [as مُسْتَهِبَّرَنُ ى]; and the second into a pure ى،
[as سُؤُلٌ]: since, if they were softened, the first would
be like the quiescent ى، which does not occur after
Kasra; and the second like the quiescent ى، which does
not occur after Damma; as the ى does not occur after
Damma or Kasra. And some, in the case of such as
and have recourse to the strange betwixt-and-between, [saying سَلَّ and مَستَهْرَنَّونَ, as above mentioned]; while this opinion also is attributed by some to Akh. Those who venture upon this mode of softening here, strange, extraordinary though it be, do so only to escape from the charge incurred by S in the well known betwixt-and-between, [vid. the occurrence of the similitude of a quiescent عَلَى after Kasra, and of the similitude of a quiescent ی after Damma,] as before mentioned; and from the charge incurred by Akh, vid. the occurrence of the pure ی mobilized by Kasr after Damma in سُلَّ, and of the pure ی mobilized by Damm after Kasra in مَستَهْرَنَّونَ: such [an occurrence] being eschewed in their language. But, as to [the Hamzās in] the remaining five [exs.], there is no dispute that the well-known betwixt-and-between is [prescribed] in their case. The Hamza is sometimes changed into ل, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Fath, as سَلَّ asked; into a quiescent عَلَى, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Damm, as رُسُل heads; and into a quiescent ی, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Kasr, as مَستَهْرَنَّونَ scoffers [below].

This, says S, is not an undeviating rule: but is confined to hearsay, [being only remembered from the Arabs, as one remembers the word for whose ی is substituted.
like أَرْكَبْتُ أَرَكَبْتُ أَرَكَبْتُ for أَرْكَبْتُ أَرَكَبْتُ أَرَكَبْتُ; whereas you do not say أَرَكَبْتُ أَرَكَبْتُ أَرَكَبْتُ. I rendered eager (R). And hence أَرَكَبْتُ أَرَكَبْتُ أَرَكَبْتُ [659], orig. مَنْسَأَةُ staff (S). In metric exigency, however, says he, that is regular, as

[by AlFarazdaq, The mules have gone away with Mslama at evening. Then graze your camels, Fazāra. May the pasture not be pleasant to you! (N)],

[by Zaid Ibn 'Amr Ibn Nufail alKurashi al'Adawi, They (his two wives) have asked me for divorce, because they have seen me to be such that my wealth has become small. Ye (an enallage from the 3rd pers. to the 2nd) have brought to me an unseemly matter (AKB)],

(R), by Hassān, Hudhail asked of the Apostle of God a lewd boon. Hudhail erred in what it asked, and did not right (N). For سَأَلْتُ I asked, [aor. أَسَالُ, like أَفْسَدْتُ I feared, aor. أَفْسَدْتُ (Mb),] does not belong to the div. of these [poets]: nor does سَأَلَ He asked, aor.

[below] (S); or هُمَا يَسَأَلُونَ They two ask, one of
another (Mb). It has reached me that Thou askedst, aor. تسال, is a dial. var. (S); and Am says that it is a recognized dial. var., [being the dial. of Kuraish (K, B), who say سبت, aor. تسال, and همًا يُتَسْأَلُانِ They two ask, one of another (K),] in accordance with which is the reading [of Nāfi' and Ibn 'Amir (B)] سَأَلَ سَأَلَ الْآخِرَ LXX. 1. [503] (AKB); and [the author of the KF says that] سَأَلَ, aor. يُخَافُ, like He feared, aor. يَخَافُ, is said, and همًا يَتَسْأَلُانِ [above] (KF). S cites, among [the exs. of] what is not allowable out of poetry, except by hearsay, the saying of the poet [‘Abd Ar-Rahmān Ibn Ḥassān (S, N)]

وَكُنتَ أَذَلَّ مِنْ رُتَّبِ يَقَاعِ # يُشَجِّعُ لِهِ مِنْ أَلْفِهِ رَأْجِي (R) And thou wouldst be viler than a tent-peg in a plain, whose head a hammerer batters with the stone, meaning # (N). But this, says IH, which is the truth, is not an instance of that, being regular, [contrary to the opinion of S (SH),] because رَأْجِي is the end of the verse; and, this being paused upon, the final of the word is a quiescent Hamza preceded by Kasra, as in كُمْ يُقَرِّي [above], the rule of which is to be alleviated by being made into ي, in, or out of, poetry. When, indeed,
such as بـِرَِّٰلْوَاجِيَ يَا فَتى I passed by the hammerer, O youth, the Hamza being made a quiescent ی, [as in مُسْتَهْرِسِن above,] then it belongs to this cat. S lays down unrestrictedly that the Hamza, which, according to those who alleviate, is put betwixt and between, is converted into ی when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Fath, into ی when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Kasr, and into , when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Damm: but the truth is that one should restrict this, as IY does, by saying "The Hamza is [sometimes] converted into ی when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Fath, into ی when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Kasr, and into , when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Damm", as above expressed. IY, however, does not restrict the , and ی, that the Hamza is converted into, by quiescence; but it is more proper to say "a quiescent ی," and "a quiescent ی", as we have done above. According to this, then, [the Hamza in] such as لَوً was base or مِسْتَهْرِسِن [above] is not converted into ی, either in, or out of, poetic exigency; nor [the Hamza in] such as مَسْتَهْرِسِن or مِتَانة into a quiescent ی; nor [the Hamza in] such as مُوَجَّل or سَتَلِ with a quiescent ی. Sf says "Among the anomalies that occur are the following:—(1) some
transfer the vowel of the detached Hamza [below] to the final of the preceding word mobilized with an uninflectional vowel, as قَالَ سَكَانُ Ishaĥ said and Usâma said: whereas, if the vowel [of the preceding final] be inflectional, the vowel of the Hamza is not transferred; so that you do not say يَقُولُ سَكَانُ Ishaĥ says or لَن يَقُولُ سَمَّةَ Usâma shall not say, from respect for the vowel of inflection: (2) some elide the [detached] Hamza [below], without transfer of its vowel to the final of the [preceding] word, saying قَالَ سَمَّةَ and قَالَ سَكَانُ: but the first [mode] is more excellent: (3) some elide the detached Hamza [above], i.e., that which is in the beginning of the word, when it occurs after an ِ at the end of the [preceding] word: and then, if the Hamza be followed by a quiescent, as in مَا أَحْسَنَ How good is! and مَا أَمَرْنَ What is thine affair?, the ِ is dropped, [as مَّ مَّ حَسَنَ]; but, if it be followed by a mobile, as in مَا أَشَدَّ How hard is!, the ِ remains, as مَا شَدَّ, whence مَا شَدَّ أَنفَسْهُمْ وَأَعْلَمْهُمْ بِيَا يَحْكُمُ أَلِيَامَائِرِهِ الْمَكْرِيِّ الْمُسْلِمُ (R) How hardy are their souls! and how knowing are they in what the noble, the Muslim, defends his dependents with! (M.A.R). The Hamza is sometimes elided, (1) without reason or canon, as أَنْسُ for أَنْسُ: (2) in رَايْتَ, (a) [often] with the interrog. Hamza,
as above] for أَرَأَيتْ; and this is the reading of Ks in the whole of the formations of رَأَيتْ conjoined with the ة, and having the interrog. Hamza at their beginning (R): Abu-l-Aswad [ad-Du’ālī (KA)] says

أَرَأَيتْ أَمْرًا كُنْتُ لَمْ أَبْلُهُ # أَتَانِي فَقَالَ أَتَصِدْنِي خَلِيلًا

(Jh, R) Hast thou considered, [meaning Tell me what thou thinkest of:] a man, that I had not proven, who came to me, and said “Take thou me for a friend”? (MAR); and another says

أَرَأَيتْ إِنَّ مَنْعَتْ كَلَّامٌ لَّبَدِ # أَسْتَنْعِي عَلَى لَبِيْلِي أَلْبَكَاءَ!

Hast thou considered, mc. nin. Tell thou me [560], if thou prevent me from speaking to Laila, shalt thou prevent me from weeping for Laila? (Jh): (a) the reason why that [elision] is frequent in رَأَيتْ and its congers is only frequency of usage, as elision is necessary in يَرَى [above], أَرَى, and يَرَى [above], but unnecessary in such as يَسَّال asks and يَنْتَاَي [above]: for, when you prefix the interrog. Hamza to رَأَيتْ, then, [by reason of the frequency of such prefixion] it is assimilated to the Hamza of vs. [433, 488]; so that the Hamza of رَأَيتْ is allowably elided: (b) seldom with هَلْ, as

صَاحَ هَلْ رَأَيتْ أَوْ سَبِعَتْ يَرَى # رَأَيتْ يَرَى أَلْبَكَاءِ

(R), by Ismā’īl Ibn Yasār (KA, Jh) an-Nisā’ī (KA), Comrade, hast thou seen, or heard of, a herdsman
that put back into the udder what he had collected in the milking-vessel? (Jsh, N); or in one version, فی الیکی in the milking-vessels (Jh). And the Hamza, which, if it remained in its place, would be alleviated by elision, is sometimes made to precede, from dislike to elision; so that one says یساؤلون یا سلون They ask, because its alleviation is then by conversion, not by elision: the poet says

إذا كلام قوم یسلون مليکهم عطاء فدهماء الذی انا سائلة

*When people arise, asking of their king a gift, then Dahmad is that gift which I shall be asking; and like it is يیستس for یابیس despairs (R).*

§. 659. In the imp. of the v. whose ف is a Hamza quiescent in the aor., as in أتى came, aor. یاتى, and أساء sinned, aor. یاسا, [and مثم dressed the wound, aor. مثو,] the Hamza is changed into a pure ی if the conj. Hamza be pronounced with Kasr [428], as ییث come and ییث sin, orig. ییث [661] and یثتم یثتم [661]; and is converted into a pure ی, if the conj. Hamza be pronounced with Ġamm, as یوسドレス the wound, orig. یوس Dress the wound: the second Hamza being converted into a soft letter, as an escape from the combination of two Hamzas, because alleviation, which is allowable in the case of [one] Hamza [658], is necessary in the case of two Hamzas
Three *vs.*, however, deviate from this [rule], vid. ُخُذَّلَ, ُلَكَءَ eat, and ُمُرَ command, which are heard, but are not to be copied, because of their exclusion from [the predicament of] their counterparts (IY). They elide the [ًرادَُ (Jrb)] Hamza (M, Jrb), which is a ُنَ (IY), in ُكُلْ[above], ُخُذَّلَ, and ُمُرَ, irregularly (M), from frequency of usagë (Jrb), for alleviation, because of the combination of two Hamzas in what is frequently used (IY); and [then (IY)] they dispense with the *conj.* Hamza (IY, Jrb), because of the disappearance of the quiescent [Hamza], and the mobility of what is made the initial, vid. the ُخَ in ُخُذَّلَ, the ُلَ in ُكُلْ, and the ُمَ in ُمُرَ [428]. Thus the measure of the *v.* is ُعُلِّلَ, with the ُبَ elided (IY). Then they make this elision obligatory in ُخُذَّلَ and ُكُلْ; but not in ُمُرَ (M, R), where elision, though chaster than conversion, is not obligatory (R). Therefore they do not say ُهُرُؤُسَلَ or ُوُهُرُؤُسَلَ ُخُذَّلَ or ُكُلْ; but [you say ُوُارَمُرَ ُمُرَ; and (IY)] the Kur has XX. 132. [428] (M). The regular form is ُوُؤُكُلَ, ُوُؤُخُذَّلَ (IY, Jrb), and ُأُؤُرَ (IY), in the *imp.* from ُؤُخُذَّلَ taking, ُؤُكُلَ eating, [and ُؤُرَ *commanding,*] like ُؤُشَّرَ [in the *imp.*] from ُؤُشَّرَ exulted, i. q. ُبَطَرَ (Jrb). But they keep to ُخُذَّلَ and ُكُلْ, irregularly, from frequency (SH) of usage (MASH). As for the *imp.* from ُمُرَ commanding, it does not reach the same extent of frequency as the [other] two;
so that they assign to it an intermediate predicament, allowing *أَمْرُ* and *مَرْ* in it (Jrb). This is when it is inceptive. When, however, it occurs in the interior [of the sentence], as in *قَامَرُ* And command, *وَأَمْرُ* Then command, and *قَلْتُ لَكَ أَمْرُ* I said to thee "Command", retention of the Hamza is more frequent than elision, because the reason for the elision is the combination of two Hamzas, which are not combined in the interior [669]. But *زَرْ* and *فَرْ*, though rare, are allowable, because the original state of the word is to be inceptive: so that it is as though at first the Hamza were elided in inception; and afterwards the curtailed word, occurring in the interior [of the sentence], remained in its [curtailed] state (R). This discussion, although it involves a combination of two Hamzas [661], is mentioned here by [Z and] IH, because it is akin to [the discussion on] أَلْوَاجِي , سَالُ, [658], مِنْسَأةً, and in continuity, inasmuch as their alleviation [also] is irregular (Jrb).

§. 660. It [is known, from what (Jrb)] has been previously mentioned [658], that the [mobile (IX)] Hamza [preceded by a quiescent, which is not a letter of prolongation or softness (IX),] has its vowel transferred to the preceding quiescent (IX, Jrb), and is elided, as مَسْلَةً for مَسْلَةً (IX); and here [Z followed by] IH shows whether, when the vowel is transferred to the determinative ج, that vowel is taken into account, or
not (Jrb). One instance of that is [668], when its Hamza is alleviated (IV). If the vowel be not taken into account, as is the method of most, Al-‘Akbar must be said, with expression of the conj. Hamza, because the J is virtually quiescent (Jrb). [For,] when the vowel of the Hamza, which is the initial of a word, is transferred to the preceding J of determination, that J is constructively quiescent for [three] reasons:—(1) that the J is orig. quiescent, contrary to such as the ق of جع [below]; (2) that the J, being another word [599], not [part of] the one whose initial is the Hamza, is on the verge of departure; so that it is [regarded] as though it had departed, and the vowel of the [second] Hamza were transferred to the [conj.] Hamza, the J remaining quiescent; contrary to the ق of جع, which belongs to the same word as the [elided] جع: (3) that transfer of the vowel of the Hamza to the preceding [quiescent] is not constant, so that it is as though the vowel were not transferred; contrary to the transfer of the vowel of the جع [in the o.f.] of جع to the preceding [quiescent] (R). But, if the vowel be taken into account, L-‘Akbar must be said, with elision of the [conj.] Hamza, because the vowel of the J renders it unnecessary. For the J becomes like part of the n., literally, because it consists of one letter; and ideally, because it alters the signification of the n. from indeterminateness to determinateness:
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and, since it becomes like part [of the ج], the vowel transferred to it [in لُجْحِر ] resembles the vowel [transferred to the س ] in سَلُ [below], orig. إسَال [658] (Jrb). When [therefore] the cat. of أَلْحَرُ is alleviated, the Hamza of the ج more often remains (SH); while some elide it (MASH): so that لُجْحِرُ is said (SH), the second حامزة [only] being elided, according to the more frequent [method] (MASH); or لُجْحِرُ (SH), the conj. حامزة also being elided, according to the rarer [method] (MASH). And apparently the cat. of أَلْسِنْفَارُ ability and أَلْسِنْفَارُ asking pardon is like that, as respects the allowability of أَلْسِنْفَارُ and أَلْسِنْفَارُ and أَلْسِنْفَارُ (Jrb). And, [when بِي بَن is conjoined with the cat. of أَلْحَرُ, then (Jrb)] one says, (1) according to the more frequent [method, بِن أَلْحُرُ pronounced [بِن لُجْحِرُ from the red, with Fath of the ن (SH), because, the ج being quasi-quiescent [above], if the ن were not mobilized, two quiescents would come together (Jrb); and بِن لُجْحِرُ pronounced [بِن لُجْحِرُ in the red, with elision of the ي (SH), lest two quiescents come together, because the ج is virtually quiescent [above]: (2) according to the rarer [method], بِن لُجْحِرُ, with quiescence of the ن; and بِن لُجْحِرُ, with expression of the ي (Jrb). As for بِن لَنَّ from now, henceforward
[206], it is [treated] according to both methods:—(1) if you say ُلَحْمَرُ, taking the vowel [of the ِل] into account, you say ُمِنْ لَآن, with quiescence of the ِن in ِمِنْ لَآن, because what follows it is mobile; and, according to that, ِمِنْ لَآن. II. 66. [149, 206] is read, with expression of the ِج, because the ِل is mobile, so that two quiescents do not come together: (2) if you say ُلَحْمَرُ, with expression of the conj. Hamza, not taking the vowel of the ِل into account, but treating the ِل as quiescent, you say ُمِنْ لَآن, with Fath of the ِن, because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and, according to that, you say ُمِلَکِن, on the principle of the poet's saying

Convey thou to Abū Dukhtanūs a message, not that which is sometimes said, consisting of falsehood, the ِمِنْ (Jh) being elided [by some of the Arabs, in juxtaposition with the art. (Jh)], on account of the concurrence of two quiescents, because it is treated like the unsound letters [663] (IV). But Ks and Fr relate that some of the Arabs convert the Hamza into ِل in such [formations] as this, [i.e., where an initial Hamza is preceded by a determinative ِل,] saying ُلَحْمَرُ for ُلَحْمَر, and ُلَرَضُ for ُلَرَض, ُلَرَضُ for the earth (IV, R); and, in order to preserve the quiescence of the determinative ِل, do not transfer the vowel [of the Hamza] (R).
It is as though the speakers of this dial. avoided mobilization of this J; and therefore converted the Hamza [into a J] homogeneous with the J, as they say لُدُو[191, 200, 275, 306, 321], when they treat it as a n., adding a, homogeneous with the, and مِنَ آلُرْض from the earth and مِنَ لُرْض pronounced مِن آلُرض are read, [the former] by throwing the vowel of the Hamza upon the [preceding] quiescent, which is the J; [and the latter by converting the Hamza into J].

He that says البخْرَ, expressing the [conj.] Hamza, ought to say سَلْسَل 658 for إِسْالم, when alleviated; and he that says البخْر ought to say سَلْسَل [above]: except that the conj. ِ is more often retained with the determinative J, and elided with any other [letter]; because this J is constitutionally quiescent, not being subject to the alternation of mobility, except for an accidental cause 669; so that the quiescence in it is stronger (IY). But [IH states that] they do not say أَنْلُ إِسْلم or سَلْسَل, because the word [containing the letter wherefrom, and the letter whereto, the vowel is transferred (Jrb)] is one (SH), as we have mentioned [above] in the second reason. As for سَلْسَل, the vowel of the س is not so constant as the vowel of the ق in قُلْ [below], nor so transient as the vowel of the ل in البخْر [above], because سَلْسَل is like قُلْ in respect of all the [three] reasons [above.
assigned for the constructive quiescence of the ج in 
لاَّحُمْرُ, except the third, since transfer of the vowel 
[of the Hamza] in it is not so constant as transfer of the 
vowel of the ِ, in قُولٌ [below]; but, though not so 
constant [as that], it is more frequent than transfer of 
the vowel of the Hamza in الْأَحْمُرُ: so that in 
الْأَحْمُرُ retention of the [conj.] Hamza is more frequent; but in 
ْقُلُ elision of the [conj.] Hamza is necessary: while in 
ِسْلُ a dispute occurs, IH holding elision [of the conj. 
Hamza] to be necessary, as you see [from his words 
"they do not say إِسْلُ" above], which is the opinion of 
S; whereas Akh allows إِسْلُ, as before mentioned [658]. 
All of this about ْقُلُ Say thou [above] is based on the 
theory that its o.f. is قُولٌ, derived from قُولٌ, before 
transfer of the vowel of the ِ, to the ِ; but, if we say 
that ْقُلُ is derived from قُولٌ pronounced with Damm of 
the ق, then there is no conj. Hamza here [428], to 
be elided because of the vowel of the ق, or retained 
because of the vowel's being accidental (R).

§. 661. Having finished the single Hamza [658, 660] 
in the word, [Z followed by] IH begins the explanation 
of the two Hamzas [659, 661, 662] (Jrb). They are 
(combined (R)) either in one word, or in two words 
(R, Jrb). When two Hamzas are combined [in one 
word (IA); the heaviness increases; and (IY)] alleviation
is necessary [659] (IY, IA), if they be not in the position of the ا and [below] (IA). It is always the second of them, not the first, which is changed, because the excess of heaviness is produced by the second. The two Hamzaz mentioned [as combined in one word (Tsr)] must be [in one of three states (Tsr)]:—(1) the first mobile, and the second quiescent; (2) the converse, [the first quiescent, and the second mobile (Tsr)]; (3) both mobile (Aud): it being impossible for both to be quiescent together [663] (Tsr). If the first [Hamza] be mobile, and the second quiescent, the second is changed into an unsound letter [697], homogeneous with the vowel of the first, [from dislike to the combination of two Hamzaz, together with the difficulty of pronouncing the quiescent second (Tsr)]: so that it is changed into (1) an ʼ after Fatḥa, as ʼAʼishah [orig. ʼAʼamn] (Tsr): (a) hence the saying of And he, [meaning the Prophet (Tsr),] was wont to enjoin upon me, [when I menstruated (Tsr),] that I should wear a waist-wraper, with a Hamza [pronounced with Fath (Tsr)], and then an : (b) [MM says that (Tsr)] the generality of Traditionists mispronounce it, reading it with an [pronounced with Hamza (Tsr)] and a double ُ: but for this [pronunciation] there is no reason [in Arabic (Tsr)], because it is [an aor. v., whose measure is (Tsr)] [with Kasr of the ُ, derived
(Tsr)] from "waist-wrapper"; so that its ف is a quiescent Hamza, after the aoristic Hamza pronounced with Fath [404] (Aud): (c) [so says IHsh:] but [Kh remarks that] the Bdd allow إِتْبَر from إِتْبَر, and إِتْبَر trusted from إِتْبَر trust, and إِتْبَر took a wife from إِتْبَر wife, family, by conversion of the second Hamza into ﺎ, and incorporation of it into the ﺎ [of إِتْبَر]; and Z transmits إِتْبَر with incorporation; while IM says that it is confined to hearsay, like إِنْتَكَل [689]: and, since it is allowable in the pret., it is allowable in the aor.; and in another tradition is إِنْتَكَل كَانَ قَصِيَّرًا فَلِيَتَرَ يَك. And, if it be short, let him gird himself therewith, transmitted in this form by MIAn (Tsr); (c) [the author of the KF, however, agrees with IHsh, saying] "Do not say إِتْبَر; though it occurs in some traditions, being perhaps a mispronunciation of the reporters" (KF): (2) a ى after Kasra, as إِيْسَان [orig. إِيْسَان (Tsr)]: (a) the reading [of Al A'mash, reported by Abü Bakr, the disciple of 'Aṣim (Tsr),] إِيْسَان. CVI. 2. Their keeping to, [with the second Hamza] sounded true, is anomalous (Aud): (b) Ks allows إِنْتَكَل [659] to begin with two Hamzas [below], this being transmitted from him by IAmb, who says that it is hideous, because the Arabs do not combine two Hamzas, whose second is quiescent (Tsr): (3) a ى
after Damma, as 

\textit{was trusted}, [in the past., orig. 

أُوْثِينَ (Tsr)]: (a) Ks allows أُوْثِينَ to begin with two Hamzas, this being transmitted from him by IAmb, who refutes it (Aud) by [the argument] that the Arabs do not combine two Hamzas, whose second is quiescent: but IAmb mentions this refutation of Ks in connection with his allowing 

إِنَّهُ بِقَرْآٍي X. 16. \textit{Bring thou a Kur'an to begin with two Hamzas [above], not in connection with أُوْثِينَ (Tsr). If the first [Hamza (Tsr)] be quiescent, and the second mobile, [in which case they are not in the position of the ف, from the impossibility of beginning with a quiescent, but are in the position of the ع or ج (Tsr),] then, (1) if they be in the position of the ع, the first is incorporated into the second, [because of the combination of two likes, and is sounded true (Tsr),] as 

Sa\'al [671, 738] (Aud), with the Hamza doubled, [on the measure of] the intensive [paradigm] نَقَالُ [343], denoting the frequent asker (Tsr); and رأَس and لَأِل (Aud), with their second [rad.] doubled, on the measure of the rel. n. نَقَالُ [312], denoting the seller of pearls and of heads (Tsr): (2) if they be in the position of the ج, the second is changed into ى, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether it be a final, or not a final (Tsr)]: so that, from قرأ read, you say, (a) in the paradigm of قَبْطَر [245, 392],
[301, 302] (Aud), orig. قَرْأَى، where two Hamzas, the first of them quiescent, [and the second a final,] come together at the end (Tsr): (a) Mz asked Akh why they do not incorporate in the paradigm of بَعْظُمٍ from قَرْأَى, as they incorporate in سَأَلٌ [above]: and he replied [firstly] that the two $\varepsilon$ s are only homogeneous [369], contrary to the two $\lambda$ s, as is proved by دُرْحَمٍ [392] and كَرَّدَنُ [253, 375, 731], meaning that the two $\varepsilon$ s are therefore more fit for incorporation than the two $\lambda$ s; and [secondly] that what is not allowable at the extremity is [sometimes] allowable in the middle, as is proved by the succession of two $\varepsilon$ s in هُوْرَى، which is disallowed in the pl. of [683] (Sn): (b) in the paradigm of سَفْرَجُ [245, 254, 401], قَرْأَٰئِلٍ، with two Hamzas, having between them a $\iota$ substituted for a Hamza (Aud), which is not a final, orig. قَرْأَٰئِلٍ، with three Hamzas, the second of which is changed into $\iota$, while the first and third are sounded true: so says IUK (Tsr). And, if both be mobile, then (1) if they be at the end, [in which case the second is final,] or [if] the second [be not final, but] be pronounced with Kasr, [in either case (Tsr)] it is changed into $\iota$, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether the first be pronounced with Fath, Damm, or Kasr (Tsr)]: (2) if the second [Hamza (Tsr)] be not
final, but be pronounced with Damm, it is changed into ى, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether the first be pronounced with Damm, Fath, or Kasr (Tsr)]: (3) if the second [be not final, but] be pronounced with Fath, it is changed (a) into ی if the first be pronounced with Fath or Damm; (b) into ی if the first be pronounced with Kasr (Aud). In short, the two mobile Hamzas are either at the end [of the word], or not. In the first case, they are of three sorts, because the first Hamza is pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm: and, in the second case, they are of nine sorts, arising from the multiplication of the three states of the first [Hamza] into the three states of the second. The final [Hamza] is changed into ی in all of its [three] sorts: and the non-final is changed into ی in four of its [nine] sorts, vid. the [one] pronounced with Fath after Kasra, and the [three] pronounced with Kasr after Fatha, Kasra, or Damma; and into ی in five, vid. the [two] pronounced with Fath after Fatha or Damma and the [three] pronounced with Damm after Fatha, Kasra, or Damm (Tsr). The *exs.* of the final Hamza [after one pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm (Tsr) are that you should form, from *قارَأ* a word like "جعفر" [392], or "جعْفَرَ (Aud)", in which case you say "قارَأ", or "جعْفَرَ", with two Hamzas; and then change the second Hamza into ی, because the ی does not occur as a final in what exceeds three letters [685, 727]; so that the word
becomes ترّي or ترّي [pl.] ترّي (A), or ترّي [du.] [fem.] ترّي [du.]

(1) if the ی be preceded by فتّا, as in the first ex., it is converted into [684, 719], and the word becomes abbreviated (Tsr), ترّي (R, A), upon the measure of سلمي Salma (A), [du.] ترّي (A); and [fem.] ترّي [du.]

(2) if the ی be preceded by كسرة, as in the second ex., its vowel is elided because of the heaviness, and the word is subjected to the same alteration as قاضي [16], becoming defective (Tsr), ترّي [18] (A), but with كسر of the حمزة, because it is defective, as also is the third [below] (Sn): (3) if the ی be preceded by داّممة as in the third ex., the داّممة is converted into كسرة, in order that the ی may be preserved from conversion into , and the word is subjected to the same alteration as قاضي [16] (Tsr), [or rather] as یَّید [243, 290] (A), orig.

like یَّید [237] (Sn), it also becoming defective (Tsr), ترّي [18] (A); [and, with the art.,] ترّي (MKh), like ألمولى (IA): (a) this [third ex.] and that which precedes it are defective, each of them upon this measure [یَّید or داّممة (Sn)], in the nom. and gen.; while in the acc. the ی returns, as یَّید ترّي and ترّي (A); (b) the حمزة of is
pronounced with Kasr, like the Hamza of قرنيا; not, as is fancied, with Damm: this is proved by A's confining himself to the return of the يا; and by [the Kasr of the يا in XLVIII. 20. And restrained from you the hands of the men (Sn), of Khaibar and their confederates, [the Banu (B)] Asad and Ghaḍafan (K, B). The exs. of the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr [after one pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm (Tsr)] are that you should form, from [i.e. قصد, directed his course towards (Tsr)], a word like ضيع [372, 672] with Fath, Kasr, or Damm of the Hamza, and Kasr of the ب in [all three of] them, in which case you say, in the first [exs.], مأم with two Hamzas, [the first] pronounced with Fath, and [the second] quiescent; and then transfer the vowel of the first م, [vid. Kasra (Tsr),] to the [quiescent (Tsr)] second Hamza before it, in order that you may secure an opportunity of incorporating it into the second م; and afterwards you change the [second (Tsr)] Hamza, [to which the Kasra of the م has been transferred (Tsr),] into يا (Aud), because of the preceding [rule] that the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr after one pronounced with Fath, [Kasr, or Damm] is converted into يا (Tsr): and thus you do in the [two] remaining [exs.] also (Aud), saying لئنيم and مود; and then transferring the
vowel of the first م, [vid. Kasra,] to the quiescent Hamza, in order to secure incorporation; and afterwards changing the second Hamza into ی (Tsr): so that the word becomes ١٣, ١٤, ١٥, or ١٦ (A). That [action (Tsr)] is necessary [below] (Aud). The regular pl. of ما is ١٧ (Tsr), orig. ١٨, like ١٩ pl. of جمار ass [246] (Jrb), by conversion of the [second] Hamza into ی. If you say that analogy requires conversion of the second [Hamza] into ی, because it is quiescent, and what precedes it is pronounced with Fath, [the o. f. being ١٠ (Jh),] like ١١ pl. of ١٢ vessel, and ١٣ pl. of ١٤ god (Jh),] I say that, since two likes occur after it, and they intend incorporation, they transfer the vowel of the first م, vid. Kasra, to the preceding Hamza, and incorporate the م into the م, so that it becomes ١٥; and then they convert the second Hamza into a pure ی (Tsr). And [accordingly] ١٦. Then fight against the leaders of unbelief is read (Jh). But, as for the reading of Ibn ‘Āmir and the KK, [like ١٧, Hamza, Ks, KhA, and Al A‘mash (Tsr), and of Rauh on the authority of Ya‘kūb (B),] ١٨ IX. 12, [with the two Hamzas (B)] sounded true, [according to the o. f. (B), without change (Tsr), it is one to be stopped at, and not exceeded
(Aud, A). Akh says "The [second] Hamza is made because it is in the position of [a Hamza pronounced with] Kasr, while what precedes it is pronounced with Fath; and it is not pronounced as a Hamza, because of the combination of two Hamzas: but", says he, "those who hold with the combination of two Hamzas pronounce it as a Hamza" (Jh). [And Z observes] "If you say 'How should be pronounced?', I say 'With a Hamza followed by a Hamza betwixt and between, i.e., between the outlets of Hamza and [732]; and sounding the two Hamzas true is a well known reading, though it is not acceptable to the BB: but, as for making the pure, it is not a reading, nor may it be; and he that makes the pure is committing a solecism, and mispronouncing'" (K): [while B also declares that] to make the pure is a solecism (B). IH too says that both softening and sounding true are correct in such as (SH), in reading [the Kur] (R), an objection to the saying of the GG that the second Hamza must be converted into if either it, or the one before it, be pronounced with Kasr: for, on the authority of the Readers, it is correct to make the second Hamza betwixt and between, in such as ; and also to sound the two Hamzas true (Jrb): and, in reading [the Kur], conversion of the second Hamza into a pure , as, in the opinion of the GG, is the best-known [pronunciation],
does not occur; but only sounding [the two Hamzas] true, and softening the second. And we have mentioned [below] that, according to some, these two predicaments are not peculiar to [such as] َةُبَّ but occur in every [case of] two mobile [Hamzas in one word]. According to the GG, however, the best-known [pronunciation] is conversion of the second [Hamza] into a pure َى (R). The exs. of the [Hamza] pronounced with Damm [after one pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm (Tsr)] are (1) َةُبَّ ُّوُ بَّ ُّوُ بَّ pl. of َةُبَّ ُّوُ بَّ [255]: (2, 3) that there should be formed from َةُمَّ a word like ُضُعَ with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm of the ب, or like ُبُلَّم [372], in which case you say َةُمَّ [below], with a Hamza pronounced with Kasr or Damm, and a ب pronounced with Damm. The o. f. of the first is ُبُبَّ, upon the measure of ُمُّلَّس [237]; and the o. fs. of the second and third are ُنُمَّ and ُمُّمَّ: then they transfer, in [all three of] them, [the vowel of the first of the two likes to the preceding quiescent, vid. the second Hamza (Tsr)]; and afterwards they change the Hamza into ب, [because this is homogeneous with its vowel (Tsr)]; and incorporate one of the two likes into the other (Aud), because they are combined (Tsr). The ex. of the [Hamza] pronounced with Fath, (1) after one pronounced with Fath, is ُّوُ بَّ ُّوُ بَّ [247, 278, 686], pl. of ُّوُ بَّ (Aud), orig.
(974)

(1) after one pronounced with Damm, is [278, 686], dim. of \( \ddot{\text{a}} \text{d} \text{m} \) (Aud), orig. \( \ddot{\text{a}} \text{d} \text{m} \text{h} \) : (a) the second Hamza is converted into \( \text{a} \), when pronounced with Fath, and not final, whether what precedes it be pronounced with Fath, as in the broken pl. of \( \ddot{\text{a}} \text{d} \text{m} \text{h} \); or with Damm, as in its dim. : (b) the exemplification by the pl. and dim. of \( \ddot{\text{d}} \text{m} \) [above] is based upon [the supposition] that \( \ddot{\text{d}} \text{m} \text{h} \) is Arabic, about which the language of Z is discordant: for he holds in the K [on Kur. II. 29] that it is [a (K)] foreign [name, Adam, most probably (K)] upon the measure of \( \text{k} \text{h} \text{w} \text{a} \text{l} \text{m} \text{h} \), like \( \text{z} \text{r} \text{A} \text{z} \text{a} \text{r} \), [the name of Abraham's father (Jk, K on VI. 74)] ; and in the M [661, 684] that it is Arabic, [orig. \( \ddot{\text{d}} \text{m} \text{h} \) with two Hamzas (IY),] upon the measure of \( \ddot{\text{m}} \text{w} \text{a} \text{l} \text{m} \text{h} \) (Tsr), meaning tawny (Jh, KF). The ex. of the [Hamza] pronounced with Fath after one pronounced with Kasr is that you should form from \( \ddot{\text{m}} \text{m} \) [an ex (Tsr)] upon the measure of \( \ddot{\text{m}} \text{m} \text{h} \) [372], with Kasr of the Hamza, and Fath of the \( \text{b} \) (Aud), in which case you say \( \ddot{\text{m}} \text{m} \text{h} \text{a} \), with a Hamza pronounced with Kasr, and a \( \text{a} \) pronounced with Fath, orig. \( \ddot{\text{m}} \text{m} \text{h} \); the vowel of the first \( \text{m} \), vid. Fatha, being transferred to the preceding quiescent, as a means for attaining incorporation of the two likes; and the second Hamza being afterwards changed into \( \text{a} \) (Tsr). Akh differs about two of these nine sorts, vid.
the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr after Ḍamm, which he changes into ُ[instead of ِ]; and the one pronounced with Ḍamm after Kasr, which he changes into ِ[instead of ُ]; but the correct [mode] is what has been mentioned above (A). If you formed a word like نًمًن from moaning, you would say َأَيْنَن; but, according to Akh, أَنَن, the dispute being like what we mentioned on such as سُنْ[658]. A [Hamza] pronounced with Ḍamm after one pronounced with Kasr is not found in their language, but, if such [a n.] as ِفَعْلَ, with Kasr of the Hamza, and Ḍamm of the , occurred from َأَمْ[above], according to S; and ِفَعْلَ, according to Akh, as we mentioned on ِفَعْلَةَ[658] (R). When the first of the two [mobile (Aud)] Hamzas is [an (Aud)] aoristic [Hamza (Aud), of the 1st pers. sing., whether the v. be trans. or intrans. (Tsr)], as in the aors. of ُأَنْتُ I directed my course towards and أَنْتُ I moaned, the second may be [changed, as ُأَمْ and ِأَيْنَن; or (A)] sounded true, as ُأَمْ and ِأَنْن: [firstly] because of the assimilation of the Hamza of the 1st pers. sing. to the interrog. Hamza [below], as in أَنْنَ[658] II. 5. [28] (Aud, A), on account of its indicating an [additional (Tsr)] meaning (Aud, Sn), exceeding the original meaning (Sn) in the word (Tsr,
Sn); and secondly (Sn), because of its interchangeability with [the rest of the aoristic letters (Sn)], the ن, the و, and the ي [404] (A), after which the two modes are allowable in the Hamza, as in يومن يومن believes from يومن يومن makes safe from تأمين [below] (Sn). IA [like IHsh and A] is silent as to the case where the second Hamza is pronounced with Fath [after the aoristic Hamza], as in أَوْيَأَلْا aor. of أَلَّأَلَّa. His teeth decayed, and أَرْرَأَأَيْوْسِينَ aor. from تأمين [above]; nor have I seen it expressly mentioned by any one: but it is covered by the saying of the Aud and the A "when the first of the two [mobile] Hamzas is [an] aoristic [Hamza]"; and so it is covered by the two causes above assigned: and from that the necessary conclusion is that it may be sounded true; or changed into و, because of IM's saying "If pronounced with Fath after Damm or Fath, it is converted into و", as أَوْيَأَلَّأَلَّ and أَوْيَأَلَّأَلَّ (MKh). That [sounding true] is regular in five vs.: so AZ transmits in the Book of the Two Hamzas (Tsr). From this it is understood that change [of the second Hamza into و or و], when the first of the two [mobile] Hamzas is not aoristic, is necessary [above], except in an extraordinary case, as [in the reading of IX. 12.] before mentioned (A). They say that, if the second [Hamza (Jrb)] and the one before it be mobile, the
second must be converted into ی [above], if either it, or the one before it, be pronounced with kasr, as یا [above] and خاجه [below]; and into ی [below] in other cases, as یاودم and یاوردم [above] (SH). The o. f. of خاجه [708], according to the opinion of others than Khl, is خجاتی, with two mobile Hamzās, the first being converted, as in یبائع [683], from the ع of the word, which is a ی; and the second being the ی of the ی; and then the second is converted into ی, because the one before it is pronounced with kasr; so that the word becomes خجاتی, which is afterwards subjected to the same alteration as قاضی [16]. They do not put the second Hamza betwixt and between, because that would involve some regard to the Hamza; so that it would entail a combination of two Hamzās. But, according to the opinion of Khl, that the o. f. is خجاتی by transposition, خاجه does not belong to this cat., [because it contains only one Hamza] (Jrb). And hence خطایا, [which is an instance of the combination of two Hamzās in one word (R)], on the well-founded hypothesis, contrary to the opinion of Khl [below] (SH), because it is pl. of خطیئة fault, sin; and the ی of خطيلة is converted into Hamza in the ultimate pl. [246], as in خطيلة کبائر crime, pl. کبایره: so that it becomes خطيلة کبائر,
according to S; and then the second [Hamza] is converted into ى, as the rule for two [mobile] Hamzas in one word is conversion of the second into ى, when it is final [above]; so that the word becomes خطائی [below].

The object of IH here is only [to indicate] the combination of two Hamzas in the o.f. of خطائی [283], according to S, and the conversion of the second into ى: but, as for the conversion of the first into a ى pronounced with Fath [below], it will shortly be mentioned. Khl [above] also says that its o.f. is خطائی [above], with a ى after a Hamza; but [in order to arrive at this] he transposes, putting the ى into the position of the Hamza, and the Hamza into the position of the ى (Rt). The opinion of S is more agreeable with analogy, and more sound, because of what has been transmitted [by AZ] from Arabs whose Arabic is trustworthy، اللهم آفرٍ آلح [below], for which, if ى were transposed, as Khl mentions, there would be no reason (Jrb). Two other modes [of pronunciation] occur, in the case of two mobile Hamzas in one word, (1) what is mentioned by AZ about some of the Arabs, that they sound the two Hamzas true together: he says “I have heard those who say اللهم آغرِي خطائی O God, forgive me my sins [above], like خطائی pl. of دِرْتَهَّی tilting-ring; and many, vid. the KK and [among the
Syrians (IV], Ibn 'Amir [al-Yahşabī (IV)], read ُنْاً. IX. 12. [above], with two Hamzās: (2) alleviation of the second Hamzā, just like the alleviation of the mobile Hamzā preceded by a mobile, when not a Hamzā: so that, for ُنْاَمِه [above], you say ُنْاَمِه, putting it between Hamzā and ی, as in سَمَم [658]; and similar are such as ُنْاَمِكَ. I direct my course towards thee, et cetera. And in these two modes, i.e., sounding the two [Hamzās] true, and softening the second, some add an ُث [below] between the first and second, when the first is initial, from dislike to combining two Hamzās, or the similitude of two Hamzās, in the beginning of the word, the combination of two likes in the beginning of the word being disliked, as you see from their saying أُوْاَصْلُ [357, 683] and أُوْيَصْلُ [683]. And, when two Hamzās are combined in one word, but are separated by an [original] ُث, neither of them is converted, because the separative is taken into account. Do you not see the method of those who mean to combine them without alleviation, how some of them add the ُث [above] of separation, saying ُنْاَمِث [below], in order that there may be no combination? How then should the existing ُث not be taken into account as a separative? (R). With separation [therefore], the combination of two Hamzās, as in ُث [with a Hamzā pronounced with Fath, then a quiescent
1, and then a Hamza, the name of a sort of tree, as in the Dm (Sn), or [its n. un. (Sn)] ١, has no effect (A). And, as for the fact that the [first] Hamza of [246, 278], [orig. دَآَيِّب (Jh),] must be converted into ﻢ, it is because دَآَيِّب is one of the ultimate pls.; and because its sing., i.e., ٧ََّاٰب [look of hair (MAR)], has its Hamza, in most cases, converted into ﻢ, as is the rule of alleviation [658] in the like thereof, [such as ﻢُمَرَّجَل] (R). Elision of the second [Hamza (Jrb)] is obligatory in the cat. of أَكْرَم I honor [428] (SH), i.e., the 1st pers. sing. [of the aor.] from إِفْعَال [332] (MASH), another objection to what they say, vid. that conversion of the second Hamza into ﻢ, [above] is necessary, if neither it, nor the one before it, be pronounced with Kasr. The o. f. of أَكْرَم, with two Hamzetas, because the letters of the aor. are the letters of the pret., with the addition of the aoristic letters [369, 404]; and, since its pret is أَلْوُاٰرَم, the aor. [in the 1st pers. sing.] must be أَلْوُأٰرَم (Jrb). By rule, the second [Hamza] in it should be converted into ﻢ, as in ﻢُوُيَّدَم [above]: but the word is lightened by elision of the second [Hamza], from frequency of usage, as it is lightened in دَخِل and دَكَل [659] by elision; though, by rule, the Hamza [in them] should be converted into ﻢ,
(R). And [then (R)] its congener,""ضُرْعُو يُبُرْعُو"" and ""ثُرْعُو يُبُرْعُو"" (R),] are made to accord with it (SH), as ""ثُرْعُو يُبُرْعُو"" and ""ثُرْعُو يُبُرْعُو"" (Jrb), although two Hamzas are not combined in them (R). They make conversion of the Hamza, when single, into a 'pronounced with Fath [above], obligatory in the cat. of مَظْبَأَيَا [283, 726]. And hence مَظْبَأَيَا [above], according to the two sayings (SH) of Khl and others (MASH). This predicament is common to (1) what contains two Hamzas, like مَظْبَأَيَا, according to the opinion of S: and (2) what contains a single Hamza, like (a) مَظْبَأَيَا, by common consent; and (b) مَظْبَأَيَا, according to the opinion of Khl: and for that reason IH has postponed it to here (Jrb). If more than two Hamzas were to succeed one another, the first, third, and fifth would be sounded true; and the second and fourth would be changed:—e. g., if you were to form, from Hamza, a word like أَثْرُجَةٌ citron, you would say أَثْرُجَةٌ, [with a Hamza pronounced with دَامِم, then a quiescent أُ, then a Hamza pronounced with دَامِم, then a quiescent أُ, then a Hamza pronounced with فَث, and then a أُ of femininization (Sn).] orig. أَثْرُجَةٌ (A), with five Hamzas, the second and fourth quiescent, the first and third pronounced with دَامِم, and the fifth pronounced with فَث (Sn). If the two Hamzas
be combined in two words, then, if the first [Hamza] be inceptive, like the *interrog*. Hamza, their predication is [the same as] that of two Hamzas in one word, when the first is initial, as in ﺍُّﻮُلَّأَيْمَةُٰ and [above]. The first is not alleviated, by common consent: while the second is alleviated in exactly the same way as when they are in one word; except that here the second is sounded true more frequently than when they are in one word, because the *interrog*. Hamza is an independent word; though, as respects its being *unil.*., it is like a part of what follows it. Then those who separate the two mobile Hamzas there by an †, whether both be sounded true, or the second of them be softened, as in ﺍُّﻮُلَّأَيْمَةُٰ [above or ﺍُّﻮُلَّأَيْمَةٰ], separate them here; and those who do not separate there do not separate here also (R).

The poet (R) Dhu-r-Rumma (M, MAR) says

فُنْيَةُ قَلْبِيَةُ ﺍُّﻮُلَّعُسَاءٰ آلِحٰ [29]; and another says

حُزَقُ إذَا أَمَّأَتَهُمُ أَبَنَا فَكَأَهَّتُ # تَفَکَّرُ أَيَاهُ ﻋَفَوْنَ آمَ تَرَدَّا (M, R), cited by AZ (M) in his Nawādir, where he says "The Arabs of the desert have recited it to us," and by Jh also in his book (IY), *(He is) short* [in stature (MAR)]: whenever the people bring out a jest, he considers whether him they mean or an ape (IY, MAR): and Ibn ‘Āmir reads ﺍُّﻮُلَّأَيْمَةُٰ II. 5. [497, 28], and similarly ﺢَنْتُدُ لَآَنَّ يُوْسِفُ XII. 90. [581]. Then,
after the entry of the \textls[50]{I} of separation, some, vid. the Banū Tamīm, sound the two Hamzas true: while others, vid. the people of AlḤijāz, alleviate the second; and this is preferred by IA1 (IY). When the first is an \textls[50]{interrog}. Hamza, and the second a \textls[50]{conj}. Hamza, then the latter, if pronounced with Kasr or Ɗamm [668], is elided, as أَصْطَفَى XXXVII. 153. [669] and أَصْطَفَى Was he chosen?; and, if not, is converted into \textls[50]{I}, or softened [656, 663, 669] But, if the first be not inceptive, vid. in the case of the \textls[50]{non-interrog}. Hamza, then the first is either quiescent [662] or mobile [below]: and, in either case, says S, those who sound [the Hamza] true, i. e., others than the people of AlḤijāz, alleviate one of them, deeming it heavy to sound both of them true, as the people of AlḤijāz deem it heavy to sound the single [Hamza] true [658] (R). For (S), says he (R), it is not [a usage] of the language of the Arabs that two Hamzas should meet together, and both be sounded true (S, R). Then, if both be mobile [above] (R), (1) some of them alleviate the first (IY, R), not the second, because the first is the final of a word, and finals are the seat of alteration (R); and this is the saying of IA1 (IY, R), who adduces, as proof of that, نَفَذَ جَأَءَ أُشْرَاطُهَا XLVII. 20. For \textls[50]{already} its signs have come [below] and يَا ذَكْرِيَا، إِنَّا نَبِيِّرَنَّ XIX. 7. O Zachariah, verily we bring thee glad tidings (IY): (2) some of them alleviate
the second (IV, R), not the first, because the heaviness comes from the second, as they do in the case of two Hamzas in one word; and this is the saying of Khî [below] (R): S says (IV). We have heard that from the Arabs, vid. in XLVII. 20. and XIX. 7. [above] (S, IV), where he alleviates the second Hamza, putting it betwixt and between (IV); and the poet says

For every fair woman, when she comes forth, the evil eye is dreaded, and envy (S, IV), which is cited by S with the second [Hamza] softened, and put betwixt and between, because it is pronounced with Kasr after Fatha, [like the Hamza in سَمِمَ] (IV), [and] which we have heard so recited by trustworthy Arabs: (a) Khî [above] being wont to affect this saying, I asked him why, and he said “I have seen them, when they meant to change one of the two Hamzas, which meet together in one word, change the last, as in آَذَمْ [above]; and I have seen IAl take the Hamzas in يَا وَيَلُتِي أَلَدَ ْوَأَنَا عَنْجَرُ [XI. 75. O my wonder, shall I bear a child, when I am an old woman?, and sound the first true: and all [of this] is [good] Arabic” (S): (3) sounding both of them true (IV, R) together (R) is allowable (IV); [and] is preferred by many, vid. the Readers of AlKûfa and Ibn 'Amir, as in the case of two Hamzas in one word: and this is more appropriate here (R), because
the two Hamzas are constructively separate (IY, R), one not being inseparable from the other (IY): (4) the people of AlHijāz alleviate both together (IY, R), as they do with the single Hamza (R), because, if there were only one, it would be alleviated (IY). Those who alleviate the first alone do so in one of the modes before mentioned, vid. elision, conversion, or softening, as was mentioned in the case of the single [mobile] Hamza [658], which should be referred to. And those who alleviate the second alone, treat it like the mobile Hamza after a mobile; so that the nine cases mentioned [658] occur, the rules of which should be referred to, because they are equally applicable here. Thus in II. 136. [He guideth whom] He willeth unto [a right way] three modes occur in the second [Hamza, as in the Hamza of سُوُلَ], vid. the well-known and the strange betwixt-and-between, and conversion of the Hamza into ٰ, [658]. But, in the case of two [Hamzas] agreeing [in vowel], (1) elision of the first is transmitted from IAl, as أُلِيْا أُلِيْثَ ٰ XLVI. 31. [Nor have] protectors [against Him]: those [are in manifest error], مِنْ أَلْسَمَا إِلَى جَا أَشْرَاطُهَا XLVII. 20. [above], and XXXII. 4. From the heaven to [the earth]: (2) conversion of the second into a pure letter of prolongation, i. e., into an if the first be pronounced with Fath, أ, if it be pronounced with Damm, and ی if it be
pronounced with Kasr, is transmitted from Warsh and Kumbul. And those who alleviate both Hamzas together, vid. the people of AlHijaz, combine the two modes of alleviation now mentioned [for alleviation of the first alone, and of the second alone] (R).

§. 662. If the first [Hamza] be quiescent [661], as "أَقْرِئْ أُبَابَانَ الْسَلَّامَ," Read thou a verse, "أَقْرِئْ أُبَابَانَ الْسَلَّامَ." Make thy father read the salutation, [i. e., Deliver to thy father the (written) salutation (KF),] and لَمْ يَرْبِدُ أُبُونَ Thy father was not bad, then, in this case also, there are four methods:—(1) the people of AlHijaz alleviate them both; (2, 3) others alleviate either the first alone, or the second alone; (4) many, vid. the KK, sound both of them true: as we mentioned in the case of the two mobiles [661]. And AZ transmits from the Arabs a fifth method, vid. incorporation of the first into the second [738], as in the rest of the letters. Those who alleviate the first alone convert it into ә, if the preceding letter be pronounced with Fath; into ә, if it be pronounced with Damm; and into ى if it be pronounced with Kasr. Those who alleviate the second alone transfer its vowel to the quiescent first, and elide it. The people of AlHijaz, who alleviate both together, convert the first into ә, ә, or ى: and soften the second betwixt and between, when it follows the ә, because transfer [of its vowel] to the ә is impossible; but elide it,
after transfer of its vowel to the preceding letter, when it follows the ٖ or ی, because that [transfer] is possible: so that they say ﴿َٖاءَ آية﴾ with the ٖ in the first, and softening in the second; َٖاءَ بَكَأً with the ی pronounced with Fath, i.e., with the Fatha of the elided Hamza; and َٖاءَ بُونَا with the ٖ pronounced with Fath: and, on the analogy of this, you form ﴿لَمْ تَرْدُو مَكَ﴾ Thy mother was not bad, and ﴿لَمْ يَرْدُو بَلْكَ﴾ Thy camels were not bad, et cetera. Similarly, if the second alone be quiescent, as in ﴿مَنْ يَشَأَ أُتْبِن﴾ Whoever wills shall be entrusted, it is regulated by the vowel of the preceding letter, just like the single [quiescent] Hamza [658]. And, if both be quiescent, as in ﴿مَنْ يَشَا أُتْبِن﴾ Whoever wills shall be entrusted, the first must be mobilized [668]; so that the phrase becomes [an instance] of this last kind (R).
CHAPTER VI.

THE CONCURRENCE OF TWO QUIESCENTS.

§. 663. It is common to the three kinds [625] (M), the n., as زید آلطریف the smart Zaid; the v., as ١٨٩. [428]; and the p., as هل آلرجل خذل الفمو نی آلدادر. Is the man [666] in the house? The concurrence of two quiescents is not allowable: nay, is impossible, inasmuch as the quiescent letter is quasi-pausal, and what follows it is quasi-inceptive; while it is impossible to begin with a quiescent [667] (IY). When the first of two quiescent letters is a sound letter, it is not possible for them to concur, unless you put a Kasra slurred, not impled, upon the first of them. The listener then reckons that the two quiescents concur, and even the speaker shares with him in this notion. But, when either of them is sensitive, he knows that there is a faint Kasra on the first [letter], as in بَکْر Bakr [below], بَشْر Bishr, and بَسْر full-grown unripe dates, where the ع of the three [words] is mobilized with a faint Kasra, otherwise it would be impossible for you to put the quiescent ۠ after it. And similarly, when you assume that the initial of a word, which you mean to articulate, is quiescent, which does not occur in Arabic, at the beginning of a sentence, except with the conj.
Hamza [667-668], though it is found in Persian [667], as the initial of which is quiescent, as is proved by Make haste and flower-garden, except that they are pronounced with a slurred Kasra (MAR),] you find that, of your own accord, you accomplish the articulation of that quiescent by means of a Hamza pronounced with Kasr, so extremely faint as to be like part of a soliloquy, which the hearer does not catch; and that afterwards you sound aloud the quiescent letter at the beginning of the word. You therefore realize that the employment of Kasra as the means for removing the difficulty of articulating the quiescent, whether that quiescent be at the beginning, end, or middle of the word, proceeds from your own constitution and nature [664], when you leave it to its own devices. And thus appears the reason why they pronounce the ccaj. Hamza with Kasr [668]; why they import it [667], and not any thing else; and why they pronounce the first of the two quiescents in إِضْرَبُ أَضْرَبُ [below] and لَمْ يَكُنُ اللَّدِينَ XCVIII. 1. [450, 640] with Kasr [664]. When, however, the first of the two quiescents is a letter of softness, it is possible for them to concur, but with some heaviness. That is possible with the unsound letters because these letters are ties between the letters of the word, connecting one with another: for you take their constituents,
i.e., the vowels; and, by their means, string the letters of the word together, which, but for them, could not be arranged in order. The matter is lightest when the first of these two quiescents is an ی [646, 658], because of the prolongation contained in the ی, since it is a letter of prolongation only; and, for that reason, such formations as مان contended in pulling and یندومد stopping up are more frequent than such as یندومد [below]. Next after that [in degree of lightness] is when the first of the two [quiescents] is ی, or ى preceded by a vowel homogeneous with it, as in یندومد آلفب [below]: but no similar ex. with the ى, as ساُرَةُ سُورُت [for سُورُت was privily spoken to, pass. of سَأَرَت spokes privily to him], occurs in their language; [though ینىآللل will be found below]. And the last degree [of lightness] is when the first of the two quiescents is ی, or ى preceded by Fatha, because of the smallness of the prolongation contained therein: but such [a combination] occurs only in the dim., as خُوَیدَة [below]; so that, in ینىألاع from ینىألاع [shortness of the upper teeth (MAR)] and ییُؤد, affection, you do not say ینىألفل and ینىآرد, with elision of the vowel of the first ی [and ى], as in ینىسیم [below]; but transfer the vowel of the first of the two similar letters, when incorporation is intended, to the ى, and ى, as ینىییلفل ییفل having short upper teeth and ینىآرد more
affectionate, as you do in such as اَمَرَ Aَشَّنَّ harder and َبِترِرَ bitterer: the ی of the دَم. being exclusively characterized by untransferability of the vowel from the following letter to it, when incorporation is intended, because they constitute it quiescent, and it is inseparable from quiescence [274]. And, in addition to the prolongation contained in the letter of softness, [which, in every real concurrence of two quiescents, forms the first quiescent,] one of two conditions is prescribed for the second quiescent:—(1) that it should be incorporated, provided that the incorporated [letter], together with the [letter that it is] incorporated into, be in the same word as the letter of prolongation: (a) that is because, being incorporated into a mobile [731], it is in the predicament of the mobile, because of the closeness of its adhesion thereto, since the tongue removes the incorporated [letter] and the [letter that it is] incorporated into with one movement; so that they become, as it were, one mobile letter: (b) we stipulate that the incorporated should be in the same word as the letter of prolongation in order to guard against such as خَافِئَ اللَّهَ Fear ye two God, خَافِئَ اللَّهَ Fear ye God, and خَافِئَ اللَّهَ Fear thou [fem.] God, where the letter of prolongation is elided on account of the two quiescents, because, in their concurrence, unrestrictedly, even if all the conditions be realized, there is some difficulty, as we have mentioned;
so that, when the first of them is in a place where elision is suitable, vid. the end of the word, then to lighten the word by eliding it is more appropriate: (2) that the second quiescent should be paused upon with quiescence [640], or be treated like the paused upon: (a) that is because pause is [taken] with the object of resting; and the approach of rest lightens the pressure of the heaviness upon you. Pause is of two kinds, (1) constitutional, which is [found] (a) in the names of the letters of the alphabet, because they are constituted in order that boys, or those who are in the same condition, vid. the ignorant, may be taught thereby the shapes of the single letters of the alphabet, each of which receives a name beginning with that letter: so that the boy says, e. g., َع Alif, pausing a little, just enough to separate it from the others; and then says ب Bâ, and so on to the end: (a) you do not see two quiescents concur in these ns., except when the first is a letter of softness, as in داَل جيم نون Dâl-Jim-Nûn: (b) similarly in the ejîs., as ُعُضّر [used in chiding a dog (M.A.R.)] and ُعْضَر [200], in which the pause is constitutional, because they are not constituted for the purpose of construction, as has been explained in their cat. [200]: (2) not constitutional, but supervening in usage, [which is found] (a) in ns. other than the names of the letters of the alphabet and the ejîs. [640], as َلَعُمُّونَ and the [below],
food and the dead; (b) similarly in ns. enumerated [159], as زیدْ قُرْوُود سَعِیدُ عَمَانَ for they are constituted to be spoken in syntactical construction; and then the user pauses upon them, either in construction with their op., as جَآء نَّي بُومُونُ The believers came to me; or not in construction therewith, as قُووود زیدْ Thamūd-Zaid (R). The concurrence of two quiescents is pardonable (1) in pause, unrestrictedly (SH), i. e., whether the first be a letter of softness (R, Jrb), as in الْبُومُونُ the male believers, and الْبُومُونَاتُ the female believers [above] (R); or not (R, Jrb), as in بُكر [above] and أمَرَ [below] (R): and whether the second be incorporated [below], or not: (a) pause upon the letter supplies the place of its vowel, since it strengthens the tone of the letter, and makes its sound full: for, when you pause, e. g., upon أمَرَ [above], you find that the has a reiteration, and a fullness of sound, that it has not when you conjoin it with [the initial of] another [word]; and, when you conjoin it, that [fullness of] sound ceases, because your taking to a letter other than the one mentioned diverts you from impletion of the first letter: so that, from what we have mentioned, it is plain that the letter paused upon is more complete in sound, and stronger in tone, than the conjoined; and that supplies the place of the vowel, so
that the letter paused upon may be combined with a quiescent before it, as in ُعُرُوٰ , because, pause being the place of abbreviating and stopping, that [omission of the vowel] is pardonable in it (Jrb): (b) you already know, however, that in the second [case, where the first of the two quiescents is not a letter of softness,] there is not really a concurrence of two quiescents, since it is impossible when the first of them is a sound letter (R): (c) if the concurrence of two quiescents be in continuous speech, it is not pardonable, except in [the following] cases mentioned by IH (Jrb): (2) in the incorporated [letter], preceded by a [letter of (Jrb, MASH)] softness, [whether it be a letter of prolongation, or not (MASH), provided that both quiescents be (Jrb),] in one word, as خَوَّةْ dear particular friend, [dim. of خاصّة parti-
cular friend (R, Jrb),] فُؤوُةْ الضاَئِيِن 1. 7. [539], and ِقُدْوُةْ The garment, or cloth, was pulled out, or stretched [above] (SH), pass. of تَبَادَدْنَا إِلَّا بُتْرُبْ We pulled the garment, or cloth, one against the other (R, Jrb), i. e., each of us pulled it from the other (R), and انْتُحَاجَوْتِي VI. 80. [170] (M), read with a single ن [405] by Nāfi' and Ibn 'Amir, though, as regards the latter, this is disputed on the authority of [his Reporter] Hishām (B); contrary to what happens when they are in two words (Jrb, MASH), as َرَأَيْنَ قَالُوا أَلْلَهُمْ VIII. 32.
And when they said "O God", VIII. 65. 
[49], and 

Nor hath He laid upon you any hardship in the faith, where the [letter of] softness must be elided (MASH), as will be explained [below]: (a) the unsound letter [697], when quiescent, is named "letter of softness"; and this, when the vowel of what precedes it is homogeneous with it, is [named] "letter of prolongation" [below]: (b) the ی is always a letter of prolongation: while the ی and َََُُُُُُْ are sometimes letters of softness, as in بَيْع saying and بَيْع selling; and sometimes letters of prolongation, as in يَلُو says and يَبْيِعُ sells; and thirdly, are neither letters of softness, nor letters of prolongation, but are equivalent to the sound, vid. when they are mobile, as in عَمَد promised and يَسَر was gentle: (c) thus is it mentioned in one commentary on the M; but they often loosely apply the term "letters of prolongation and softness" to these letters, either because it is attributable to this analysis, or because the thing is named after what it is reducible to: (d) the concurrence of two quiescents is allowable in this case because the letters of prolongation and softness contain that prolongation by means whereof the articulation of the quiescent after it is accomplished: and also because the incorporated [letter], together with the [letter that it is]
incorporated into, is equivalent to one letter, since the
tongue is removed from them by one impulse; and, the
[letter] incorporated into being mobile [731], the second
of the two quiescents, [i.e., the incorporated letter] is
like the non-quiescent, so that a concurrence of two
genuine quiescents is not realized: (e) the concurrence
of three quiescents is allowable (Jrb), as [أَصِيمُ] دَوَابُ and
مُدَيِّقُ (K on III. 1.), when these two matters are
combined, i.e., in pause upon a word like دَوَابُ [256,
646] and أَصِيمُ rather deaf [274, 281], dim. of أَصِيمُ
deaf (Jrb), and مُدَيِّقُ [274], dim. of مُدَيِّقُ (Jh,
KF), where the first quiescent is a letter of softness, and
the second is incorporated: (f) the concurrence of four
quiescents is disallowed in every dial., and in every case
(Jrb): (3) in such [ns. (Jrb)] as كَيْسِنُ, قَافُ, مِيمُ, etc.
[231], which are uninfl. for want of construction, [the
concurrence of two quiescents here being pardonable
both] in pause (SH), as when you pause upon the
م in XIX. 1 [18] (R), [in which case the final
is quiescent] because of what has been mentioned above
[under pause] (Jrb); and in continuity (SH), as when
you join the ع to the م in the [foregoing] initial
monogram (R), [in which case the final is quiescent] to
distinguish what is uninfl. for want of the requirer of
inflection, vid. construction [159, 321], from what is
uninfl. on account of the existence of the preventive [of inflection], vid. resemblance to the orig. uninfl. [159]: (a) they do not reverse [the process of distinction, by allowing the concurrence of two quiescents in the latter class of uninfl. ns., instead of the former], because those which are uninfl. for want of the require are few, while those which are uninfl. on account of the existence of the preventive are many; [and the concurrence of two quiescents, being abnormal, ought to be confined to the few] (MASH): (b) some assert that, in continuity also (Jrb, MASH), the concurrence of two quiescents is on account of pause (Jrb), [because] the quiescence [of the final] in these ns. is on the ground that pause is meant to be understood (MASH): (c) by "such [ns.] as عَيْنٍ, قَابٍ, مِيمٍ, etc."

IH means such as contain a concurrence of two quiescents, the second of which is quiescent for want of the motive for inflection, whether the word be the name of a letter of the alphabet, as in كَافٍ لَامُ Kūf-Lām; or something else, as in مَرَضُدَ كُؤُونٍ مِيمٍ ambush-Thamūd-chief: and whether the first [quiescent] letter be a letter of softness, as in what we have mentioned; or not, as in عَمْرُ بَكْرُ Amr-Bakr [159]; though we have mentioned that this last, while resembling a concurrence of two quiescents, is not really one:

(d) the reason why the concurrence of two quiescents is allowable in such words is that they are treated like the
paused upon, as will be explained, even if they be not [actually] paused upon: (e) the quiescence of their finals is not because the latter are [orig.] mobile, and afterwards have their vowel cut off on account of pause, but because these words are uninfl. upon quiescence [below]: (f) Z. says that they are [orig.] infl.; yet are not [actually] infl., because they are denuded of the cause of inflection: but this [assertion] of his is marvellous, for how can the n. be infl. without a requirer of inflection? and we say that they are not mobile with any vowel, because the vowel is either inflectional—and how can the inflectional vowel exist without the cause of inflection, vid. construction with the ap.?—or uninflational, which is not allowable, because the uninflationedness of that [n.] in which the cause of inflection does not exist is stronger than the uninflationedness of that [n.] in which a preventive of inflection accidentally arises; and the stronger of the two kinds of uninflationedness ought to be accompanied by the o. f. of uninflationedness, vid. quiescence [159], because the o. f. of inflection is mobility, and the o. f. of uninflationedness is quiescence: (g) we say of these words, whether names of letters of the alphabet [321, 635], or nums., like رَجُلٌ [159, 321, 647], or anything else, like زَيْدٌ خَالِدٌ [159], that, even if some of them be literally joined to others, still the final of every one of them is in the
predicament of the paused upon; that being necessary in their case, because every word of them, as respects the sense, is disconnected from what follows it, even if it be literally joined thereto: and the proof that every one of them is in the predicament of the paused upon is the expression of the conj. ِ in إِنْتَنَّ, when you enumerate the nums.; and the conversion of theِ of such as أَرْبَعَةٌ and ْتَلَّتَةٌ إِنْتَنَّ ْتَلَّتَةٌ أَرْبَعَةٌ One-two-three-four, by common consent; whereas the conj. ِ is elided [669] in the interior [of the sentence], and theِ is not converted intoِ except in pause, [646, 690]: (h) these ns. therefore are uninfl. upon quiescence [above]: you make the predicament of pause applicable to them, as you pause upon كُمْ [640] and the rest of the words uninfl. upon quiescence, the predicament of pause [in respect of quiescence] being made applicable to the final of every one of them, because none of them has any [syntactical] concern with what follows it, as [the auspiciatory formula] يَسْمَعُ اللَّهُ الرَّحْمَنُ الرَّحِيمُ In the Name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful has no [syntactical] concern with the beginning of the chapter after it, like ﷺ ْهُوَ اللَّهُ أَحْدَةٌ CXII. 1, [160], so that you pause upon الرَّحِيمُ; but you do not become silent upon every one [of these words], as is the property of pause at the end of the complete sentence [640], because that is only 102 a
for rest after fatigue, whereas you are not fatigued by pronouncing each word of them: so that, since their finals are treated like the [letter] paused upon, the ُ of ُأَرْبَعَة is converted into ُس [646]; but, since you join them to what follows them, and do not pause upon them, the vowel of the Hamza in أَرْبَعَة is transferred to the ُ [of ُكُلِّمَة], according to what is transmitted by S [321, 647, 648], as it is transferred in مَسْلَة [658] and قَدْ أَنْفَع XXIII. 1. [16], and similarly in the saying of the poet [Abu-nNajm al'Ijl (AKB)]

أَقْبَلْتُ مِنْ عِنْدِ زِيَادٍ كَلْحَرَفُ # نَحْطُ رَجْلَي بَحْطِ مُحْتَلِفٍ

تُكْتُبُانِ فِي الْطَّرِيقِ لَمَّا أَلِفٍ

[I advanced from the presence of Ziyād (a friend of his) drunk, my two legs tracing a zigzag line, scrawling on the road Lam-Alif, meaning, says IJ, the letters of the alphabet, not one more than another, or, possibly, (the figure) لا (AKB)], where the vowel of the Hamza of أَلِف is transferred to the م of لَام : (i) Mb transmits from Mz that transfer of the vowel of the Hamza in أَرْبَعَة to the [preceding] ُس is disallowed; but S is too trustworthy for his report from the Arabs to be rejected, especially when it is not forbidden by analogy: (j) S makes a distinction between what is constitutionally quiescent [in the final], like the letters
of the alphabet, and what is accidentally quiescent, when enumeration is intended, as زَيْنُوُّ وَاحِدٌ إِثْنَانَ ثُلُثُهُ [159], saying that, in what is orig. infl., the nom. may be pronounced with Ishmām [640], as وَاحِدٌ إِثْنَانَ with Ishmām of the Damm [on the د of وَاحِدٌ], the nom. being pronounced with Ishmām because it is the strongest and earliest inflection [24]; whereas in أَلِفٌ كَلِمَ، no vowel is pronounced with Ishmām, because these are more notorious for quiescence [of the final] than the former, since the quiescence of the like thereof is constitutional: (k) Akh disallows Ishmām; but there is no reason for his disallowance, while there is the reason mentioned for approval: (l) according to what S says, there is no harm in pronouncing the nom. with Ishmām in the pre. [n.] in such as فَلَمْ زَيْنُ، the manservant of Zaid, when not constructed with its op. (R): (m) one ought to pause upon the م in آَلِمُ اللَّهُ III. 1. [321], as one pauses upon أَلِفُ and كَلِمَ، and to begin with what follows it, as you say وَاحِدٌ إِثْنَانَ [above]: and this is the reading of 'Āšim: (n) as for its Fath [below], this is the vowel of the Hamza thrown upon it, when the Hamza is elided for alleviation [658] (K): (o) there is a dispute about آَلِمُ اللَّهُ III. 1. [321, 664]:—those who assert that, in continuity also, the concurrence of two
quiescents [in such as ميمّم ] is on account of pause hold the vowel on the م to be transferred from the Hamza, because, in that case, [i.e., when the م is paused upon] the Hamza is not [necessarily] elided [669], since it is not in the interior [of the sentence] ; so that the vowel [of the Hamza (B)] is transferred (Jrb) to the م, to indicate that the Hamza is virtually expressed, because it is elided for alleviation [658], not on account of [its being in] the interior [669], since the م is in the predicament of pause; [and thus this reading of the text is] like their saying زاحيد أثناَان One-two, by throwing the vowel of the Hamza upon the د (B); and for that reason the م is pronounced with Fath [above]: whereas those who say that, in continuity, the concurrence of two quiescents [in such as ميمّم ] is not on account of pause say that the Hamza is elided [because of its being] in the interior [of the sentence]; and, two quiescents [then] concurring, vid. the م and the ل, they mobilize the first, because of what will be mentioned [below]; while they do not pronounce it with Kasr [664], but with Fath, from regard to the solemnity of the Name of God, and because, if they pronounced the م with Kasr, two Kasras and a ى would be combined (Jrb) : (p) if you say "Then what is the reason for the reading of 'Amr Ibn 'Ubaid with Kasr?," I say "This reading is founded upon the notion that the mobilization is because.
of the concurrence of two quiescents; and is not accept-
ed" [664] (K); but Akh allows Kasr also in ُلله ُبِينكِ،
which is read by 'Amr Ibn 'Ubad, on the ground that
the vowel is because of the two quiescents, not because
of transfer (R): (4) in such [phrases] as ُلله ُبِينكِ،
Is Al Hasan with thee? and ُبِينكِ، Is the
blessing of God thine oath? [669] (SH), i. e., in every
word that begins with a conj. Hamza pronounced with
Fath, and is preceded by the interrog. Hamza: (a) that
[combination] is [found] in two cases, firstly with ُل
[599, 667], and secondly with ُبِينكِ or ُبِينكِ [650,
667], since the conj. Hamza is not pronounced with
Fath except in them [668]: (b) they permit the concurre-
ence of two quiescents here, because, if they elided the
conj. Hamza, saying ُبِينكِ and ُلله ُبِينكِ،
one would not know whether it was an enunciation or
an interrogation; so that they change the [conj.]
Hamza into ḍ (Jrb), because of [that (Jrb)] ambiguity
(SH): (c) IH means that, when the interrog. Hamza is
 prefixed to what begins with a conj. Hamza pronounced
with Fath, the conj. Hamza may not be elided [669],
although it occurs in the interior [of the sentence], lest
the interrogation be mistaken for enunciation, because
the vowels of the two Hamzas are identical, since both
[Hamzas] are pronounced with Fath: (d) in [dealing
with] that [combination] the Arabs have two methods, the more frequent being conversion of the second [Hamza] into a pure \([497]\), while the second is softening of the second [Hamza] between Hamza and \([656, 661, 669]\) (R) : [for] some of the Arabs put the conj. Hamza, in what we have mentioned, betwixt and between \([658]\) : the poet \([\text{AlMuthak\kib al'Abdr (AKB)}]\) says

\[
\text{رَا مَا أَدْرِى إِذَا يَسَتَّ أَمْرًا \* أُرِيدُ الْخَيْرُ أَيْهَا الْيَلِيمَيْنِ}
\]

\[
\text{أَلْخَيْرُ الْأَلِيْدَيْنَ أَنَا أَبْتَغْيِهِ} \* \text{أَمْ أَلْشَرَّ الْأَلِيْدَيْنَ} \text{هُوَ يَبْتَغْيِهِ} \]

\([669]\) (Jrb) \text{And I know not, when I intend a matter, meaning good, not evil, which of the two will follow me, whether the good that I seek, or the evil that seeks me (AKB), where [the second Hamza in أَلْخَيْرُ is the conj. Hamza, which is alleviated by being softened betwixt and between, since (AKB)], if it were not put betwixt and between, the measure of the verse would not be right; while it is not said to be sounded true [669], because no one allows that, and the proper way is to explain [the verse] according to what is allowed: and the two modes [of pronunciation] are transmitted from Fr in the texts \text{آلَّن} X. 91. \text{What!} [dost thou believe (K, B)] now? \([497, 669]\) and \text{آلَّدَ كَرِئِي} VI. 144, 145. \([656, 669]\); but the well-known [mode] is the first (Jrb) : (e) the first is more appropriate, because
the second Hamza ought to be elided [669], on account of its occurring in the interior [of the sentence]; while conversion is nearer than softening to elision, because, like elision [658], it is a removal of the Hamza altogether: but the Kur is read in both ways: (f) when the second [Hamza] is converted into ِ, two quiescents concur, irregularly, because, in such as لا خسن [above], the second [quiescent] is neither incorporated, nor paused upon, as we prescribed [above]; while, in your saying هل Is God ?, though it is incorporated, still the incorporated [letter] is not in the same word as the [letter that it is] incorporated into, [because the incorporated is the ج of the art., while the incorporated into is part of what the art. is prefixed to (MAR)) : (g) the ِ converted from the Hamza is not elided [below], lest the same confusion between interrogation and enunciation, from which they escaped [by refusing to elide the conj. Hamza], be entailed upon them; while that [retention of the ِ, notwithstanding the irregularity in the concurrence of the two quiescents.] is facilitated by the ج 's being more powerful in prolongation than its two fellows (R) : (5) in such as لا ها لله [552, 656] (SH), where the concurrence of two quiescents appears, from their being in two words, not to be allowable; but is allowed (MASH), because ها is equivalent to part of the word [ الله ُ], by reason of its being a compensation.
for the jurative م. which is like part of the word [that it is prefixed to] (Jrb, MASH) and [similarly in such as (Jrb, MASH)] [556, 558] (SH), from dislike that the expression الله [52, 262] should occur pronounced with Kasr of its Hamza, so that its meaning should not be recognized: (a) elision of the م [of م] in [such as (Jrb)] [552], and elision or Fath of the مى in [558] are allowable (Jrb, MASH), in which case two quiescents do not concur (MASH); so that in مى الله مًا الله and you are allowed the option of combining, or not combining, two quiescents: and for this reason IH separates them from the preceding cases, in which there is no option, as is obvious in all but آية الله الحسن and [is] likewise [affirmable] in these two, either upon the ground of the well-known method, [vid. conversion of the conj. Hamza into م] or because the Hamza betwixt and between approximates to the quiescent [658] (Jrb). And [in other cases than those which we have mentioned the concurrence of two quiescents is not pardonable; so that their saying (Jrb)] حَلَقَتْ [اللَّيْثِي] with expression of the م (Jrb)] is anomalous [228, 610] (SH), analogy requiring elision, as in عَلَمَ أَلَّامِيرِ the two menservants of the governor and ذَوَّبَا أَبْنِكَ the two garments of thy son, where you
do not pronounce the ۱: Aus [Ibn Ḥajar (Mb, Dw)] says

And the two rings of the belly-girth are pressed together in folks, and their hearts heave with impatience; but, in this prov., they never elide it, in order to describe the event as distressing, by sounding the dü true in pronunciation (Jrb). [since] إِلَّاتَقْتُ آللَّهَ is said, as a prov., when the evil is great, because the two rings do not meet except when the camel is extremely emaciated, or when the belly-girth is drawn excessively tight. But IH's saying "And حَلَقَتَا الْبَطَانَ is anomalous" ought to come after "and يُرْمِي الْفَرْضَ [below], because the ought to be elided, as in يُخَشَى الْقُرُومَ [below]. If the concurrence of two quiescents be [in any case] other than the mentioned, it is of two kinds, the first [quiescent] being either a letter of prolongation or not. And by "letter of prolongation" [above] we mean a quiescent letter of softness, when the vowel of what precedes it is homogeneous with it. If it be [a letter of prolongation], then, (1) if elision of the letter of prolongation would lead to confusion, the second [quiescent] is mobilized, since the [first, being a] letter of prolongation, is not movable, as in مُسْلِمَانِ Two Muslims and مُسْلِمٌ Muslims, where the ن [16, 228, 234] is
orig. quiescent; and, if the Tand, were elided because of the two quiescents, the two [formations] would be confounded with the acc. and nom., sing., when pronounced with Tanwin: (a) similarly in يُسْلِمُانِ They two become Muslims, يُسْلِمُونَ They become Muslims, and تُسْلِبِينَ Thou [fem.] becomest a Muslim, if the letters of prolongation were elided, the v. would, at first sight, be confounded with the [v.] corroborated by the single n. [610]: (2) if elision do not lead to confusion, the letter of prolongation is elided, whether the second quiescent be (a) in the same word as the first, as in خَفْ Fear thou, قُلُ Say thou, and بِنَامَ Sell thou [671, 703]: (b) like part of that word, as being (a) an attached nom. pron., as in تَخَشَّيْنَ Thou [fem.] dreadest, كُنْفُرُونَ Ye [masc.] raid, and تَرْمَيْنَ Thou [fem.] shootest: (a) their o.f. is تَخَشُّ , تَخَشَّ , تَخَشِّ , and تَرْمُي , Tَرْمَيْنَ; but, when the quiescent [nom.] prons., [i.e., the and of the pl. masc. and the of the sing. fem.] are attached to them, the s's are elided because of the two quiescents: (b) the first of the two corrob. n's, one of which is incorporated into the other, as Do ye surely raid and إِرْمَيْنَ Do thou [fem.] surely shoot [below], where the two prons. [ and ] are elided, because the quiescent n is attached to them [610]: or (c) the initial of a separate word, as in يُبْحَشٌ.
The people dread [above], The army raids, and He shoots at the mark [above]. The reason why the first [quiescent] is elided when it is a letter of prolongation, in the absence of confusion [above], and is mobilized when it is anything else, as in strike, strike, [like below], except with a preventive, as in below, as will be explained, while the second, in all the positions just mentioned, is neither elided, nor mobilized, is only that the second of the two quiescents is the one whose pronunciation becomes impracticable when the first is sound, and heavy when the first is a letter of softness; and, the cause of the impracticability and the heaviness being the quiescence of the first, that bar is removed, either by elision of the first, when a vowel upon it would be heavy, vid. when it is a letter of prolongation [below], or by mobilization of it when that would not be so: whereas you begin with the first of the two quiescents, before the occurrence of the second; so that its quiescence is neither impracticable, nor heavy. Mobilization of the letter of prolongation [above], which is ا or ى, would be heavy, because the effect sought from prolongation is alleviation, by making the letter of softness quiescent, and [the vowel of] what precedes it homogeneous with it, in order to soften its pronunciation: while mobilization of it would be
destructive of this object. But, as for the ‹, there is no question about it, because mobilization of it is impossible, since, in that case, it would not remain an ‹ [683]. And the reason why the is elided from ا‌غْرَزْنِ, and the ي from إِرْمِنَ [above], though the corrob. ن is like part of the preceding word, so that, if the or were left intact, it would be like [the ‹ in] ال‌ضُّلَآئِنَّ [above]. I. 7. [above], and [the of] نْ تُمْؤُدُ آل‌تَرِبٍ [above], is that this ن is, in every case, another word; and is not inseparable, so as, by reason of inseparability, to be given the predicament of part of the word. If anyone say "Then wherefore is it reckoned like part of the word in ا‌ضْرِبْبَانِ De ye two surely strike [below], so that the ‹ is not elided?", I say "The object is to distinguish between the sing. and the du.: for the ن, as not being heavy, can have the predicament of part of the word; but, as being bil., and not inseparable from the word, is not like part thereof: so that, where they have an object in giving it the predicament of part [of the word], i. e., in such as ا‌ضْرِبْبَانِ [below], they give it that [predicament]; and, where they have no object, they do not give it that [predicament]." The nom. prons. attached to the apoc. and imp. in such as ا‌غْرَزْوا لَمْ تَفْرَزْوا Ye did not raid, ا‌غْرَزْيَ Raïd thou [fem.] and لَمْ تَفْرَزْيَ Thou [fem.] didst not raid, ا‌رْمِيَا Shoot ye two and
Ye two did not shoot, *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Shoot ye and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Shoot thou [fem.] and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Thou didst not shoot, *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Be ye two pleased and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Ye two were not pleased, *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Be ye pleased and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Ye were not pleased, *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Be thou [fem.] pleased and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Thou [fem.] wast not pleased, are affixed to the v. after the elision of the ل for formation of the apoc. [404] or imp. [428], as they are affixed in Strike ye two and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Say ye [below], *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Ye two did not strike and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Ye did not say [below], after the apocopation [404] or quiescence [431]; then the لs are restored on account of their affixion, because with them the apocopation and quiescence are not upon the ل; and then the لs are elided with the ی, or ی, on account of the concurrence of two quiescents, after elision of the vowel of the ل; but are not elided with the ا, as *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* [above], *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Ye two did not raid, *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* [above], because of the absence of two quiescents. And the ل is not converted into ی in *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* above] and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Dread ye two, because they are made to accord with *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Ye two are pleased and *لَمْ تَقْصَرْ عَيْنَِّي* Ye two dread, as will be explained [719] (R). And, [should one say
that the ʿع, vid. the ʿل converted from the ʿس, and 
the ʿل of ʿف, and ʿح, vid. the ʿل converted from the 
ʿس, are elided only because of the concurrence of two 
quiescents, while this cause is absent (Jrb) in such as 
Fear thou God, Dread ye God, 
Dread thou [fem.] God [below], 
Do ye surely dread and Do thou [fem.] surely 
dread, [so that the elided must be restored, IH replies 
that in them (Jrb) the vowel [of the ʿس, and of the ʿس, 
and ʿس (Rb)] is not taken into account (SH), because it is 
accidental, put on account of [the occurrence of a 
quiescent after it in (Jrb)] a separate word, vid. ʿلا، 
[which is obvious (Jrb)]; and [similarly (Rb)] the [corrob. 
(Jrb) ʿن, which, when attached to the [prominent 
(Jrb)] pron., is like a separate (R, Jrb) word, according 
to what IH lays down at the end of the Kāfiya: so that 
the ʿل elided on account of the quiescence of the ʿس, and 
of the ʿل [and ʿس], does not return (R), contrary to [the 
ʿل of] such as Fear ye two and خَافَا Do thou 
masc.] surely fear (SH), where the vowel [of the ʿس] is 
quasi-original, because what follows it is attached to 
the word in the same way as a part [thereof], which in 
خَافَا is obvious; and in خَافَا is [equally true,] because, 
with the pron. latent, the ʿن is quasi-attached [to the v.] 
(Jrb). If, then, it be said "Grant that the ʿن [of
is like a word separate from the \(p\), because of the intervention of the [prominent] pron. between them, is it not quasi-attached to the pron., in the same way as to the \(l\) in خْفَان \(l\)? and therefore, since the vowel of the \(l\) in خْفَان \(l\) is quasi-original, because of what is attached to it, i.e., the \(n\), and for this reason the \(l\) elided in خَفَان returns [in خَفَان \(l\)], so ought the vowel of the \(l\) and \(y\) in خْشَيْن and خْشَوْن to be [quasi-original], so that the \(l\) elided in them, on account of the quiescence of the \(l\) and \(y\) attached to them, ought to return”, we say (1) that, between the attachment of the \(n\) to the \(l\) of the word, and its attachment to the [prominent] pron., there is a difference, because the \(n\), when attached to the pron. in letter, is not attached thereto in sense, since it denotes corroboration \([610]\) of the \(n\), not corroboration of the pron. : and (2) that the \(l\) of the word is radically mobile, so that [even] its accidental vowel is taken into account; contrary to the \(l\) and \(y\) of the pron., which are radically quiescent. If you say “Is not the \(n\) in such as إِضْرَبَان \(n\) [above] after the [prominent] pron.? Then why is not the \(l\) elided, as in إِضْرَبَانَ الْرَّجُلَ Strike ye two the man?”, I say “From fear of confounding the \(d\). with the sing., as above explained”. As for the vowel of the \(l\) in خَفَان \(l\) [above], خَفَانٍ, خَفَانَ, خَفَانٍ, خَفَانٍ, it, notwithstanding its
being accidental, becomes quasi-original, because of the attachment of the attached nom. pron., which is like part of the v.; and [because of] the attachment of the corrob. ن to the v. itself: and so in لِيَخَافُوا Let them two fear and لِيَخَافُوا Let them fear. Moreover, in the words mentioned, the vowels of the ل, although accidental, caused by affixion of the prons. and the ن, are still permanent, on account of the exclusion of the ل from being constructively quiescent, as it is in تُمَّ الْلِّيْلُ LXXIII. 2. Rise thou [to pray (B)] at night [below] and لَمْ يَقُولَ الْلِّيْلُ. He did not rise to pray at night, since, with the corrob. ن attached to the ل of the word, the apocopation [404] and quiescence [431] are totally removed, because, with it, the apoc. and imp. become uninfl. upon the vowel [402, 406, 610, 664], according to the soundest [opinion]; while, with attachment of the prominent prons., as in قُولِي Say thou [fem.] and كُمْ تَقُولْ Thou [fem.] didst not say, without a corrob. ن, the [indication of the mood, which in قُلْ Say thou and كُمْ تَقُلْ Thou didst not say is effected by] apocopation [404] or quiescence [431], is shifted from the ل to the ن [405, 431], which is after the ل [and the attached nom. pron.], in "the five paradigms", and by elision of which
the indication of the mood is therein effected]: so that in neither case does the ل remain constructively quiescent. Inevitably, therefore, the س return. And, on account of the cessation of the apocopation or quiescence, the لs are retained in أَغْرَوْنَ Do thou surely raid, لِيَغْرُوْنَ Let him surely raid, and أَغْرُواِ, Raid ye two [above]. The reason why the first of the two quiescents, i. e., the ل in حُبْلِيَانِ رَمَى, [229], but is converted into or ي, as you see, and mobilized, is fear of confounding the د. in غَرَا wa أَعْلِيَانِ, [719] They two raided and رَمَيَا They two shot, حُبْلِيَانِ and حُبْلِيَانِ, [229], but is converted into, or ي, as you see, and mobilized, is fear of confounding the د. with the sing., i. e., غَرَا He raided and رَمَيَا He shot, أَعْلِيَانِ زُبُرِ, حُبْلِيَانِ غَرَا the higher part of Zaid and حُبْلِيَانِ عُمَّرِ the pregnant female of 'Amr [684]. But the ل elided in the like of رَمَتْ she shot and رَخَّتْ She raided is not restored, although the د. is mobilized, in رَمَتْ They two [fem.] shot [607] and غَرَتَا They two [fem.] raided, because, although its vowel is on account of the ل, which is like a part [of the v.], still the verbal د. of feminization is radically quiescent; contrary to the ل of [the v. in] تَوُمَا Stand ye two, [which is radically mobile,] as above mentioned; and also because the د. which ought to come after the اغ., because it is the sign of feminization of 104a
the *ag.*, not of the *v.*, debars the ٌ from complete attachment, as we said of [the prominent *nom. pron.* in التمْلَكُ، ٌ] [which debars the ِن from complete attachment to the *v.*]. Some, however, allow restoration of the ٌ in the like thereof, citing as evidence the saying [of *Ibrahîm al-Kâsî*, describing his mare (*Jsh*)]

لَهَا مَثَّنَايٌ خَطَأَتَا كَمَا أَكْبَّ عَلَى سَاعِدِيَّةٍ آلِهَةِ

(R) *Having two sides to her back, that have become thick, as when the leopard crouches down upon his two fore-arms*, where the poet ought to have said خَطَأَتَا (Jsh). If the first of the two quiescents be not a letter of prolongation, it is mobilized, [not elided, whether it be a sound, or an unsound, letter (*Jrb*),] as اذْهَبُ اذْهَبْ [above], لَمْ أُبْلَهْ [below], and III. 1. Go, *go* [above]; and [as] إِخْضَرَّوْا آلِهَةً [above] (SH) : except when its mobilization would lead to destruction of the object, as in إنُظْلِقُ لَمْ يُلْدِه and [below], as will be explained. The reason why, in the absence of this preventive, the first must be mobilized, is that, its quiescence being, as we mentioned, the bar to the pronunciation of the second quiescent, that bar is removed by mobilizing the first, since the mobilization does not lead to heaviness, as mobilization of the letter of prolongation would, according to what we have mentioned. But from this *cat.* are excepted (1) the
single corrob. ن, as in [537, 614], which is elided, to distinguish it from the Tanwin [609]: (2) the ن of لَدَنْ [205], which is elided, though anomalously, because, being liable to elision, without a concurrence of two quiescents, as in the saying [of the Rajiz Ghailān (S)]

يَسْتَرْعِبُ الْبُرَّعِينِ مِنْ جَرِيرٍ مِنْ لَدْنِ لَحْيَينِ إِلَى مَنْخُورٍ

It takes full two fathoms of its rope from its two lower jaws to its chest, it may be elided when it occurs in a place where elision of the letter of prolongation would be good, and that because of the resemblance of the ن to the و [270]: (a) the ن of لَمْ يَكُنْ [450], although it shares with the ن of لَدَنْ in what we have said about resemblance to the و, and allowability of elision without [a concurrence of] two quiescents, is not treated analogously to it, because elision of the ن of لَدَنْ on account of the [concurrence of] two quiescents is anomalous, what we have mentioned being a reason for approving it, but not a necessitating cause: (3) the Tanwin of the proper name qualified by ابْن pre. to a proper name, as has been explained in its place [50, 609]. But, as for the elision of the Tanwin, on account of the [concurrence of (K)] two quiescents, in وَحَايْمُ الْطَائِيِّ آلِهَ [234], and in the reading of CXII. 1, 2. [609, 160],
it is anomalous (R), the approved [course] being to sound the Tanwin, and pronounce it with Kasr [609; 664] (K). The o. f. of [the v. in] لَمْ أَبْلَهْ I did not care [above] is أَباَلَيِ : the ي is elided because of the prefixion of the apocopative [لَمْ] ; then, لَمْ أَباَلِ being frequently used, abbreviation is required ; and therefore a second apocopation of the word by the apocopative is allowed, through assimilation of أَباَلِ, on account of the mobility of its final, to what has nothing elided from it, like يَقُول says and يَخْضَاف fears; so that the vowel of the أ is elided ; and then the л, on account of the two quiescents: and then the s of silence is affixed, as in لَمْ يَرِهُ He did not see and لَمْ يَخْشَأَ He did not dread [615], because the أ is constructively mobile, since its vowel, being only irregularly elided, is, as it were, expressed; so that, two quiescents concurring, the first is pronounced with Kasr, as is the rule [664], Kasr being also its original vowel (R). And hence إِخْشَأَن and إِخْشَأَن [above] are said, because, [says IH,] the [corrob. (Jrb)] ن here (Jrb) is quasi-separate (SH) : but the vice of this [argument] is not hidden (Jrb), [since] there is absolutely no reason for his bringing in this clause here, because the first quiescent, when not a letter of prolongation, is mobilized, whether the second be attached, like the s in لَمْ أَبْلَهْ [above] ; or separate, like
and إِخْصَوْا الله [above]; or quasi-separate, like [the in نإِخْصَوْنَ إِخْصَيْنَ and then what sense has his saying "because the ن is quasi-separate", when the predicament of the attached also is the same? The mobilization of the ل of determination prefixed to the conj. Hamza, as in the son and the name [669], the departure and the extraction, belongs to the cat. of mobilization of the first of two quiescents with Kasr [664], in order that pronunciation of the second may be possible, as in قد أُخْصَرَ He has already extracted and Has he been peculiarly distinguished?, because the conj. Hamza with its vowel is elided [669] in the interior [of the sentence]; so that two quiescents, the determinative ل and the quiescent that follows the conj. Hamza, concur. But Ks transmits from some of the Arabs that, when you mean to elide the Hamza in the interior [of the sentence], its vowel may be transferred to what precedes it: so that َالله أَلْرَحْمِيَ الَّذِي أَلْكَشَّدُ لِلَّهِ In the Name etc. [141], praise etc. [141] is transmitted with Fath of the م in the الرَّحْمِ, when you conjoin it with the initial of أَلْكَشَّدُ 1. 1.; and similarly َالله أَلْلُكَيْل LXXIII. 2. [above] is anomalously read with Fath of the م (R), by alleviation [658] (B). And,
according to this, the Kasra of the ل in أَلَّئِنَّ and أَلْتَلَقَ [above] may be transferred from the conj. Hamza. And similarly the Damm in such as وَلَكِنْ VI. 10. [540] and وَقَالَتْ أَخْرِجُ XII. 31. [664]. But [the authority for] this [transfer] is weak: and, if it were allowable, لَمْ يَكُنْ أَلْدِينَ XCVIII. 1. [above] and مَنْ أَلْدِي Who is he that?, with Fath of the two نs, would be allowable (R). The first is mobilized in all-cases (Jrb), except (1) when mobilization of the first is avoided for the sake of alleviation, in which case the second is mobilized, as in [with quiescence of the ل, and Fath of the ق (MASH),] and لَمْ يَلْدَهُ [with quiescence of the ل, and Fath of the د (MASH)]; and as in رُزْدَ and لَمْ يُرَدْ in [the dial. of] Tamīm [664, 731] (SH): i. e., in every position where two quiescents are combined by making the first to be quiescent for an object; so that, if the first were mobilized, the object, for which it was made quiescent, [vid. alleviation (MASH),] would come to nought (Jrb): (a) IH means that, if the first be not a letter of prolongation, the second is mobilized when destruction of the object would be produced from mobilization of the first: and this is [found] in the v. alone, as إنْطُلِقَ Depart thou, orig. إنْطُلِقْ, an imp. from إنْتَلَقَانِ departure, where, إنْتَلِقْ.
being assimilated to كَفْ in the dial. of Tamīm [368],
the ج is made quiescent; so that two quiescents concur;
and, if the first were mobilized, that would be destructive
of the object: and so one says of لَمْ يَلَّدَ (R), and
[according to Z] رَيْتَهُ XXIV. 51. [below] (M): the
poet says وَدَى وَلَدِي لَمْ يَلَّدَهُ أَلِهَمْ [505] (M, Jrb), orig.
لَمْ يَلَّدَهُ, which [also (IY)] is assimilated to كَفْ;
so that the ج is made quiescent; and, [two quiescents then
concurring (Jrb),] the ن is mobilized with Fath [below]:
and hence, [as some assert (Jrb),] the reading of هُبَّ
وَيْخَضَّ اللَّهَ وَيَتَّقُ XXIV. 51. And dreads God, and
is pious [below], with quiescence of the ق, and Kasr
of the س (IY, Jrb): (b) the second of the two quiescents
is pronounced with Fath [above], in preference to Kasr,
which is the o. f. in mobilizing [one of] two quiescents
[664], in order to purify the v. from Kasr, for which
reason the v. is protected from it by the ن of support
[170]: (c) as for Damm, one is not reduced to it, in
averting [a concurrence of] two quiescents, except for
alliteration, as in مَنْذ [203, 664]; or because the quies-
cent [to be mobilized] is the ج of the pl., as in إِخْضَوْنَ [610, 664]: (d) some say that the second is pronounced
with Fath for alliteration to the vowel of what precedes
the first quiescent, in addition to Fath's being lighter:
(e) the people of AlḤijāz do not incorporate in the
reduplicated [v.] whose  uneven stress is quiescent on account of the apoc. or imp., as  Restore thou and  He did not restore, because the condition of incorporation [731] is mobilization of the second [letter]: but the Banū Tamīm [664, 731] and many others, seeing this quiescence to be accidental, caused by the formation of the apoc. and imp., and to be sometimes replaced by mobility, although the vowel is accidental, as in  Restore thou the people [664], do not take this quiescence into account, but treat the second [letter] like the mobile; and therefore make the first quiescent, in order that it may be incorporated, and the word be thus lightened by incorporation: so that two quiescents concur; and, if the first were mobilized, that would be destructive of the object [of the incorporation, vid. alleviation (Jrb)]: and this [mobilization of the second] occurs in the Kur, as  II. 282. And let not a scribe or witness do harm, or be harmed (R), either [act. or pass. (K)] voice being admissible, as is proved by [the fact] that  is read with Kasr [by 'Umar (K)], and Fath (K, B) by Ibn 'Abbās (K): (f) all agree upon omitting incorporation in  when a [v. of] wonder [477], as  How dear he is!, because it is aplastic: (2) sometimes also when the second is the final of an uninfl. word, in which case it is
mobilized, since, the two quiescents being, upon this hypothesis, inseparable one from the other, [because the measure is supposed to be ٌْبَقُول,] if the first were mobilized, one measure would be confounded with another, as in ٌْبَقُول [206] and ٌْبَقُول [above], where the ْبَقُول a: d ْبَقُول would be mistaken for the ٌْبَقُول and ْبَقُول mobile therein: (a) [the mobilization of the second quiescent in] ٌْبَقُول [206, 321, 666], ْبَقُول [207, 321, 666], and ٌْبَقُول [202, 664, 666] may be attributed to [fear of] the like [confusion], and to [dislike of] the heaviness of a vowel upon the unsound letter, if the latter be not converted [684, 703]; while, if it were converted, that [conversion] would be a liberty in an indecl. [n.] (R).

But the reading of Ḥafs ٌْبَقُول XXIV. 51. And feareth Him [above] does not belong to this [cat. (Jrb)], according to the soundest (SH) saying, because the ٌْبَقُول of silence may not be expressed in continuity [615], nor mobilized at all [616]; and, if it might be mobilized here, the [vowel] suitable for it would be Fath, as in ٌْبَقُول [above] (MASH). This is a refutation of Z, who says that ٌْبَقُول is orig. ْبَقُول, with the ٌْبَقُول of silence [615] affixed thereto; so that [the termination of] it becomes ٌْبَقُول like ٌْبَقُول [above]; and then the vowel of [the medial, i.e.,] the ق is elided, as is [the practice in] the dial. of Tamim (R), like [the vowel of the ] in
Sulaima said "Buy thou for us barley-meal; and give me bread of wheat, or flour (N); so that, two quiescents concurring, the second, i.e., the ș of silence, is mobilized, lest destruction of the object, [vid. alleviation by quiescence of the medial,] be entailed, if the first should be mobilized. But what he says involves venturing upon mobilization of the ș of silence, [and expression of it in continuity (Jrb), each of] which is strange [615, 616]: and [Jj, whose opinion is adopted by (Jrb)] IH, says, which is the truth, that the ș here is [an objective pron. (Jrb)] relating to ِئَخْشَ ālīlah in [above]; and that ِتَثْقَ , being like ِكِنْفَ, is lightened by elision of the Kasr of the ق; and then the conj., i.e., the ِيَ, which follows the ș of the pron., is elided, because it is elided when the ș follows a quiescent, as in عَنْة, and عَلْيَهُ (R): so that there is no concurrence of two quiescents, nor any mobilization on account of such (Jrb).

§. 664. The general rule in every concurrence of two quiescents is that the first of them should be mobilized with Kasr, as بَغَبْثِ أَلْامَة The handmaid committed fornication and قَامَتِ أَلْجَارِيَّة The girl stood (IV). Since you know that, in some cases [663], mobilization [of one quiescent] is unavoidable, IH points out that
(Jrb) the o. f. [of mobilization (Jrb)] in a concurrence of two quiescents is [with (Jrb)] Kasr (SH). The reason why the o f. in mobilizing is Kasr, (1) in the case of the first quiescent, is what we have mentioned about one's own nature [663], when one is not forced to [employ] another vowel: (2) in the case of every quiescent whose mobilization is needed, both this [quiescent] that we are discussing [663-666], and the conj. Hamza [668, 669], is said to be that quiescence is substituted in the v., i.e., the apoe., for Kasr in the n., i.e., the gen. [404]; so that, when a vowel replacing, and annulling, quiescence is needed [in the v. or elsewhere], Kasr is substituted for quiescence by way of retaliation: (3) in the case of the first quiescent, is said to be that it occurs only at the end of a word, and therefore likes to be mobilized with a vowel not liable to be mistaken for an inflectional vowel; so that Kasr is most appropriate, because it is not an inflection except with Tanwin after it [16], or with a subst. therefor, vid. an art. or a post. n. [17]; and, when no Tanwin is found after it, nor any subst. therefor, it is known not to be an inflection: whereas Dam or Fatḥ is sometimes an inflection without Tanwin, or any subst. therefor, as يُضْرِبُ [408] and رَأَيتُ أَحْمَدتُ [17] and جَآءَنِي أَحْمَدتُ [408] and لَن يُضْرِبُ [410, 549]; so that, if the quiescent were mobilized with either of these two vowels, that vowel
would be liable to be mistaken for an inflectional vowel (R). If there be any variation [from this o. f. (MASH)], it is on account of an accident (SH), requiring some [vowel] other than Kasr, necessarily, preferably, or allowably (Jrb), like (1) the necessity for Damm in (a) the م of the pl. [below] (SH), as لَهُمُ اللَّدُنُوْرُونَ XXX VII. 172. [252] (Jrb), in order to restore it to its o. f. (MASH), since it is orig. pronounced with Damm, as is proved by the reading of the people of Makka [with Damm of this م, and (MASH)] with اُ, after it (Jrb, MASH), as عَلَيْكَمُو (MASH); (a) IH's saying "in the م of the pl." [above] is not unrestricdly true, because, when the م of the pl. is after a ِpronounced with Kasr [161], the best known [pronunciation] is Kasr of the م, as in the reading of IAl 161. The ties between them, for alliteration to [the Kasr of] the ِ, and in order to treat the م like the rest of what is mobilized on account of the [concurrence of] two quiescents; though the remainder of the Readers vary from the well-known [pronunciation], as بِهِمْ النَّاسُالْبَابُ II. 161. and عَلَيْهِمْ التَّطَّالِ IV. 79. [204], with Damm of the م, in order to mobilize it with the original vowel, i.e. Damm: (b) if the م be after a Damma, whether upon the ِ, as in هُمْ أَمْوَيْدُونَ VIII. 4. They are the believers and in the reading of ُمْبِلْيُهُمْ التَّطَّالِ [161] IV. 79. [above],
or upon any other [letter], as in XXXV. 16. Ye are the needy, VIII. 50. For you to-day, and II. 143. God will bring you, the well-known [pronunciation] is ḫamm of the م, in order to mobilize it with the original vowel, and for alliteration to what precedes it; but, in some dials., Kasr of it occurs, because of the [concurrency of] two quiescents, as in the rest of its congeners, consisting of one quiescent before another (R): (b) similarly (Jrb) مَدَد (SH), as مُدَدُ أَنْيَمُ (203, 510) (MASH), because, its o.f. being مَدَدُ, they mobilize [the أ ], in case of need, with the original vowel (Jrb): (a) ḫamm of the أ of مَدَدُ, on account of two quiescents, is not necessary, as IH mentions: but is more frequent than Kasr, either because its o.f. is ḫamm, since مَدَدُ is said to be orig. مَدَدُ; or for alliteration [in the vowel] of the أ to [that of] the م; or because it is like the finals [201]: (c) نَخْصُ (161), in order that the ḫamm may indicate plurality, as in حُمْرُ and آنَتمْ (R): (2) the preference for Fath in such as آلِيَّمُ إِلَّهَ III. 1. [321, 663] (SH): (a) IH says "preference for Fath" because Akh allows Kasr, according to analogy in the concurrence of two quiescents; and ‘Amr Ibn ‘Ubaid reads with it; but it is not accepted [663] by the Readers (Jrb): (b) [IH’s citation of "such as آلِيَّمُ إِلَّهَ III. 1." is relevant only on the
assumption that the vowel of the ꞌ is imported on account of a concurrence of two quiescents, which assumption is based on the theory that the quiescence of the final in such as مّ is not on account of pause; and, on that assumption, the reasons for adopting Fath, in preference to Kasr, as the vowel of the ꞌ, have been indicated by H in §. 321, and Jrb in §. 663: but [R, who maintains the theory that the quiescence of the final in such as مّ is on account of pause, says that] the Fatha of the ꞌ is transferred from the Hamza, not [imported] because of [a concurrence of] two quiescents: [and in that case the citation is not relevant here]: (c) the Fath [on the final of the v.] in such [formations] as لیَضْرَبْنَ Do thou surely strike and لیَضْرَبَ Let him assuredly strike is on account of the [concurrence of] two quiescents, according to Zj and Sf (R): [for] what we have mentioned, vid. that the v. [in such formations] is uninfl. upon Fath [402, 406, 610, 663], is the opinion of S, Mb, and F: while Zj and Sf say that the vowel is [imported] on account of the [concurrence of] two quiescents, whether the v. [before the affixion of the ꞌ] be infl., [as in لیَضْرَبَ Let him strike,] or uninfl., [as in لیَضْرَبَ strike thou,] because, by affixion of the ꞌ, the v. is estranged from resemblance to ns. [404]; and therefore reverts to its o. f., vid. uninflectedness [402], the
ο. f. of which is quiescent; so that it has to be mobilized [in the final], on account of the two quiescents; and is then mobilized with Fath, to preserve [the final of] the v. from being unnecessarily pronounced with Kasr, the characteristic of the gen.: [but here the Fath is necessary, not preferable, there being no alternative vowel for the final of the v. in these formations:] (R on the Corroborative ن in IH): (3) the allowability of ٰظُمُب when the second of the two quiescents is followed by an original ٰظُم in the same word [with the second quiescent (R, Jrb)], as قَالَت تَأْخْرَجَ XII. 31.

And she said "Come forth" [663] (SH), ۳۶۸۸. ۴۰, ۴۱. [609], XV. 45, 46.

And springs. Enter ye them (M), and قُلْ أَنْظُرُوا X. 101. Say thou, Consider ye [666] (IY), in [all of (IY)] which ٰظُم is [allowable (Jrb)] for alliteration (IY, Jrb), the ٰظُم of the ُب in قَالَت being an alliteration to the ٰظُم of the أَخْرَج, since there is no barrier between them, except a quiescent letter; and similarly [the ٰظُم of] the ٰظُم [in ۳۶۸۸] being an alliteration to the vowel of the ُب [in أَخْرَج], since there is nothing between them, except the quiescent ِب; and similarly [as] ۳۶۸۸ LXXIII. 3. Or deduct [666, 668], except that the ٰظُم here is for two reasons, one being the same as in ۳۶۸۸. ۴۰, ۴۱.
[above]; and the other being assimilation to the of the pron., on the principle of IX. 42. [below], where Damm is allowable, although the after the is pronounced with Fath (IY): and [similarly (Jrb)]

She said "Raid thou [fem.]" (SH), because the original vowel of the is Damma, since the ا is affixed to أُزُرُ with Damm of the ز (R): contrary to such as إِنِّي أَمُرُ أُزُرُ IV. 175. [16, 591] (SH), because the Damm of the ز (R, Jrb) is not original (Jrb), [but] is an alliteration to the accidental Damm of inflection, while an alliteration to an accidental [vowel] is accidental (R); and to قَالَتْ أَرْمُوا She said "Shoot ye" (SH), because the original vowel of the م is Kasr, since the ا is affixed to إِمَّـٓلَحَّمٓ with Kasr of the م (R); and VI. 57.

Judgment belongeth not [666] (SH), because the Damm of the ح, though original, is not in the same word as the second quiescent, since the art. is one word [599], and another: (a) the secret of it is that, when the Damm is in another word, it is not inseparable from the two quiescents; and is therefore not taken into account (Jrb): (b) Kasr is allowable [in all of this (IY)], according to the o. f. (IY, Jrb); and is read, as 

XII. 31. [above], خَلْوَحَا Xv. 45, 46. [above], and XXXVIII. 40, 41. [609] (Iy): (c) Mb does not approve of Damm (IY, R) of the first
quiescent (R) here (IJ), when it follows a Kasra, as in XXXVIII. 40, 41. [and XV. 45, 46.] (R), because it involves a transition from Kasr to Damm [668], which is deemed heavy (IJ, R) in their language, and is not found in their speech; whereas X. 101. and LXXIII. 3. [above] are not like that (IJ) : (d) مُرِيبٍ ٱلْذَّيٍّ (L. 24, 25. Suspicious [of God and His religion (K, B)], who is read with Fath of the ﷺ, for an escape from the succession of Kasras (M), upon the principle [666] of مَتُّوْمُينَ IV. 97. [89]; but the reading of the majority is مُرِيبٍ مَّيْنَيٍّ with the Tanwin [of مُرِيبٍ ] pronounced with Kasr [609], on account of the concurrence of two quiescents (IJ): (e) sometimes the first of the two quiescents, although the second be not followed by an original Damma, is pronounced with Damm, for alliteration to the Damma of what precedes it, as ﷺ لَأْسَرٍ Say thou “Strike”; and ﷺ لَأْلَيْلٍ LXXIII. 2. [663] is anomalously read (R), with Damm of the ﷺ (K, B), for alliteration (B): IJ says “The object of putting this vowel is to effect thereby an escape from the concurrence of two quiescents; and, with whichever of the [three] vowels you mobilize [the ﷺ, the object is realized” (K): (f) by analogy to this, the [first quiescent] preceded by a Fathâ is pronounced with Fath by some, as إِصْنَعْ ٱلْكَيْرَ. Do thou good (R): (4) the preference for 106 a
Damm, (a) [in the  (R, Jrb) of the pron. (Jrb) of the pl., when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (R),] in [such as (R, Jrb)] (a) ِإْخْشَأُوا الْقُومَ ُ(SH), II. 238. [547, 668], and ُذَخَّرُوا ُلَّهُ مُخْلِصِينَ XXXI. 31. They call on God, being sincere (Jrb), contrary to IX. 42. [below] (SH): (α) [the , of the pron. in] ِإْخْشَأُوا الْقُومَ [above] is pronounced with Damm to distinguish it from the , in such [words] as ُذَخَّرُوا and ُذَخَّرُوا [below], which is a [mere] letter (IY); [for,] whenever the , is a [mere] letter, [forming] part of the word itself, it is mobilized with Kasr, as IX. 42. [below] and LXXII. 16. [525], to distinguish between them: this is the doctrine of Khal: (β) others say that the Arabs prefer Damm in what is a n., [i.e., pron.] (IY on §. 663), because Damm, being homogeneous with the , is related to it more closely than any other [vowel]: and also (Jrb) because a letter, [vid. a ِي or ِي (Jrb),] pronounced with Damm has been elided [here] before the , [of the pron.] (IY, Jrb), the o. f. being ِإْخْشَأُوا ِذَخَّرُوا ِتَسْأَرُوا [and ِذَخَّرُوا] (IY); so that, [when mobilization of the , is needed (IY),] they mobilize it with the vowel [of the letter (Jrb)] elided, which is more appropriate (IY, Jrb) than importation of a strange vowel; whereas, when the , is part of the word itself, they mobilize it with Kasr, according to the general rule
[above] in the concurrence of two quiescents, since there is then no elided vowel, wherewith it might be mobilized (IY): (b) [610, 663], in order that the vowel of the letter preceding the ن may be similar in all conjug., as (α) it may be said that they intend to distinguish the ِ of the pl. from any other [ ], as in IX. 42. [below]; while the ِ of the pl. is more worthy of .yahoo, in order that the letter preceding the corrob. ن may be made to keep one vowel in all conjug., as just mentioned (R): (b) similarly in the ِ of the pl., [when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath.] in the n. [161] (R); [for] they treat the ِ of the pl., [when so preceded,] like the ِ of the pron., because each of them indicates the pl. masc., and has a letter pronounced with .yahoo, vid. the ِ of the word, elided before it (Jrb), as مُصَفَّتانِ ِ اللٰهِ the elect of God (R, Jrb), [which is so pronounced] in order that it may correspond with such as صَارِبُو ِ أُلْقَوْمِ the strikers of the people (R): (α) in other cases, the ِ [preceded by a Fath.] is pronounced with Kasr (Jrb); [so that] Kasr is preferred in the ِ of [and أَوْ ] (R), as لَوْ أَتَّصَفَيْنا ِ لَوْ أَتَّصَفَيْنا ِ LXXIII. 3. above] (Jrb), according to the o.f.; because there is no such inducement to .yahoo as there is in
the, of the pl.: (b) the, of the pl. is sometimes assimilated to the, of such as لُو and رُو, and is therefore pronounced with Kasr; and similarly the, of such as لُو [and رُو] is sometimes assimilated to the, of the pl., and is therefore pronounced with Damm (R): [thus] لَلَا تَنَّسَوْا آتَيْتَلْ. II. 238. [above] is read with Kasr of the, [of the pl.] (K): while لَلَا أَنْفَضْتُ (IX. 42. [above]) is read with Damm of the, [of لُو], by assimilating it to the, (K, B). of the pron. (B) of the pl. [masc.] in لَلَا تَنَّسَوْا آتَيْتَلْ. II. 88. Then wish for death (K), [and] in II. 15. [403] (B); and [similarly] لَلَا أَلْعَبَتْ XVII. 17. [and لَلَا أَنْفَضْ LXXIII. 3. above] [K, B]: but both of these [variations] are rare (R): (c) as for the, which is the sign of the pron. [161, 402], it, when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is pronounced with Kasr in [meeting] the conj. اِخْشَيْ َآتَيْتَلْ. Dread thou the man said to a woman, because, since they make the vowel of the, homogeneous with the, they make the vowel of the, homogeneous with the, which is treated here as the, is treated there; while, if you treat it like [the, in II. 238. [above], you [still] pronounce with Kasr: so that in every case it is pronounced with Kasr: (d) the, in من مَضْطَقْقِينَ is [treated] like that in اِخْشَيْ. As
from the elect of God (S): (c) in صَٰلِحٍ [202, 663, 666], because it is like the finals [201] (R): (5) the allowability of Damm [for alliteration (Jrb)], and Fath [for lightness, besides Kasr, according to the o.f. (Jrb)], in such [imps. and apocs.] as رََّبِّي، Restore thou and لَمْ يَبْرِقَ. He did not restore, contrary to such as رَّأَّسُوا آلَّةَمُهُ Restore thou the people, [where the double letter meets a quiescent after it, in which case Kasr is preferred (Jrb),] according to most (SH), because, if it were not incorporated, and أُزْدِدَ آلَّةَمُهُ [663] were said, Kasr would be necessary; so that, when they incorporate, the second [د] retains its vowel (Jrb): [or] because, since Kasr is allowable, on account of the concurrence of two quiescents in one word [رَٰبِّيٰ], and then a [second] concurrence thereof in two words [زَٰزُوْدُ آلَّةَمُهُ] supervenes, the cause of Kasr is strong; and the allowable becomes necessary, on account of the strength of its cause (IV): (a) some, [vid. the Banū Asad (M),] pronounce [it (IV, Jrb)] with Fath [with the art. (IV)], as دُمْ أَلْسَمَزَ آلُهُ [171] (M, Jrb), also related دَمْ أَلْسَمَزَ آلُهُ with Kasr (Jrb); and as نَفْعِضُ آلُهُ [below] (M): and [Jrb affirms that] some pronounce with Damm [below], which is rare (Jrb): (b) [all of] this is when the aor. is [orig.] pronounced with Damm of the أُ (Jrb, MASH): but, if it be
pronounced with Fath or Kasr [is allowable], according to the o. f.; and Fath, for lightness, and for alliteration [also] in the case of the [aor.] pronounced with Fath of the ع (MASH): (c) when the Banū Tamīm, and those who imitate them, incorporate, as we have mentioned [663], in such imps. and apocs. as these, they adopt [three] several methods [of mobilizing the second quiescent]:—(a) some pronounce it with Fath, as in لَمْ يَلْدُهُ إِنْطُقَ [663], from regard to its being a v., in which it is more proper to avoid a permanent Kasra; whereas in أُرْدُنَ الْقُومَ [above] the matter of the Kasra is softened by its being accidental: so that they say مُدّ draw, مُعَصَّ bite, and مُعَصَّ be mighty; and, according to them, the Fath of مُعَصَّ is not for alliteration, otherwise they would say مُدّ with Damm, and مُعَصَّ with Kasr: (b) some flee from Kasr to alliteration, as in مَنْذ [203, 663]; so that they say مُدّ, مُعَصَّ, and مُعَصَّ; and, according to them, the Kasr in مُعَصَّ is not because the [second] quiescent is [properly] mobilized with Kasr; otherwise مُدّ and مُعَصَّ also would be pronounced with Kasr: (c) some, vid. Ka'b and Ghanī. keep all [three] pronounced with Kasr, which is the o. f. in annulling [a concurrence of] two quiescents; and, according to them, the Kasr in مُعَصَّ is not for alliteration, otherwise alliteration would take place in مُدّ and مُعَصَّ also: (d) the
Arabs, Ḥijāzīs and others, unite in adopting incorporation, together with Fath, in لُمْ дел.îm [189], because, لُمْ being compounded with كا, they lighten it by the necessity for incorporation, and the necessity for Fath: (e) if this apoc. or imp. be contiguous to a quiescent after it, as رَعَةُ أَبْنِكَ Restore thy son and لُمْ تَرَى آلِقَومَ Thou didst not restore the people, then most of those who incorporate are agreed upon pronouncing it with Kasr, by analogy to the rest of what is quiescent before a quiescent like this, as in اضْرِبُ آلِقَومَ Strike thou the people: (f) some of the Arabs leave it pronounced with Fath with this quiescent also: Y mentions that he heard them recite

[above] (R), by Jarîr (IY, Jsh) Ibn ‘Atîya atTamîmî, addressing ‘Ubaid Ibn Ḥuṣain an Numâirî, the poet cognominated Ar Râ‘î, Then lower the eye: verily thou art of Numair; so that neither Kâb hast thou reached, nor Kilûb (Jsh), with Fath of the ض (R), as though, says F, they reduced it to the general rule [that Fath is allowable in such an imp., when not followed by a quiescent], saying خُصُص, and afterwards annexed the art. to it (IY); [i. e.,] as though they mobilized it with Fath before the introduction of the art., and then did not alter it when the art. was put: (g) from none of them has Damm [above] been heard before the quiescent:
IH [followed by Jrb], in the Commentary [on the SH], allows it; but this is a mistake (R): (6) the necessity for (a) Fath in such as ُز،، Restore thou her (SH), for affinity to the l (Jrb): (α) the Arabs are all agreed upon the necessity for Fath when a s followed by an l is attached to this imp. or apoc., as ُز،، [above], عضهاٍإِسْتَعِدُهاٍ Bite her, and ُز،،إِسْتَعِدُهاٍ Make her ready (R), because the s is faint (R, Jrb); so that the l, as it were, follows immediately after the [letter] incorporated into; while the l is not preceded by any [vowel] but Fatha (R): (b) Damm in such as ُز،، Restore thou him, [for affinity to the , (Jrb),] according to the chastest [usage]; while Kasr [in ُز،، (MASH)] is a weak dial. var., [heard by Akh from the Banu 'Ukail (MASH)]; and Th is taxed with error in allowing Fath (SH) in such as ُز،، [below] (MASH): (α) when the s denoting the sing. masc. is pronounced with Damm, all of them pronounce [the letter incorporated into] with Damm, as ُز،، [above], عضَّةٍإِسْتَعِدُهُ Bite him, and ُز،،إِسْتَعِدُهُ Make him ready, because the , [161], as it were, follows immediately after the [letter] incorporated into, since the s is faint, as though you said عضَّرٍ، وَزُرُرٍ، إِسْتَعِدَّرٍ, عضَّرٍ, وَزُرُرٍ; and the Damm in ُز،، is not for alliteration to that [vowel] which precedes it, otherwise عضَّةٍ and ُز،،إِسْتَعِدُهُ would not be pronounced with Damm (R): (6) IH says "according to the chastest
(1039)

[usage] because it is not necessary that the vowel preceding the, should be homogeneous with it; and, for this reason, the [dialectic] variation [above mentioned] occurs here (Jrb): (c) Kasr of the [letter] incorporated into occurs in one dial., because, when that letter is pronounced with Kasr, the s also is pronounced with Kasr, by alliteration to it, as is the custom of the s in غَلَامِهِ [161], so that the, is converted into ى; whereas, if the s retained its original vowel, Kasr would be disliked, because the quiescent, would, as it were, follow the Kasra, without separation, since the s is faint:

(d) Th in the Faṣḥ, without [the authority of] any hearsay, allows Fatḥ of the [letter] incorporated into, notwithstanding the occurrence of the s of the 3rd pers. [sing. masc.] after it, as یَرُبُّ [above], یُعْثَمُ, and یِسْتَعِیدُ: but many pronounce this to be an error; though analogy does not forbid it, because the occurrence of the quiescent, after Fatḥa is not uncommon, as in یُرُوُلُ superiority (R): (c) Fatḥ in the ن of مَنِ the with the ل [of determination (Jrb)], as مَنْ أَرْجِلِی from the man, Kasr being weak; contrary to مَنْ أَنْبِكَ from thy son [666, 669] (SH), where Fatḥ is weak (Jrb).

§. 665. Some of the Arabs dislike the concurrence of two quiescents in every case, even if they satisfy the condition on which a combination of two quiescents is
allowable, as in َبِئْسَةَ beast and شَابَةُ lass (IX). Mobilization of the first quiescent occurs in two pardonable [663] sorts of concurrence of two quiescents, because of their dislike to the concurrence of two quiescents, unrestrictedly:—(1) where the quiescence of the second is on account of pause, and the first is not a letter of softness, as in مَرْتَ ِبِعَمْرُ َء 'Amr came to me and جَآئِنِي عَمْرُ و 'I passed by 'Amr, in which case the first is mobilized with the vowel of the second, [as ِبِعَمْرُ and ِبَمْرُو, ] because it must have a light vowel, as we mentioned [663] at the beginning of the chapter; and therefore to mobilize it with a vowel that was [orig.] expressed, and whose elision was then intended for an indication of a meaning, [vid. completion of the purport of the speech,] is more appropriate: (a) if the second quiescent be the َ of the masc. [648], as in إِضْرَبةَ strike him, ُمَنَة , and ِضْرَبَتْها, the vowel of the َ may be transferred to the preceding quiescent, as ُضْرَبَتْها ِضْرَبَتْها [641], ُمَنَة , and ِضْرَبَتْها ; but some of the Banū Tamīm, vid. the Banū 'Adr, elide the vowel of the َ, and mobilize the first [quiescent] with Kasr, as ٌخَذَتْها ُضْرَبَتْها [641] and ًأَحْدَتْها ُضْرَبَتْها The woman struck [607]: (2) when the second quiescent is incorporated, and the first is an ِ [below], as in I. 7. [663], in which case the ِ is converted into a Hamza [683] pronounced with Fath, as in the
anomalous reading I. 7. [539, 656] transmitted from Ayyūb es Sikhtiyān; and in 641, 656 and transmitted from him by AZ, who cites

[677] (R) O marvel! Assuredly I have seen a marvel, a woodlouse driving a hare, putting a halter upon her, attaching a nose-reinto her, in order that she might go. Then said I “Let me ride behind”, and he said “Welcome!” (M.A.R), i.e., the I being converted [by poetic license (Jh)] into a Hamza pronounced with Fath, since the metre of the verse would not be correct with I, by reason of the combination of the two quiescents; and in the reading of [HB and (K)] 'Aur Ibn 'Ubaid 5 لَمْ يَسْأَلْهُ لَدَى ذَنْبِهِ إِنْسُ وَلَدَ جَانَ LV. 39.

Then, on that day, man shall not be questioned about his sin, nor spirits, reported by AZ: (a) Mb says, I said to Mz “Dost thou take that as a precedent?”; and he said “No, nor do I accept it”; (b) Z and IH hold that the I is made into a Hamza pronounced with Fath for an escape from the concurrence of two quiescents; (c) it may, however, be said that the conversion of the I in such as 640 into Hamza is not for an escape from the concurrence of two quiescents, but is like what is [found] in the bār and al-ālām [683]; and that, since they convert it
into a quiescent Hamza, which cannot be followed by a quiescent, as the ل can be, the first of the two quiescents is mobilized, as is the general rule [664], except that it is pronounced with Fath, because Fatha proceeds from the same outlet [732] as the subst. and its original, i.e., the Hamza and the ل, because both are from the throat: (d) if the ل have an o. f. mobile with any vowel, the Hamza is mobilized with that vowel, as in the saying [of the Rājiz (Jh)]

(1042)

(R) O abode of Mayya (a woman's name) in the low-lying sands, sands mixed with stones and earth, (give me) patience, صبرًا being governed in the acc. by a v. understood, i.e. أعطيني صبرًا, while Jh has the version سقّيأ. God send thee rain [41], for thou hast excited the yearning of the yearner (MAR), where, says S, he pronounces with Hamza [by poetic license (Jh)] what should not be pronounced with Hamza (Jh, MAR) : (e) when the first of the two quiescents in this cat. is an ل [above], one escapes from the concurrence of two quiescents by converting it into a mobile Hamza; but not when it is a ٰ, as in تأمزَّروني [663] and تُؤْوِدْ XXXIX. 64. Do ye bid me?, [with incorporation of the (K)]; or a ى, as in دُوِّيَّة [274] and خُرْيَضَة [663]: because of the frequency of the [concurrence of] two
quiescents when the first of them is an \( \mathbf{\text{I}} \), not when it is
\( \mathbf{\text{I}} \) or \( \mathbf{\text{R}} \) (f) they do not alter the \( \mathbf{\text{I}} \) in \( \text{XXXIX. 64.} \) [above], because, [says Jrb.] the Hamza is remote from it; and because, [if \( \text{تَأَمُّرُونَتِي} \) were said,] the Damm upon the Hamza, together with what precedes it, would be heavy (Jrb): (g) \( \text{تَأَمُّرُونَتِي} \) is read in \( \text{XXXIX. 64.} \) [by Ibn 'Amir, with the two \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \)'s displayed (B)], according to the o. f.; and \( \text{تَأَمُّرُونَتِي} \) [by Nafi' (B)], with elision of the [second (B)] \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \) (K, B), which is often elided [170, 405] (B).

§ 666. The \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \) of \( \mathbf{\text{M}} \) \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \), (1) when the \( \mathbf{\text{L}} \) of determination [599] is conjoined with it, is most commonly pronounced with Fath, because the \( \mathbf{\text{L}} \) of determination frequently occurs after \( \mathbf{\text{M}} \), and the succession of two Kasras is deemed heavy when frequent: (a) that [Fath] is not because the vowel of the [conj.] Hamza in \( \text{أَلْ} \) is transferred [to the \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \)], otherwise \( \text{هَلْ أَلَّمَل} \) [663] would be allowable: (b) Ks says that they pronounce [the \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \)] with Fath in such as \( \mathbf{\text{M}} \) \( \text{أَلَّمَل} \) [664] because \( \mathbf{\text{M}} \) \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \) is orig. \( \mathbf{\text{M}} \), but he produces no argument in [support of] it; and this is as he says that \( \mathbf{\text{K}} \) is orig. \( \mathbf{\text{K}} \): (2) when a quiescent other than the \( \mathbf{\text{L}} \) of determination follows immediately after it, is commonly pronounced with Kasr, according to the o. f., as \( \mathbf{\text{M}} \) \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \) \( \mathbf{\text{M}} \) \( \mathbf{\text{N}} \) [664, 669],
the [succession of] two Kasras not being heeded, from rarity of usage (R). But [S says that (R)] some chaste speakers pronounce [the ن (R)] with Fath (S, R) with [a quiescent] other than the ج of determination (MAR), to escape from the [succession of] two Kasras (R); so that they say مِنْ أُنْسِلْيَبَنُم from the Muslims (S). And [they assert that (S)] some of the Arabs [also (R)] say مِنْ آللِهِ from God; so that they (S)] pronounce it with Kasr, [which is not common, with the ج of determination (R), treating it (S)] according to the o. f. (S, R); and do not heed the [succession of] two Kasras, because the second is accidental. They keep also to Fath of [the final in] أَيْنَ [206, 321, 663] and كَيْف [207, 321, 663], in order to escape from the combina-
tion of two likes, i.e., the ي and Kasra, [which would ensue] if they pronounced with Kasr, according to the o. f.; and because DAMMA after the ي, if they pro-
nounced with DAMM, would be heavy. But كَيْف 202, 663, 664] deviates from that [rule]: for they allow [the final in] it to be pronounced with (1) DAMM, in the chasest, best-known [usage]; (2) Fath, according to the rule mentioned [for أَيْنَ and كَيْف]; (3) Kasr, which is weak: though the last two [pronunciations] are rare. The reason for DAMM has been mentioned before [664]: and, as for Kasr, it is [allowable] according to the o. f.;
although it varies from the rule mentioned, since the first [quiescent] is a ی (R). But ۸ is [pronounced with Kasr of its ن (R)],] according to the o. f. (SH), with whatever quiescent it be [conjoined], since two Kasras are not combined in it, as in ۸ [above] (R). And ۸ from the man, [quoted by Akh (R)] with ū from, is weak (SH); and, says he, is bad (R).

He likens it to their saying ۸ ۸ LXXIII. 3. [664 (IY, R) and ۸ ۸ meaning that the ن is mobilized with ū for alliteration to the ū of the ج, the incorporated not being taken into account, [so that ۸ is reducible to ۸ ]: but this [explanation] is weak, because ū is not allowable in VI. 57. [664], notwithstanding the ū after the second quiescent, without separation. If, then, this quotation were correct, it should not be copied in any other [phrase]; and, even if it were copied, such copying would be allowable only in what is like it, vid. where the [second] quiescent is followed by [a letter pronounced with] ū, as in ۸ from the judgment; or by a letter [interposed] between them, as in ۸ from the upper
arm (R). But with Fath, for alliteration, is not allowable, because alliteration is not an o. f.; but is found only in what has come down from them, and is not to be copied (Jrb).
CHAPTER VII.

THE PREDICAMENT OF THE INITIALS OF WORDS.

\$ 667. It is common to the three kinds \[625\] (M), the n., the v., and the p., because each of them may be inceptive \[658\], as \( \text{قَامَ رَبُّكَ} \) \[24\], \( \text{قَامَ رَبُّكَ} \) \[20\], and \( \text{إِنَّ رَبٌّدَا قَامِمُ} \) \[517\] (IY). One begins only with a mobile, as one pauses only upon a quiescent (SH). The inceptive letter is only mobile (IY, Jrb), because the articulate [quiescent] letter is supported either, like the of \( \text{عُمَّرُ} \) \( \text{امَرُ} \) \( \text{عُمَّرُ} \) upon a neighbouring vowel; or, like the of \( \text{حَوْيِّصَةٌ} \) \[668\], upon a preceding letter of softness, which serves instead of a vowel: and, when these supports are missing, speech is impracticable. The proof thereof is experience; and whoever denies that denies what is visible to the eye, and disputes what is perceptible by the senses. Some allow beginning with a quiescent, because the utterance of the vowel comes to pass only after the utterance of the consonant, and to make a thing depend upon what comes to pass after it is absurd. But the answer is a denial [of the assertion] that the vowel is [uttered] after the consonant; nay, the vowel is [uttered simultaneously] with it (Jrb). Most [authorities] hold that beginning
with a quiescent is impracticable [368, 640, 663, 668]; but IJ takes the view that it is difficult, not impracticable, saying that it occurs in Persian [663], as شتر camel and ستام saddle-ornaments. Apparently, however, it is impossible; and beginning with a mobile is unavoidable: but, since that mobile in such as شتر and ستام is extremely faint, the word is thought to begin with a quiescent; whereas it is supported, before that quiescent, upon a letter approximate to Hamza, pronounced with Kasr. As for pausing upon a mobile, it is not impossible. By “pausing” we do not mean the technical “pause”, which is only upon the quiescent, or its like, vid. that [letter] whose vowel is pronounced with Raum [640]; but we mean “quiescence” and “ending” (R). The initials of words are generally mobile (M, R). But some of them occur quiescent (M), except that they prefix the conj. Hamza [668] as a means of effecting the articulation of the quiescent (IY). It being obvious that beginning is not possible, except with a mobile, if the initial of the word be mobile, the matter is plain; but, if it be quiescent, it needs the conj. Hamza (Jrb). That [quiescence of the initial] is [found] in (1) ns., [which are (Jrb)] of two kinds (M, Jrb), (a) confined to hearsay (Jrb), vid. [ten (IY, Jrb) non-inf. (M)] ns., [limited in number (IY),] i.e., ابن son, بنت daughter, [i. q. ابن (Jrb)] إثنان two [masc., إثنان, إثنان] two
man, woman, name, rump or anus, and God's blessing (M, Jrb) or [651] (M): (b) regular (Jrb), vid. the inf. ns. of the [eight (IY), or rather twelve,] vs. whose [initial (M)]'s [in the pret. (Jrb)] are followed by four or more (M, Jrb) letters [668], as (a) [332, 482] (M), like [668] (IY); like had power [482, 468, 671]; and, like, these three being of one measure and one paradigm (IY): (b) [332, 482] (M), like [332, 482, 493, 468]; like [496]; like [482, 494]; and [494]; these five also being of one paradigm, [to which belong three more formations, whose inf. ns. are mentioned below, vid. like, including (482) like (482, 483); and like (495, 668): (c), like (495), which is a different paradigm]: (α) as for the first three, their initial is made quiescent, because, if they did not do that, more than three mobiles would be combined in one word; and, as for the following five [or rather nine], it is as though, having added a letter to them, they disliked the multiplicity of consonants, and the multiplicity of vowels, and therefore made their initial quiescent: and,
since that is necessary in these vs., they have recourse to it in their inf. ns. (IY): (β) they are eleven [or rather twelve] formations, [the first ten being augmented trils., and the last two augmented quads.] (Jrb, Tsr, MASH):—you say (M) إِنْعَالَلْ [إِنْعَالَلْ (Jrb, Tsr, MASH),] إِسْتَعْفَالَلْ (M, Jrb, Tsr, MASH), إِنْعِيَالَلْ (Tsr, MASH), إِفْعَيَالَلْ (Jrb, Tsr),] and إِفْعَيَالَلْ (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), as إِنْعَالَلْ (IY), إِفْعَيَالَلْ (Jrb, Tsr),] إِفْعَيَالَلْ (IY, Tsr), إِفْعَيَالَلْ (M, Jrb, Tsr), إِفْعَيَالَلْ (IY, Jrb, Tsr), إِفْعَيَالَلْ (Tsr), إِفْعَيَالَلْ (Jrb, Tsr), (γ) hence إِفْعَيَالَلْ [إِفْعَيَالَلْ (IY, Tsr),] إِفْعَيَالَلْ (M, Jrb, Tsr), إِفْعَيَالَلْ (IY, Jrb, Tsr), إِفْعَيَالَلْ (Tsr), and إِفْعَيَالَلْ (Jrb, Tsr): (γ) hence inf. n. إِفْعَيَالَلْ [إِفْعَيَالَلْ (IY, Tsr),] inf. n. إِفْعَيَالَلْ; and إِفْعَيَالَلْ They overtook one another, inf. n. إِفْعَيَالَلْ; where the initial is quiescent, because they incorporate the د of تَفَعَّلٌ into what follows it (IY): (2) vs. (M, Jrb), (α) of this class (M), i.e., the vs. of those inf. ns. belonging to the eleven [or rather twelve] formations, [or to the cat. of إِطَّيَّرٌ, ] whether such vs. be in the pret., as إِفْعَيَالَلْ departed [above]; or imp., as إِفْعَيَالَلْ depart [668] (Jrb): (b) the paradigms of the imp. [of the 2nd pers. (M)] in the [unaugmented (M)] tril. (M, Jrb), as إِطَّيَّرٌ strike and إِذْهَبَ go [428,
668] (M), when neither the ف nor the ١ of its aor. is unsound; for, if either of them be unsound, the conj. Hamza is not needed, as ١٢٣ promise and ١٣٤ say [428, 668] (Jrb): (3) ps., the ج of determination [599], and its ١٥٩, ١٨٧ (M, Jrb) in the dial. of Tayyi (M). The initial of the word is not quiescent, in a regular way, except in ١س., and what is connected [330] with them, vid. инf. ١س., because ١س. have much plasticity, and are the principal subjects of [euphonic] transformation [697], such as conversion, elision, and transfer of the vowel; so that it is allowable, in their case, to make the initial quiescent. But that does not occur in the pure ١س., except a few irregular ١س. vid. the ten [668] mentioned [above]; nor in the ١ت., except the ج and ١م. of determination. The Hamza in the ten ١س. is a compensation for that infirmity which affects them, since they are ١ت١٧٣, weak in constitution, their ج s having been elided as forgotten, or virtually elided, which is an infirmity upon an infirmity, because the elided as forgotten is like the non-existent. But it is not necessary, in the whole of the ١ت١٧٣. whose ج is elided, that the Hamza should be substituted for it, as you see in ١٢٣ morrow [153, 275], ١٢٣٢٠, ١٢٦٥, ١٣٠٦, and ١٣٥ vulva [275, 306]. Since, then, these [ten] ١س. are afflicted with transformation, which ought to be in the ١س., they resemble ١س.; so that the conj. Hamza [668] is prefixed to them, as a
compensation for the [J actually or virtually] elided, as
is proved by the fact that the two are not combined in
such as "بَنَى" and "بَنَوْيَ" [806]. The finals of "يَبُّم" [16, 306],
"يَمْرُ" [16, 306], and "آيَمْنَ" [650], are not [actually] elided,
the م in "يَبُّم" being a subst. [687] for the J, i.e., the م,
[which is therefore like the expressed]. But, since the
vowel of the ن and the ر, in "يَمْرُ" and "يَبُّم" respectively,
is an alliteration to the vowel of inflection [on the letter]
after them, they become like the letter of inflection, [so
that the finals are virtually elided] (R). The م of "يَبُّم"
is, [however, sometimes said to be (R)] aug., [for corroboration and intensiveness (Jrb, Tsr),] as in "زَرْدُم" (R, Jrb, Tsr) and "سَتِمْ" [below], the J being [actually] elided.
And, as for "آمَّنَ" [650], since the ن is often elided, as "آمَّنَ" [651], and the oath is the position of abbreviation, the expressed ن becomes like the non-existent,
[so that it too is virtually elided] (R). The o.f. of "إِبْنَ"
[275, 277] is ["بَنَّي" or (KF)] "بَنَّو" (IY, R, Jrb, A, Fk),
[since] the measure of "إِبْنَ" is [orig.] َ فَعُلَ with two
Fathas (Tsr), like َ تَلَمَ pen (A), with Fath of the ف and
(IY, R, Fk), because its [broken (Jrb, Fk)] pl. is "اَبْنَأَ" [307] (IY, R, Jrb, Fk), upon the measure of َ فَعَلَ (Fk),
as َنَحْنُ أَبْنَأَ اللَّهَ V. 21. We are the sons of God and
being regular in (R, Jrb) with Fath of the 
like (237); and [not] in quiescent in the , [except] when is hollow [237], like and [242]; while may not be like pl. of [237], nor like pl. of 
trunk, because indicates Fath of [the in] its sing. [307] (R), for which reason they say in the rel. n. [306], with Fath of its (IY). The proof of the Fath of the is its pl. and its rel. n. , with Fath thereof (A) in the pl. and the rel. n. “But,” says the author of the Msb, “its o. f. is said [by some] to be , with Kasr of the , like load, as is proved by daughter [234, 263, 277, 307, 689], the alteration, according to this saying, being small; and the smallness of the alteration being evidence of originality”, meaning “the alteration” of (Sn). And the proof of the mobilization of the is its pl. [above], being pl. of with mobilization of the ; while the proof of the vowel’s being Fath is that is more frequent in [the pl. of] the pronounced with Fath of the than in [the pl. of] the pronounced with Damm of the , like pl. of upper arm, or with Kasr of it, like pl. of liver [237] (A). Its ل [below] is elided (Jrb, Tsr,
Fk), for lightness (Fk); and its ف made quiescent (Jrb, Fk), in order that the Hamza may be [put as] a compensation for the elided (Fk); and [then (Fk)] the Hamza is prefixed (Jrb, Fk) to it (Fk), in order to accomplish the articulation of the quiescent (Fk). The [elided (IY)] ي is [said to be (Tsr)] (1) a، (IY، R، A، Tsr), which is correct (Tsr), not a ی [below] (A)، (a) because the ي of those نs. in which the ي is elided, [and the Hamza made a compensation for it (Tsr),] is a، (A، Tsr), in most cases (A، [i. e.] in the case of all but [إشْتَ، إِثْنَانِ، إِثْنَانِ] [below] (Tsr), not a ی (A)؛ (b) because they say in the fem. يُنُثَ [above] (IY، R، A)، substituting the و for its ي (IY، A)، and substitution of the و for the ی is more frequent than for the ی [689] (IY، R، A)؛ (c) because of [their saying (A)] بَنُوَة sonship [below] (R، A)، while فَتْرَة youthfulness [243] from فَتْرَيْا a youth is irregular (R): (2) a ی (A، Tsr)، as ISh reports to be held by some, who derive ابن فتى بَنَى بِأَمْرٍاَيْ (A)، because the son is the effect of the father’s going in to the mother (Sn)؛ [or] from بَنُيْتُ I built, because the son is built upon the father, as the wall is built upon the foundation (Tsr). But there is no evidence in بَنُوَة [above], because of فَتْرَة، which is from the ی (IY، A)، since they say فَتْيَاَيْ in the du. [229، 326]، and
in the pl. [243, 246, 257] (IY). And Zj allows both the modes [of representing the ج] (A). The o. f. of the ج [below] is شجرة [234] (R, Jrb, Fk, Sn), like بَنَةُ (R, Jrb, Fk), because it is fem. of إنْ (R, Jrb, Fk); and its predicament is [like] that of إنْ (Jrb). As for إنْ [above], it is زُرَّمْ augmented by the م [668] for intensiveness (IY, A, Fk) and corroborations (IY), as in intensely blue (IY, A) and سَنَّهُم big in the rump [671, 676] (IY). It has been heard (Fk), as

(2055)

وَهْدُ لِي أَمْ أمْ خَيْرُهَا إِنْ ذَكَرْتُهَا # أَنْيَأُ اللَّهُ إِلَّا أَنْ أَكُونُ لِهَا أَبْنَا (IY, A, YS), by AlMutalamis, And have I any mother other than her, if I mention her? God forbid but that I should be a son to her! (MN); and is therefore to be remembered, but not copied (Fk). The م is not a subst. for the ج (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk) of the word (IY, Jrb, Tsr), as [it is for the ع (Fk)] in نَمَّ [16, 275, 278, 306, 687] (IY, Jrb, Fk), because that would require the Hamza to be dropped (Fk): for, if the م were a subst. for the ج, [it would virtually be the ج; and (IY)] the ج would be like the expressed, so that [prefixion of (IY)] the conj. Hamza would be unnecessary (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr), since it is [prefixed as] a compensation [for the ج] (Fk). The o. f. of إنْتَيَّاٰ [16, 313, 314] is ينْتَيْيَابِ (IY, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), with Fath
of the ف and ع (A), like مُنَبَّرُ [above] (R), (1) because it is from مُنَبَّرُ [318] IV, A, Fk), an explanation of the reason for the ل’s being a ى (Sn): (2) because they say in its rel. n. یُنَبَّرُ [295] (R, Jrb, A, Tsr), with two Fathas (Jrb, Tsr, Sn), an explanation of the reason for the Fath of the ف and ع (Sn); whereas, if the ث were pronounced with Дَمْن or كَسْر, that would appear in the rel. n.; and, if the ع were quiescent, they would say مُنَبَّرُ with quiescence, like مُنَبَّرُ [302] (Jrb): but this is open to the objection that their saying مُنَبَّرُ does not prevent quiescence of the ع in the o. f., because, in the rel. n. of یُنمَثُ [below], you say مُنَبَّرُ [306], with Fath of the ف and ع, according to the correct [opinion as to Fath of the ع, when orig. quiescent, in such ns.] (Sn). The ل is elided, the ف made quiescent, and the [conj. (Tsr, Fk)] Hamza put (Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk). And the o. f. of مُنَبَّرُ [below] is مُنَبَّرُ (Jrb, Tsr, Fk, Sn), like مُنَبَّرُ two trees (Jrb, Tsr, Fk). The o. f. of مُثْرُ [and مُثْرُ (below) (Fk, Sn)] is مُثْرُ (A, Fk) and مُثْرُ (Fk, Sn), which are another dial. var. (Fk). مُثْرُ is a complete n., nothing being elided from it, except that, since its Hamza [in the o. f. مُثْرُ] may be elided by transfer of its vowel to the quiescent [ر] before it with the art. [below], as مُثْرُ the man, they transform it
because of that, and from frequency of usage. And is with the addition of the (Tsr). Their initial is made quiescent, and then the conj. Hamza is added to them, although they are of three letters, because their is a Hamza, and they are subject to abbreviation, as and ; so that they are treated like and [above] (Fk). For is abbreviated by transfer of the vowel of the Hamza to the ; then the Hamza is elided, and the conj. Hamza put as a compensation therefor, [the being made quiescent, as in its congeners (Sn)]; and afterwards, upon restoration of the [final] Hamza, the conj. Hamza is retained, because alleviation [658] of the Hamza [which is the ], by transfer of its vowel to the quiescent before it with the art., as in the Tsr (above), and then by elision of it (Sn),] is always permissible, so that the expected [alleviation (Sn)] is treated like the occurring. As for the fems. of above], and [i.e., , and (Sn),] the discourse on them is like the discourse on their mascs. [668]: and the in and is for femininization [263], like the of [264]; contrary to the in and [277, 295, 307], which is a subst. for the of the word [689] (A). The o. f. of [275, 277, 306] is, (1) [according to the BB (Jrb, Tsr, Fk).]
(IV, R, Jrb, A, Ts'r, Fk), upon the measure of فِعْلُ, with Kasr of the ف (IV), as S says (IV, A), like قَفُّدُ, *bunch of dates* (Jrb, A, Fk), or سَمُوُّ, [as is said (A),] like قَفُّذُ (R, A), as is proved by their also saying سِمُوُّ without a *conj.* Hamza, whence

٢٠٢٠٨ (R), by Ru'ba Ibn Al' Ajjāj (N), *By the Name of Him whose Name is in every chapter of the Kur'an, they (the camels) have arrived upon a path that they know, He [the herdsman (MAR)] has turned loose among them a nine-year-old he-camel, that he reserves for covering; and he (the nine-year-old) will follow with them a path that he knows, because he is accustomed to that work (N, MAR), i. e., covering (N), related by AZ, says AHS in the commentary on the M, with Kasr and Damm of the الس (MAR), meaning إسْمُهُ (AZ): [and by other evidence also,] because its [broken (Fk)] pl. is أَسْمَاء (Fk, Sn), أَسْمَاءٌ being a pl. for these two measures, like أَجْدَاعٌ, جَذَاعُ, pl. أَجْدَاعُ, pl. أَجْدَاعٌ [above] (Jh); and its dim. is سَئْيِ [277] (Fk, Sn); and its v. is I *named* [below]; *orig.* سَمَّيُ, أَسْمَأْوُ, and سَمِّيَتْ, where the canons of etymology require conversion
of the ū into Hamza in the first [683], and into ʿ in the two last [685, 723, 727] (Sn): whereas, if its o. f. were ʿاوْسَم, [as the KK say (Sn),] its pl. would be ʿاۡوَسَم, and its dim. ʿوُسَم, [and its v. ʿوُسَّم] (Sn),] the assertion of inversion [below] being improbable (YS, Sn): (a) A's phraseology necessarily implies that its o. f. is not said by anybody to be ʿوُسَّم with Fath of the س, the reason being that ʿوَسَّم with Fath does not form the pl. ʿأَفَعَّل [237] (Sn): (b) it is derived from ʿسَا was elevated, because it elevates, and gives notoriety to, its named, which, but for the name, would be obscure (R): (c) its measure is ʿأَفَعَّل (Jh, IY), the [letter] gone from it being the ū (Jh): (d) its ج (A, Tsr, Fk), the ū (IY, Jrb), is elided (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), for lightness (IY, A), as in ʿم and ʿم [above] (IY), because the alternation of the inflectional vowels upon it is [deemed (Jrb)] heavy (Jrb, Fk): and [its initial is made quiescent (A), i. e., is so constituted, by secondary, not primary, constitution (Sn); or, as is said (A),] the quiescence of the ج is transferred to the س (Jrb, A, Fk), because of the alternation of those vowels upon it (Jrb, Fk): and [then (Fk)] the [conj. (Jrb)] Hamza is put (Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk) at its beginning (Fk), as a means of accomplishing [the articulation of the quiescent]; and (A) as a compensation (A, Tsr) for the [elided (Sn)] ج (Tsr, Sn), for which
reason they do not combine the two, [i.e., the J and the Hamza (Sn),] but express one of them, saying in its rel. n. سْمُ َوِّي or سْمُ َيِّى (A), with Kasr or Damm of the س, and, in either case, with Fath, though some allow quiescence, of the م (Sn): (e) others than S transmit أَسْمَ [668] with Damm of the conj. Hamza (R): (2) according to the KK, وِّ (R, Jrb, A, Tsr, YS), with Fath of the و (YS), meaning عَلَمُ mark (Jrb), because the name is [like (R)] a mark upon the named (R, Jrb, A): (a) its ف is elided (R, Tsr); and the خ remains quiescent, so that the conj. Hamza is put (خ) : [or] it is inverted, its ف being put last, after the J; and its variations occur in accordance with that (A): (b) according to what they say; there is no precedent for it, since one does not elide the ف, and put the conj. Hamza; and, though, as respects the sense, what they say is more probable than the saying of the BB, because the name is very like the mark, still its variations, vid. the dim. and broken pl., like سُيِّى and أَسْمَ [above], and others, like سُيِّى namesake on the measure of حَلِيفٌ confederate, and تُسْمَى تُسْمَى I was named and [above], refute that; unless they say that the n. is inverted by putting the ف into the position of the J, when they intend to lighten the n. by elision, since the [usual] position of elision is the J; and that then the خ is elided as forgotten; but is restored in its variations,
vid the dim., broken pl., etc., in the position of the ج, since it was elided in that place (R): (c) the preferable opinion is the first (Jrb). As for ُبُحَطُت, it is orig. سْتَتَ (IY, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), upon the measure of نَعُل (IY), with Fath of its first and second (Tsr, Fk), like جَمَّل (Jrb, Tsr); and is curtailed of the ج, i.e., the َس (IY), as is proved by (1) [its pl. (IY, Jrb, Fk)] ُبُحَتَة [260] (IY, R, Jrb, A, Fk), which may not be like ُقَفَال (IY, َجَدَع [above], because of the rel. n. سْتَتَى [306] (R); (2) [its dim. (IY, Fk)] ُبُتْبَة [275, 277] (IY, A, Fk); (3) their saying زَيْتُبُحَتَة مِنْ عَلْبَرُ و Zaid is bigger in the rump than 'Amr (A). Its ج, i.e., the َس, is elided; its initial is made quiescent; and the Hamza is put (A, YS), because of what has been mentioned [under ُبُحَتُ] (A). And it has two other dial. vars., ُبُتَة [275, 306], with elision of the ع, its measure being نَل; and ُبُحَتَة, with elision of the ج, its measure being نَع (A, YS). The proof that the o. f. is سْتَتَ, with Fath of the ف, is the Fath thereof in these two dial. vars.; and the proof of the mobilization, and Fath, of the ع is what has been mentioned under ُبُحَتَة [above]. And, as for the أَيْتَن [650] peculiar to the oath, [which is a n. so constituted, with Damm of the م and ع, for the oath (Jh),] its ج is conj. according to the BB, but disj.
according to the KK, because, according to them, it is pl. of ُبِيّنَ oath; whereas, according to S [and the other BB (Sn)], it is a sing. n. from ِبِيّنَ, i.e., ُبِرَكَةُ blessing (A). The BB hold that [the pre. n. in] آيٰبِيّنَ آللَّهِ [650] is a sing., upon the measure of ُبَعْلَ [372], upon which the sing. does sometimes occur, like ُأَجْرَ [256, 628] and ُآنْكَ [255, 256], as in the tradition مَنْ أَسْتَمَعَ إِلَى قَبِيَّةٍ صَبِبَ فِي أَذْنِيْهَا آنَكَ Whoso listeneth to a singing female slave, into his two ears shall lead be poured (Jrb). And, since its ُن is elided, as ُبِرَكَّ مَنْ آللَّهِ [651], they put the Hamza at its beginning as a compensation for the ُن; but, when they restore the ُن, they do not elide the Hamza, because the ُن has a tendency to elision (A). It has twelve dial. vars. [650, 651, 653], collected by IM in these two [mnemonic] verses

ُهَمَّرْ آيُّمَ وَآيٰبِيّنَ فَتَمَّحَ وَأَكَثَرَ آيُّمَ وَآيٰبِيّنَ

أَوْ قَلِّمَ مَأَوْيُمُ بِالْبَنْطَلَيْنِ قَدْ شَكَّلُوا

ُإِمْسُ آخْتُمَهُ يَهُوَ آللَّهُ كُلًا أَصِفَ # إِلَيْهِ فِي قَسْمِ تَسْكُنُ وَا نَقْلًا

The Hamza of (1, 2) ُأَيُّمَ and (3, 4) ُإِمْسُ [with Damm of the م (YS, Sn) in both (Sn)] then pronounce thou with Fath and Kasr; or say (5) ُإِمْسُ [with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm of the م (Sn)]; or say (6-8) ُمُ or
[with Damm of the ن, and (Sn)] with triple vocalization [of the م (Sn), referring to م and م (YS, Sn)], when it is furnished with diacritical mark; and ب (12) [with Kasr of the Hamza, and Fath of the م (YS, Sn),] do thou finish off with: and postfix اللد everywhere to it in an oath—so wilt thou exhaust what has been transmitted (A, Fk). The result is that, if the Hamza of م be pronounced with Fath, the م must be pronounced with Damm [below]; but, if the Hamza [of م] be pronounced with Kasr, the م may be pronounced with Damm or Fath (YS, Sn). So in YS on the Fk, with some addition (Sn); and [YS adds that] our exposition of these two verses is what is indicated by the language of IM's son [BD] in the C (YS). But our Master, the Sayyid, [says Sn,] transmits (13) م with Fath of the Hamza, and Damm of the م [651, 668]; and ب (14) م with Fath of the Hamza and م, instead of م with Kasr of the Hamza, and Fath of the م [above]. And, according to this, the م need not be pronounced with Damm [above] in the م pronounced with Fath of the Hamza. From that aggregate, fourteen dial. vars. result (Sn). It is mentioned in the FB that they are twenty-two: and that is imported by the language of the KF, the text of
which is “And [the pre. n. in] أَيْمُ ﷺٌ and أَيِّمُ ﷺٌ, the initial in both of which is also pronounced with Kasr; and (5, 6) أَيْمُ ﷺٌ with Fath of the م and Hamza, [the latter of] which is also pronounced with Kasr; and (7) أَيِّمُ ﷺٌ with Kasr of the Hamza and م; [the 1 (in all) of which is said to be a conj. 1 (KF):] and (8) كَيْمُ ﷺٌ with Fath of the ဂ, and دَامَم of the م; and (9-11) أَيْمُ ﷺٌ with triple vocalization of the م; and (12, 13) أَيِّمُ ﷺٌ with Kasr of the Hamza, and دَامَم or Fath of the م; and (14) مُي ﷺٌ with دَامَم of the م, and Kasr of the ن; and (15-17) مُي ﷺٌ with triple vocalization of the م and ن; and (18-20) مُي ﷺٌ with triple vocalization; and (21, 22) كَيْمُ ﷺٌ and كَيْمُ ﷺٌ is a n. constituted for [use in] the oath, the full phrase being أَيْمُ ﷺٌ قَمِسُي God’s blessing is mine oath”. (YS). The summary [of the foregoing observations on the compensatory character of the conj. Hamzas in these ten n.] is that these Hamzas are a compensation for (1) a ل [elided], (a) a و, vid. in إِمَّةٌ, إِمْبَةٌ, إِيْبَةٌ, إِيْمَّةٌ; [and إِمْسَةٌ]; (b) a ى, vid. in إِنكَانَةٌ and إِنْقَانَةٌ; (c) sound, i. e., a ا, vid. in إِسْتَ; (2) an imaginary elision, vid. in إِمْرُ and
(3) an elision occurring at times, vid. in ت sr. The Hamza in the du. also of such of these ns. as are dualized, vid. ا و ر ر ان ر ان and is a conj. Hamza (Jrb). The Hamza of ج is similar [668] (IM), i.e., is a conj. Hamza, whether ج be determinative [599], conjunct [176], or red. [599]. The determination is by the ج alone, the Hamza being aug. [672], because, if the Hamza were intended, it would not be elided in continuous speech [669], as the Hamza of ام [541] and ان [571] is not elided: and because the Tanwm [608], which indicates indeterminateness [262], is a single letter; so that the indication of determinateness also must be a single letter, in accordance with its opp.: this is the opinion of S [668]. But Khl holds that ج is a bil. p. importing determination, because it is peculiar to ns. [2], and imports a meaning in them; so that it is equivalent to د in the case of vs.; and, that being bil., so is this: and because there is no [other] p. constituted of a single quiescent letter; so that this must be made to accord with what has been, not with what has not been, authorized (Jrb). The opinion of Khl [668] is that the Hamza of ج is disj. (A), contrary to the saying of IM [above] (Sn); but that it is made conj. from frequency of usage: and this is preferred by IM
elsewhere than in the Alfiya (A), in which he does not distinctly express a preference for either saying (Sn). And like ُن is ٓٓ in the dial. of AlYaman [599, 668, 687] (A). These initials, then, are quiescent, as you see, being pronounced as such in the interior [of the sentence] (M), because you conjoin the preceding word with the quiescent (IY). But, when they occur in the inceptive [658] position, then mobile aug. [671, 672] Hamzas [668] are put before them, because, in their language, there is no beginning with a quiescent, as there is no pause upon a mobile (M). From Z's saying "in their language", it is sometimes understood that this [predicament] is peculiar to the language of the Arabs, beginning with a quiescent being allowable in other languages: whereas the matter is not so; but, on the contrary, this [predicament] is caused by the impracticability of articulating the [inceptive] quiescent, and is not peculiar to one language more than another (IY).

§. 668. These Hamzas [667] are named conj. Hamzas (M), because they are dropped [below] in the interior [of the sentence], so that they conjoin what precedes with what follows them; and do not disjoin the former from the latter, as the other letters do (IY). The Hamzas at the beginning of words are of two sorts disj. Hamzas and conj. Hamzas. And they are also named disj. ٓٓ ٓ and conj. ٓ ٓ, because the Hamza and ٓ
are approximate in outlet [732], for which reason, when they need to mobilize the ⅃, they convert it into Hamza [683]: Jh says "The ⅃ is of two kinds, soft and mobile, the soft being named ⅃, and the mobile being named Hamza". The disj. Hamza is retained in the interior [of the sentence]; so that, by the utterance of it, what precedes is disjoined from what follows it, as َنْفَرُ أَحْبَدُ ⅃ أَحْبَدُ ⅃ Ahmād took fright, where the Hamza of ⅃ forms a barrier between the ⅃ and the ⅅ, disjoining one of them from the other. And for this reason it is named ⅃ Hamza of disjunction, [commonly rendered as if it were ⅃ disj. Hamza, which also occurs]. But the conj. Hamza is dropped [below] in the interior [of the sentence], so that it conjoins what precedes with what follows it, as ⅃ كَتَبْتُ أَسْمَكَ I have written thy name, where the Hamza of ⅃ is dropped, so that the ⅃ is conjoined with the ⅃. And for this reason it is named ⅃ Hamza of conjunction, [commonly rendered as if it were ⅃ conj. Hamza, which also is used] (Jrb). The conj. Hamza is every Hamza expressed at the beginning, and dropped in the interior [of the sentence]. And what is expressed in both [positions] is a disj. Hamza. The conj. Hamza is [orig.] constituted as a Hamza, because IM says "For conjunction there is a Hamza", [and does not say "an
" (Sn)]. This is the correct [opinion]; but it is said that possibly its o.f. may be the ١, since it is expressed as an ١ in such as ١١١١١١١١١١١١١ in interrogation [497, 669], when one is not constrained to have recourse to a vowel. The conj. Hamza is only prosthetic, because it is put as a means of beginning with a quiescent [below], since beginning therewith is impracticable [667] (A), i.e., impossible, in every language, by common consent, in the case of the ١; and in the case of any other [consonant also], according to what IJ and AB declare, while SJj and Kfj hold that it is possible, except that it is deemed heavy: so says Syt (Sn). The property of the conj. Hamza is to be expressed in the beginning, and dropped in the interior [of the sentence] (IA), where, however, it is sometimes expressed by poetic license, as in إذا جا وَرَزَ آلٌ [669] (MKh). Expression of it in the interior [of the sentence] is disallowed, except for poetic licence, as in

[669] (A) Now I shall not believe any two to be better in temper against the mishaps of fortune than me and than Juml, the name of a woman [18] (MN). It is [therefore defined by IHsh and Fk as] a prosthetic Hamza [at the beginning of the single word (Tsr)],
found in the beginning, lost in the interior, [of the sentence] (Aud, Fk). The cause of its being named هُمْرَةُ الْوُصُولِ Hamza of conjunction, [commonly rendered conj. Hamza,] notwithstanding that it is dropped in conjunction, [so that it should properly be named inceptive Hamza (Sn),] is disputed (A). It is [said to be (IY, Jrb, A)] so named, (1) because, by its means, the articulation of the quiescent is accomplished (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk) by the speaker (A, Fk): (a) so says Shl (Tsr); and this is the saying of the BB (A): (b) for that reason (Jrb, Fk) Khl names it سُلَمُ الْيَسَابِي ladder of the tongue (Jrb, A, Fk): (c) it is sometimes said that this [cause] would be [more] obvious if it were named Hamza of accomplishment (YS): (2) because it is dropped [above] (A, Tsr, Fk) upon conjunction of the word with what precedes it (Tsr, Fk), so that what precedes it is conjoined with what follows it (A, YS), the prefixon [of هُمْرَةٍ الْوُصُولِ] being because of a very little connection [119]: (a) so says Shl’s pupil IDa (Tsr); and this is the saying of the KK (YS): but، ٰٓ ٰٓ being the inf. n. of the trans. ٰٰٓ ٰٓ conjoined, if one said “so that the speaker conjoins what precedes with what follows it”, this would agree with the name هُمْرَةُ الْوُصُولِ (Sn): (3) by extension (A, YS), i. e., by a trope, apparently because of the connection of the antithesis (Sn).
Since the *disj.* Hamza occurs in speech more often than the *conj.* Hamza, the positions of the *conj.* Hamza ought to be delimited, in order that one may know that what goes beyond the limit is a *disj.* Hamza (Jrb). The *conj.* Hamza is not peculiar to any class [of words]; but is prefixed to the *n.*, *v.*, and *p.* [667] (Α). It is not [found] (1) in any *aor.*, unrestrictedly (Aud, А, Fk), whether [its *pret.* be] *tril.* [482] or *quad.* [495], unaugmented or augmented, because the *aor.* begins with the aoristic letter [404], which is always mobile, so that the *conj.* Hamza is not needed (Tsr): (a) for this reason they say that incorporation is not allowable in such as *تَدَكَرَ* [657], because it would necessitate importation of the *conj.* Hamza (YS): nor (2) in any *p.* other than [the determinative (Fk, Sn) or *red.* (Sn)] *ذَی* (Aud, А, Fk), according to [the opinion of] S [667] (Tsr): (a) like the *ذ* of determination are (α) its in the *dial.* of Tayyi and Himyar [599, 667, 687]; and (b) the conjunct [176] and *red.* [599] *ذ* (Fk): (b) as for the conjunct [ذِّی], it is a *n.* [below], according to the preponderant [opinion]; and for this reason Α says "so that the non-inf. *ns.* are twelve" [below] (Sn): (c) Khl [667] says that the Hamza [of ذِّی] is *rad.*, being made *conj.* from frequency of usage (Fk): nor (3) in any *pret.*, [either] *tril.*, [like *آمرُ commanded* and *آخذ took* (Aud)]; or [numerically (Tsr)] *quad.* [483, 488] (Aud, А, Fk), like *آكلُ*
honored and ُعَطَلَ gave (Aud); the Hamza in all of that being a disj. Hamza (Tsr): but [it is (Tsr) found] (a) in [the pret. of] the quin. [v., which is what contains two augs. - (Tsr)], like [667] (Aud) and ٌعَطَلَ (Tsr): or the sex., [which is of two sorts, the tril. containing three augs. (Tsr).] like [667] (Aud); and the quad. containing two augs., like [667] (Tsr): and (b) in their imp. (Aud), quin. and sex., like [428, 667], ٌعَطَلَ, and ٌعَطَلَ (Tsr): and (c) [in (Tsr)] the imp. of the tril., [the second of whose aor. is literally quiescent (Tsr).] like ٌعَطَـبْ [428, 667] (Aud); contrary to such as ُعَطَبْ grant., ُعَطَبْ, and ُعَطَبْ [428, 667], the second of whose aor. is mobile, so that it does not need a conj. Hamza (Tsr): nor (4) in any n. (And, A, Fk) other than what will be [now] mentioned (Fk), because the initial of the n. is mobile (Tsr), except (a) [in Aud)] the inf. ns. of the quin. and sex. (Aud, A) v. (Tsr), like ٌعَطَلَ [332, 667] (Aud), in imitation of their vs.: (a) the formula for them is "every inf. n. the l of whose pret. v. is followed by four or more letters" [667] (Tsr): and, [say they, in (Aud)]] (b) [the (A)] ten ns. (Aud, A) mentioned [667] (A), preserved in the memory, vid. ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ (Tsr), and the ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, ُعَطَبْ, 111 a
peculiar to the oath (Aud); while they ought to add
[the conjunct \( \ddot{\text{A}} \) and (Aud)] a dial. var. of \( \ddot{\text{A}} \) (Aud, A), so that the non-inf. ns. are twelve [above] (A), vid. the ten ns., \( \ddot{\text{A}} \), etc. [above], the conjunct \( \ddot{\text{A}} \) included in IM's saying “The Hamza of \( \ddot{\text{A}} \) is similar” [667], and \( \ddot{\text{A}} \) (Sn): (a) if they say [of \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) (Tsr)] that it is \( \dddot{\text{I}} \) with the \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) elided [651], we say “And \( \dddot{\text{I}} \) is \( \dddot{\text{I}} \) with the \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) added” [667] (Aud, A), so that whatever is their answer is our answer (Tsr): (b) they may escape [from this dilemma] by drawing the distinction that, by the addition of the \( \ddot{\text{I}} \), alliteration of the \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) to the \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) in the vowels [of inflection], according to the ops., accrues to \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) [16], which therefore becomes so like an original word that the KK even say that it is infl. in two places; contrary to \( \dddot{\text{I}} \), which does not undergo this process: and moreover there is no special appropriateness in the mention of \( \dddot{\text{I}} \) for [the purpose of] comparison, since the fems. of these ns. are their masc. [667] with the \( \ddot{\text{i}} \) added (Tsr, Sn): (c) so in the Tsr: but, in my opinion, this distinction, if they do establish it, requires consideration, because the placing of the inflection upon the \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) accrues to \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) also by reason of the descriptive; so that, in both \( \ddot{\text{I}} \) and \( \ddot{\text{I}} \), the place of the inflection is altered; but in the first because of
the addition, and in the second because of the defectiveness; and their difference, in this respect, is immaterial:

(d) لَمْ [651, 667], is exclusively specified by [IHsh and] A as to be added; and this suggests the notion that the Hamza of the latter is a disj. Hamza (Sn): (e) since IHsh looks at the dial. vars. of the word, he ought to say "And لَمْ, a dial. var. of لَمْ, according to Tayyi," who change the determinative ل into a م [above], saying أَلْجَلْلَمْ for the man [599, 667, 687]: (f) [in case of doubt] reference should be made to the rule, vid. that every Hamza, if retained in the dim. [277, 283], is a disj. Hamza; and, if not, is a conj. Hamza: (g) they omit the conjunct لَمْ [176] because of the dispute as to its being a n. [345], and because of its resemblance to the determinative لَمْ [599] in form (Ts). It has been made known that the conj. Hamza is put only as a means of beginning with the quiescent. When, therefore, that quiescent [initial] becomes mobile, the Hamza is dispensed with, as in إِسْتَثْرَ became hidden, when the of إِفْتِمَالٌ is intended to be incorporated into what follows it, its vowel being transferred to the ل [756]; so that سَطْر [with Fath of the س, and doubling of the ث (Sn)] is said, [the difference between this and the سَطْر hid from كُسَبْبِر being apparent in the aor. and inf. n., because you pronounce the aoristic letter from
this with Fath, and from the second with Damm; while
you say ٓسًتَار, with Kasr of the س, in the inf. n. of this,
and ٓتَسْتَيْر in the inf. n. of the second (Sn): except [in
the case of] the determinative ج, when the vowel of the
Hamza in such as ٓالْجُبْر [660] is transferred to it, in
which case the preferable [method] is retention of the
[conj.] Hamza, as ٓالْجُبْر ٓقَاتِمَ Al.Ahmâr is standing;
while ٓلَجْمُر ٓقَاتِمَ is weak: the difference [between this
case and that of ٓسَتَّر] being that incorporative transfer
[of a vowel] is more frequent than non-incorporative
transfer (A); so that, with incorporation, that [conj.
Hamza] which was before the transfer is not regarded
(Sn). There is a dispute [among the BB (Sn)] as to
whether the conj. Hamza be orig. quiescent or mobile,
the first being the opinion of ف, which is adopted by
Shl; and the second the opinion of س, which is appar-
ently correct, because every inceptive ٌ must be mo-
bilized, like the ج of inception [604] (Tsr). The opinion
of the majority is that the conj. Hamza is added
quiescent, because this involves less addition; and that,
when its mobilization is needed, it is mobilized with
Kasr, as is the o. f. [664]. But the opinion of س
appears to be that it is added mobile with Kasra, which
[opinion] is more just, because we need mobility of the
quiescence in the initial of the word [667]; so that there
is no reason for adding the Hamza quiescent; so says Sd (Fk). According to this [opinion], the original vowel of the Hamza is Kasr [663], as in ٌضْرِبٌ and ٌذَهَبٌ [428, 667]; while, in such as ٌخَرْجٌ [428], the Hamza is pronounced with Damm from dislike to the transition from Kasr to Damm [664]. But, according to the first [opinion], the vowel of the Hamza is regulated by the vowel of the penultimate: so that the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr in ٌضْرِبٌ, and Damm in ٌخَرْجٌ; while, Fath being disallowed in ٌذَهَبٌ because of the liability to confusion with the aor. [below] in the state of pause, the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr, because this is lighter than Damm [below] (Tsr). The opinion of the BB is that the conj. Hamza is orig. pronounced with Kasr; but that in some positions it is pronounced with Fath for lightness, and in some with Damm for alliteration. The KK, however, hold that its Kasr in ٌضْرِبٌ, and Damm in ٌشَكُنٌ dwell are for alliteration to [the vowel of] the third [letter]. The absence of Fath in ٌعَلَمٌ know is adduced as an objection [to the saying of the KK (Sa)]; but it is replied that, if the Hamza were pronounced with Fath in the like thereof, command would be liable to confusion with enunciation (A), i.e., [the imp. would be liable to confusion] with the aor. [above] in the state of pause: so in the Tsr; but there is
no restriction to the aor., because the imp. would be sometimes liable to confusion with the pret. also, when made trans. by the Hamza [433], as in A's ex., where Fath of the Hamza in 'أَعْلَمَ I know', would, in pause, produce confusion with the aor. [أَعْلَمَ] and with the pret. [أَعْلَمَ he notified] made trans. by the Hamza (Sn). The conj. Hamza, in reference to its vowel [in the n., v., and p. (Tsr)], has seven states, (1) necessity for Fath, [vid. (A)] in the n. beginning with عَلَى [663] (Aud, A), like عَلَيْهِ the man (Tsr), from frequency of usage (Tsr, Sn): (2) necessity for Damm, [vid. (A)] in (a) such passives as أَقْتُلَّ and أَسْتَخْرِجَ [486]: (b) the imp. of the tril. orig. pronounced with Damm of the أَعْلَمَ, as أَقْتُلَ kill and أَكْتُبَ write, [from dislike to the transition from Kasr to Damm, because the quiescent barrier is not insuperable (Tsr, Sn)]; contrary to إِمْشَوْا walk ye (Aud, A) and إِنْصَوْا judge ye (Aud), where the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr, because the أَعْلَمَ is orig. pronounced with Kasr, the o. f. being إِمْشَيْوُا (Tsr, Sn) and إِنْصَيْوُا (Tsr): (a) sometimes the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr before an original Damma: this is transmitted by IJ from some of the Arabs; and the reason of it is that Kasr is the o. f. [664], while the Kasr and Damm do not [actually] meet, because of the separation by the quiescent between them: (b) the two
pronunciations are referable to taking, and not taking, the quiescent [barrier] into account (Tar, Sn): (c) so in the Tsr; but Kasr is said to be a corrupt dial. var. (Sh): (3) preponderance of Damm over Kasr, [vid. (A)]; where the Damm of the ُ is accidentally made Kasr, as in ُغُرَى [428]: so says BD [in the C, following his father in the Kāfiya and the CK (Tsr)]: (a) F says in the Takmila that (a) the letter before the ُ of the 2nd pers. sing. fem. must be pronounced with Ishmām (Aud, A), which here means what, according to Fr, is named Raum [640], vid. that the Damma should be inclined towards Kasr [428], not what has been previously mentioned [640], vid. compression of the lips, without any sound, that [Ishmām of the letter before the ُ] being necessary (Sn) for a notification of the original Damm (Tsr, Sn); and (b) the Hamza [must be pronounced] with pure Damm, [without Ishmām (Tsr)]: (b) IM says in the Tashil that the conj. Hamza is pronounced with Ishmām before the Damma pronounced with Ishmām (Aud, A), meaning that, if you pronounce the third [letter] with Ishmām, you pronounce the Hamza with Ishmām; and, if not, not: so that this differs from the language of F in both respects, the necessity for Ishmām [of the third letter], and [the necessity] for pure Damm of the Hamza (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (4) preponderance of Fath over Kasr, [vid. (A)] in ُإِيمَّن
and [663] (Aud, A), because of the heaviness of the transition from Kasr of the Hamza to Damm of the م, and afterwards of the ن (Tsr): (5) preponderance of Kasr over Damm, [vid. (A)] in the word [667] (Aud, A), because Kasr is lighter than Damm, since Kasr brings one muscle, and Damm two muscles, into operation (Tsr): (6) allowability of Damm, Kasr, and Ishmām, [vid. (A)] in such as اتقاد and اخبار and when put into the pass. [436] (Aud, A), as [انفوا and اخطور] with Damm, and (Tsr) اتقيد and اختيبر with Kasr or Ishmām (Tsr, Sn), of the first and third, says Dm (Sn): (7) necessity for Kasr in what remains [of the ten ns., the inf. ns., and the vs. (Tsr)], it being the o. f. [664, 669] (Aud, A). When a sound or quasi-sound [below] quiescent [final] is conjoined with [a quiescent initial, which, at the beginning of a sentence, would be preceded by] the [conj. Hamza] pronounced with Damm, it may be pronounced with Kasr or Damm, as أَيُّ أَتْنَلْوَا IV. 69. [below] and أَوْ أَنْفَصَ LXXIII. 3. [664, 666] (A). In أَيُّ أَتْنَلْوَا أَنْفُسْكُمْ أَوِ أَخْرُجُوا مِنْ دِيَا بَرَكَمْ IV. 69. Saying, *Kill yourselves, or go forth from your homes,* IA1 and Yaʿkūb read أَيُّ أَتْنَلْوَا with Kasr of the ن, according to the o. f. of mobilization [664]; and أَيُّ أَخْرُجُوا with Damm of the و, for alliteration, and [for] assimilation
to the, of the plural in such as II. 238. [547, 664]: while 'Āsim and Ḥamza read with Kasr of both, according to the o. j.; and the remainder [read] with Damm of both, by treating them like the [conj.] Hamza conjoined with the v. (B). By a "quasi-sound. [quiescent]" is meant an unsound quiescent, treated like the sound, because the vowel of what precedes it is not homogeneous with it; so that such [an unsound quiescent] as [the of َقَالُوا َأَقْتُلُوا] َقَالُوا َأَقْتُلُوا َقَالُوا َأَقْتُلُوا َقَالُوا in XXI. 26. They said, Kill is excluded (Sn).

§. 669. Expression of any of these [conj.] Hamzas in the interior [of the sentence] is a departure from the speech of the Arabs, [and the analogy of their usage (IY)]; and is a gross solecism (M). But it occurs anomalously in metric exigency (SH), as إذَا َجًَا َلَّهَا أَلَهُ [below] (R, Jrb). The conj. Hamza, when preceded by what is not good to pause upon, must, in a case of choice, be elided: unless you stop your first speech, even if you do not pause [640], observing the rule of pause; [and begin again] after the time of the stoppage of the breath, or similar [interruption]. The poets sometimes do that, [i.e., make a stop] in [the beginnings of] hemistichs [below], because they are positions of separation; and begin [again] only after a stop, as

َوَلَا ِيُبَدِِرْ ِنِّيُاَلْجِنْصَة ْوَليِنْدَا َوَلَا ِيُبَدِِرْ ِنِّيُاَلْجِنْصَة ْوَليِنْدَا َوَلَا ِيُبَدِِرْ ِنِّيُاَلْجِنْصَة ْوَليِنْدَا
(R) Nor does our boy hasten, in winter, with the cooking-pot, putting it down from the fire without a piece of rag to take it off with (MAR). Then do not say the name [663], the departure, the partition, the begging pardon, من اسْبَك 664, 666, and from thy name. And the saying [of Kais Ibn Al Khatim (IV, MN)]

إِذَا جَآ يُوْنَ الْكُحْل أَلْنَّ يُوْنَ 662

[When the secret goes beyond the two, then verily it is liable to publication, and disclosure of the story, or, in one version,

is liable to dissemination, and multiplication by the tale-bearers (MN),] is a poetic license [below] (M). And like it is the saying of the other لا تنسب النون الهم [105], where he expresses the Hamza of إسم in the state of conjunction, by poetic license, which is easier here, because it is in the beginning of the second hemistich [above]; for the Arabs sometimes become silent after the [first] hemistich, and begin [again] with the second; so that the Hamza occurs, as it were, ineptively (IV). But the Hamza of the art. alone [below], when it occurs after the interrog. Hamza [581], is not elided [661], being [usually] converted into ı [below]
XXVII. 60. Is God better, or what they associate [with Him]? (IY), because its elision would lead to confusion (M) of inquiry with announcement, since both [Hamzas] are pronounced with Fath; so that, if it were elided, one would not know whether the Hamza [sounded] was the interrog. [Hamza] or that [conj. Hamza] which accompanies the determinative ] [667]. For that reason, then, it is retained, [though in a modified form]; and is assimilated to the of red [658], because of its permanence: the poet says [below].

The case of this Hamza is contrary to the general rule that we have laid down [above], since the conj. Hamza, when the interrog. I is prefixed to it, is [generally] dropped, as in II. 74. [543] and [661], because independence of the conj. Hamza is realized by means of the interrog. Hamza, which satisfies the condition of beginning with a mobile]; while its elision does not lead to confusion, since the interrog. Hamza is pronounced with Fath, and the conj. I [generally] with Kasr [664, 668] (IY).

[Conversion into I is not, however, the sole alternative to elision, as Z implies, in the case of the conj. Hamza pronounced with Fath: for] it has been mentioned that, in such a case, the Arabs have two methods, the chaste
of which is making the Hamza an ٰ، while the second is putting it betwixt and between, as in ُالْخِيْرُ الَّذِي أَلْحَعُ (663) (R). [Nor is this treatment of the conj. Hamza confined to "the Hamza of the art. alone", as Z states above: for] in interrogation, [when the interrog. Hamza is prefixed to it (Aud), the conj. Hamza pronounced with Fath (663, 668) (Aud, A), which is (Sn)] the Hamza of ٰ[ال] [and its subst. ٰ in the dial. of Himyar (Sn), and of ٰ[آين] and ٰ (Tsr, Sn)] is (1) changed into a [letter of] prolongation (IM), i. e., an ٰ [497, 668] (Aud), which is the more approved [method] (A): (a) IHKh says that F and many, [among whom are Z and IX,] do not mention any other than change; and that nothing contrary to it is read [in the Kur], or occurs in their speech: (b) Shl transmits from IAl that this [ٰ is not a modification of the conj. Hamza, but] is an [extraneous] imported for separation, like the ٰ of ٰ[ضرَبَّتْ]ٰ [497, 610]; and that he declares that those who hold it to be substituted for the [conj.] Hamza are in error, because it is not a disj. Hamza: but Shl replies that, since it resembles the disj. Hamza in some ways, there is nothing extraordinary in its being retained, and in the alteration of its form by change [into ٰ], for a distinction between announcement and inquiry; and that this is preferable to the importation of an extraneous Hamza: and he argues that it is sometimes combined with a
quiescent, as in [below], which, but for the regard paid to its original vowel, would not be allowable, contrary to [above] (Tsr): or (2) [sometimes (Aud)] softened (IM) between Hamza and (A), with abbreviation (Aud, A), which, [though less approved (Sn),] is agreeable with analogy, because change [into a letter of prolongation (Sn)] is the property of the quiescent (Tsr, Sn) Hamza [684-686]: (a) so in the Tsr, [where it is intended to account for the use of this inferior method in the readings cited below]: but our master the Sayyid says "It should not be imagined, from softening's being less approved, that it is not used in reading, since there is no incompatibility between its being less approved and its being chaste; while Sd distinctly declares, in the Glosses on the K, that the Readers sometimes agree upon a less approved, strange mode, as in LXXV. 9. [21]" (Sn): (b) IBsh says that this [method] is easy in comparison with what the school of S mention by "change" [above]. There is no difference in that [respect] between the Hamza of أَيْمَنُ and the Hamza of أَيْمَنُ (Tsr). You [therefore (A)] say أَلْحَسَنُ أَيْمَنُ and أَلْحَسَنُ أَلْلَهُ تَبَأَّنَكَ عِنْدَكَ [663], with prolongation, [by change (Aud,)] more approvably; and with softening, less approvably, [but agreeably with analogy, as before mentioned (Sn),] whence
(1084)

(Aud, A), by Ḥassān Ibn Yasār at Tağhlābī (MN), Is it the truth, if the abode of ArRabāb (the name of a woman) be distant, or a cord of love be severed, that thy heart is flying away (MN, J) (with thy beloved, named ArRabāb)? (J). And both modes are read [among the Seven (Tsr)] in [various passages of the Kur (A),] such as VI. 144, 145. [above] and X. 91. [497, 663]. It is not elided [656, 661, 663], as the [conj. (Tsr) Hamza (Aud)] pronounced with Kasr, [which is the o. f. (664, 668) (Aud),] is elided, as َاتَتَخَذَّنَاهُم سِخْرِيًا XXXVIII. 63. What! did we make of them a mockery?, [in the reading of others than ӀAl and the Two Brothers (Tsr), this text being read with the interrog. Hamza by the two Ḥijāzīs and Ibn ‘Āmir and ‘Āṣim (B)]; and [as (Tsr)] َاتَسْتَقْفَرْتُ َلَهُم LXIII. 6. [581, 543] (Aud, A), in the reading of all [the Seven]: the o. f. being َاتَسْتَقْفَرْتُ َأَتْخَذَّنَاهُم, with an interrog. Hamza pronounced with Fath, and then a conj. Hamza pronounced with Kasr; but the conj. Hamza being elided, because the interrog. Hamza enables it to be dispensed with (Tsr): and as the [conj. Hamza] pronounced with Ḍamm is elided, as َأَضْرَرَ أَلْرَجُل Was the man constrained? (A, Tsr), the o. f. being َأَضْرَر with a Hamza pronounced with Ḍamm, which is elided when the interrog. Hamza is prefixed: the course required by analogy being abandoned, in the case of the [conj.
(1085)

Hamza pronounced with Fath (Tsr), in order that interrogation may not be confounded with enunciation (Aud, A), the reason for A's saying "It is not elided" [above] (Sn). Nor is it [preserved intact, i.e.,] sounded true [656,663], because the conj. Hamza is not expressed in the interior [of the sentence], except by poetic license [above] (Aud, A), as before stated (A), like [668] (Aud).

§ 670. When preceded by something spoken, no mobile initial of a word, besides the conj. I [669], is elided or altered, except the s of هُوَ and هَيَّ [161], which, when preceded by a و or ف, or by a ل [of inception], is [often made] quiescent, as وُهَوَ دَا عِبَ And he is going. أَنْهَأَا خَيْرُ مِنْكَ Assuredly he is better than thou, and فَهُوَ Then he is standing, and similarly with هَيَّ [319]. But many of the Arabs leave the s with these ps. in its [original] state. And they do the like of that to the imp. ل with the ف and و, as in your saying. خَلْيَنَطَرَ And let him strike. Then let him look and وَليْضَرْ And let him strike. while those who leave the s of هُوَ and هَيَّ in its [original] state leave the Kasra of the ل in its [original] state (S). As for the quiescence of the s in وُهَ and هَيَّ [above], فَهُوَ and نَهَى and نُهِى and هُوَ, it is accidental, [but] elegant (SH), i.e., used by elegant speakers, contrary.
to II. 232. [below], and to such as [below], from
the frequency of its usage in the first [set of exs.] (R).
And so is [the quiescence of] the imp. لَلْهُوُّ نُذُورًا XXII. 30. And let them pay their vows [below].
And أَهْوَرَ [XXII. 30. [603] are
assimilated to the foregoing. But such as أَهْوَرَ 
I. 232. That he himself should dictate [above] is
rare (SH). "If it be said "The initials of these words
are quiescent, as in the texts II. 213. [464,
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[three *ps.*] mentioned, because, though not so frequent, it is *unil.*; and similarly what contains ْتُمْ, because it is copulative, like the َ, and ُ[538]: but that such as II. 282. [above] is rare, for want of both the quality of part and the frequency of usage (Jrb). I.H means that the initials of ُهوُ and ُهيُ with the copulative َ and ُ, and [with the Дж of inception and] the *interrog.* Hamza, and similarly the *imp.* Дж that is preceded by َ or ُ, are made quiescent, so that analogy requires the *conj.* Hamza to be imported for them; but that it is not imported for the sole reason that the quiescence is accidental. This answer, however, is not satisfactory, because this quiescence is founded upon the assimilation of the initials in these words to medials, such as ُهوُ and ُهيُ being assimilated to َعْضُدْ, and such as ُهيُ and ُنْهرُ to َكْتَفْ; and so is it said of [the *imp.* Дж in] XXII. 30. [above]: so that they are made quiescent only because they are treated like the medial of the word; and how should a *conj.* Hamza be imported for what is like the medial of a word [667]? And grant that it be not like the medial, is it not non-inceptive? And is not the *conj.* Hamza imported for accidental quiescence also, in the initial of a word, when it is inceptive [§58, 667], since you say ٌِبْسُمْ, notwithstanding that ُِبْسُمْ occurs, and similarly ُِبْسُتَ and ُِبْسُتَ [667]? He ought therefore to say...
that the Hamza is not imported [in ḍhamma, etc.,] because it is imported only when that word is inceptive, as we mentioned [667]; whereas this quiescence, in these words, is [found] only when they are preceded by something. The reason for their assimilation of the initials in these words to the medial is the want of independence in what precedes them, and the impossibility of pausing upon it. But ʿāʾ and ʿāʾ and ʿāʾ and ʿāʾ; and, for this reason, the alleviation [of the s by elision of its vowel] is rarer in their case: while ʿāʾ and ʿāʾ and ʿāʾ, alleviation of the s being allowable in them, according to what is read in the Kur (R). As for ʿāʾ, this is the imp. ل [419, 429, 603]: it is orig. pronounced with Kasr, as is proved by the fact that, when you begin, saying ʿāʾ, you pronounce it with Kasr, not otherwise; but, when you prefix the or to the phrase containing it, the ل may be made quiescent (IV). But in such as ʿāʾ And in order that he may do, with the ل of َكِي [411, 599], alleviation is not allowable, from the rarity of its usage (R). If ʿāʾ occur instead of the or ʿāʾ, quiescence is not as good as with the ʿāʾ or ʿāʾ, because ʿāʾ, being of more than one letter, is, as it were, detached from what
follows it: and, for that reason, most of the Readers are agreed upon mobilization in XXVIII. 61. And who afterwards, on the day of resurrection, shall be one of the persons summoned to attend (IY) (for reckoning), or (for chastisement); while Nāfi', Ibn 'Amir in one version, and Ks read ُبُنْ ُهُوَ with quiescence of the s, by assimilation of the detached to the attached [con.] (B). But Ks and others read ُمَلْعَبُوا ُفَتَّضَهُم ُفَتَّضَهُم XXII. 30. Then let them fulfil [603] their purification, with quiescence of the imp. ل, by assimilation of ُقَمَّ ُهُوَ to the ف, and ُقَمَّ, because it is a con., like them; while the BB deem that inelegant, because ُقَمَّ is independent, [susceptible of being] paused upon (R). Those who say ُقَمَّ ُفَتَّضُوا XXII. 30. [above], with quiescence of the ل, assimilate the second of ُقَمَّ to the ف and ُقَمَّ, treating ُفَتَّضُوا as on a par with ُفَتَّضُوا; and this is like their saying I see thee puffed up, meaning ُمَتَّفَقُصَا, the ُفَتَّضُوا of being assimilated to a كَتَفَ, and the ُمَتَّفَقُصَا therefore made quiescent; and like it is

فَمْ بَوَيتُ ُمَتَّفَقُصَّا وَمَا تَكَرَّدَ ُكَتَفَ ُفَتَّضُوا

Then it passed the right erect, and did not contract [above] (IY). And II. 282. [above] is read anomalously, with quiescence of the s, by treating ُلِهَّرُ [in بُقَلُ ُهُوَ]
like مَرْضِدُ but it is inelegant, because يُنْيَلُ is an independent word, and cannot be assimilated to the cov., as ثمُّ is; and the saying قَبَّةٌ مُّتَقَبَّبُ فَلْحُ [above] is superior to the like of this, because it is in one word (R). The quiescence in all of this is only a matter occurring accidentally, for a kind of alleviation; and is therefore not reckoned as a [distinct] formation (IY).

Mobilization of the s in هُرَ and هُرَ after the ل [of inception], and after the، and ف، as likewise mobilization of the imp. ل after the two [latter ps.], is the ṣ.f.: S says "It is excellent, superlative" (R).
CHAPTER VIII.

THE AUGMENTATIVENESS OF LETTERS.

§ 671. It is common to the n. and the v. (M). As for the ps., there is no augmentation in them, because it is a kind of plasticity, which is not [found] in ps. [497]. The meaning of augmentation is adjoining to the word some letters that do not belong to it, either to import a meaning, like the of مَفَارِض [369]; or for a kind of extension in the vocabulary, like the of ٨٠٠٠٠ [374, 401], the of عَنْوَة [246], and the of سَعْيِد [369, 673, 674] (IY). Augmentation is sometimes for co-ordination with an o. f., and sometimes not (R). The meaning of [augmentation for (MASH)] co-ordination is that the augment is added only for the purpose of making a paradigm to be on [the measure of] a paradigm exceeding it [in number of letters] (SH), the aug. letter in the augmented [paradigm] being put as a representative of the rad. letter [occupying a corresponding position] in the standard [paradigm] (Jrb), in order that the former [paradigm] may be treated like the latter (SH) in the formation of its dim. and broken pl. [below], etc. (Jrb). Therefore such as ٣٩٠٠ [a rugged place (Jrb)] is co-ordinated [375, 731] (SH) with ٨٩٠٠٠٠
[392], for which reason they say ٰ۪ۯٰۤۯ۶ [253] and ٰۯ۰۰۷۹۴ [274], as they say ٰۯۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۱ [245] and ٰۯۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۴ [274] (Jrb). But such as ٰۯۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۱ [333, 361, 372, 676] is not co-ordinated, [although ٰۯۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۱ and ٰۯۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۱ may be formed from it (Jrb).] because the augment is proved to be regularly put for another purpose (SH), vid. indication of the inf. n. [333], or of the time or place [361]; and because a co-ordinative letter does not occur at the beginning (Jrb). And similarly [also (Jrb)] such as ٰۯۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۱ [488], ٰۯۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۱ [489], and ٰۣ۰۰۱ [490] (SH) are not co-ordinated [483] (Jrb), for the same reason (SH), vid. that the augment is proved to be regularly put for a purpose other than co-ordination, i. e., to denote the meanings mentioned for these conjugs. [488-490] (Jrb); and because their inf. ns. occur different (SH) from the inf. n. of ٰۯۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۱ [483], being ٰۣ۰۰۱ ٰۣ۰۰۰۱۷۹۱, ٰۣ۰۰۱ ٰۣ۰۰۱ ٰۣ۰۰۱ ٰۣ۰۰۱ ٰۣ۰۰۱ ٰۣ۰۰۱ [332] (MASH). The meaning of co-ordination [673] in the n. and v. is that you add one or two letters to a combination—not regularly, in importing a [particular] meaning [below]—in order that such combination, by means of that addition, may become like another word in (1) the number of letters: (2) the special vowels and quiescences, each in the same relative position as [its counterpart] in the standard [word]: (3) its variations vid. (a) the pret., aor., imp., prohib., inf. n.,
act. part., and pass. part., if the standard be a quad. v. [482, 492]; (b) the dim. and broken pl. [above], if the standard be a quad. n., not a quin. [245, 274]. The use of co-ordination is that, in the case of that word, such a combination is sometimes needed in verse or rhyming prose. We do not lay down that there is no alteration of meaning by reason of the co-ordinative augment—how [can we] when the meaning of كَهْفَلُ aged, impotent is different from that of كَهْفُلُ corn in the blade, and the meaning of أَهْلَل [483] is different from that of أَهْلِل included, and similarly كَوْعَر [below] is not i. q. كُورَ pith of a palm-tree?—but it suffices that, in similar positions, that augment should not regularly import a [particular] meaning [above], as the aug. Hamza in أَكْبَر greater and أَفْضَل [351] denotes superiority [354]; and the aug. م in مَفْعُول denotes the inf. n. [333], or the time or place [361], and in مَفْعُول the instrument [366]. And hence we do not say that these augs. are co-ordinative, even though, by their means, these words become like the quad. in the special vowels and quiescences, and in the dim. and [broken] pl., because the appearance of these letters as augs. is to denote the meanings mentioned; so that we do not refer them to the lit. purpose, while it is possible to refer them to the id. purpose (R). Augmentation is for [one
of (A)] seven causes:—(1) indication of a meaning, as in the aoristic letter [369, 404] (A, Tsr), and the ٌ of مَعَالَةٌ [332, 490] (A): (2) co-ordination, as in (a) [the ٌ of (A)] ٌ[below] (A, Tsr) and جَذَّرُ [369, 374, 675], the ی of صَبْرٌ [373] and عُتِيرٌ [374], the ی of أَرْطَى and ِ[673], and the ی of جَمَحْفَلٌ [below] and مَعَزٌ [375, 677] (A): (a) co-ordination [above], as [defined by IM] in the Tashil, is making a tril. or quad. to be commensurable with what is above it [in number of letters]: and what is meant, says Dm, is commensurability in appearance, since, in reality, the measure is different; for the measure of ِجَعْفَرٌ [above], e. g., is ِقَوْعُل [392], while the measure of كُوْرُ [283, 675] is ِلْكُوْرُ [373]: (b) is applied to denote several meanings, among them much good and a river in Paradise (Sn): (3) prolongation (A, Tsr), as in كِتَابٌ [673] (Tsr); and hence the ی of رسَالَةٌ [246], the ی of صَحِيفةٌ [246], and the ی of حُلْوَبَةٌ [267] (A): (4) compensation, as in the ی of (A) ٌزَنادِةٌ [265] (A, Tsr) and إِقَامَةٌ [265, 338], the ی of سُطُف [680], and the ی of أَلْلّهُمَّ [52, 56] (A): (5) magnification of the sense, and (Sn) multiplication (A, Tsr) of the letter (Sn), as in the ی of َمُسْتَهِمٌ and َزَرَقٌ [667, 676, 681. A], which is added to denote magnification of the sense, and multiplication.
[of the indicator (Sn)] thereof (A); and hence [the of (A)] [272, 401, 673] (A, Tsr) and [401, 673] (A): (6) making [articulation (Tsr)] possible, as in (a) the conj. ‹A› [667] (A, Tsr), because it is not possible to begin with a quiescent (A); (b) the s of silence in [such as  địa and (A)] [615, 644, 679] (A, Tsr), because it is not possible to begin with, and pause upon, a [single] letter (A): (7) making [the vowel (Tsr) or the ] plain (A, Tsr), as in LXIX. 29. [615, 648] (Tsr); and hence the s of silence in such as مالیة LXIX. 28. [648, 679] and  [48, 55, 679], which is added to make the vowel plain [in the former (Sn)], and the l [perfectly (Sn)] plain (A) in the latter (Sn): so says IU (Tsr). The letters of augmentation (IY, SH), [i. e.] the aug. letters (M), are [ten letters, vid. the Hamza, the l, the s, the y, the n, the t, the s, the m, the w, and the l (IY), comprised in the (mnemonic) phrases (M, Jrb)] [1-3] يَا أَوْسُ هَلْ نِئَتَ and لَمْ يَأْتِنَا سَهُورً and (Jrb) [369, 401] (M, SH), which somebody has combined in a verse, vid

يَا أَوْسُ هَلْ نِئَتَ وَلَمْ يَأْتِنَا سَهُورً فَقَالَ أَلَيْيَمَمْ تَنْسَاهُ

O Aus, hast thou slept, when negligence has not overcome us? Then said he, "To-day thou dost forget it"

And Solomon came to him (M), 114a.
which is not good, because it contains a duplication of
the \( [370] \) (M, SH) : (a) it is said
that a pupil asked his master about the letters of aug-
mentation, and he said \( \text{Fe have asked me about them}\); whereupon the pupil thought that his
master had not answered him, referring to his former
answer; so he said "We have not asked thee save this
once", on which the master said \( \text{To-day thou dost forget it [above], and the pupil said "By God, assuredly I do forget it"; and then the master said "I have answered thee twice, O stupid" (R): \( \text{Alṣāṣān} \) (6) \( \text{Hūyīt} \) (M, SH) : (a) it is said that Mb asked Mz about
the letters of augmentation, and he recited

\[ \text{Hūyīt Alṣāṣān Fashībīnī} \]  
(I loved the plump (women); and they turned me
hoary, when I had of old loved the plump (women)
(MAR)]; whereupon Mb said to him (IY, R) "[Give
me] the answer" (IY); "[for] I asked thee about the
letters of augmentation, and thou recitest poetry to me"
(R); and he then said "I have answered thee twice"
(IY, R), meaning \( \text{Hūyīt Alṣāṣān} \) (b) Z [followed by
IH] says \( \text{Alṣāṣān Hūyīt} \), making \( \text{Alṣāṣān} \) precede, in order
that the [conj.] Hamza may not be elided [669], in the
interior [of the phrase], in which case the number of the
letters of augmentation would be deficient; whereas,
when he begins with it, the Hamza is expressed: (7) 

He left me, and lost his way. 

Death forgets him (9) They question one another. 

What thou hast asked is light: (11) They [fem.] sought. or Seek ye [fem.], my love: (12) 

Ye have asked my abasement. IKh has collected more than twenty [such] combinations, reported or unreported; and says that the best of them, in letter and sense, is

(R) I asked the augmentative letters about their name; and they then said, nor begrudged saying, "Those letters are collected in آمان ر تشهر" (Jsh). 

The meaning of their being letters of augmentation is not that they are only aug., since there is no letter among them that is not rad. in many positions; but the meaning is that, when a letter is added to a word, then that added [letter] is only one of these letters, unless the added letter be reduplicative, whether the reduplication be co-ordinative, as in گردد [above]; or non-co-ordinative, as in interpreted "[489]; where the د and ب are not letters of augmentation. The reduplicative
letter, notwithstanding its augmentativeness, is [taken] from all the letters of the alphabet, [except the [1], as shown below.] whether letters of augmentation, as in حُمْل [433, 482] and حَمْمَę́ amassed; or others, as in قُطْع [489] and سْرَح set free: and is co-ordinative, as in يُرْدَة and جُلْبَب [731]; and non-co-ordinative, as in عَلَم [above].

But that [aug. letter] which is co-ordinative, yet not reduplicative, is [taken] only from the letters of أَلْيَمَ [above], as in جُدُول [369, 374, 675] [above], and عَبْدَل [631] (R). The aug. is of two sorts, (1) repetition of a rad., and (2) not so. The first sort, [vid. repetition of a rad. (Tsr),] is not peculiar to any letters in particular (Aud); but is [found] in all the letters, whether letters of سَأْلَتْسبوْنِبَهَا [above] or not, except the [1] [above], which is not susceptible of reduplication (Tsr).

And its condition is that it should resemble (1) the J, as in جُلْبَب [above] and جُلْبَب [385]: (2) the غ, (a) with union, as in قُتْل slaughtered [489]; (b) with separation by an aug. [between them (Tsr)], as in كُتْبَل [384, 677]: (3) the ف and غ, as in ِمُرَمَّرِيس [370]: (4) the غ and ل, as in صُبْخَح [370, 385] (Aud). When two letters are repeated in a word, which has another rad., then one of the two duplicates is judged to be aug.; but, as to the specification of the aug., there is a dispute. IM mentions
in the Tashil that, in such as ُقُصْحَحَح [above], the second and third of the [four] similars, i. e., the first ح and the second م, are judged to be aug.; and, in such as مُرِمِّرِس م [above], the third and fourth, i. e., the second م and the subsequent ر: and some adduce as evidence of the augmentativeness of the first ح in صَحَحَح ح, and of the second م in مُرِمِّرِس, their elision in the dim., as صَحَحَح and مُرِمِّرِس [283]. But it is transmitted from the KK that the measure of ُقُعَلَل is ُقُصَحَح, its o. f. being ُقُصَحَح, where they change the middle ح into م (Tsr). As for that [duplicate] which resembles the ف alone, as in زِنَجْرَف [wine (Tsr)] and سَنَدُس [thin silk brocade (Tsr)], or the ع separated [from its duplicate] by a rad., as in حَدِّرْنَ, [a man's name (Jh, Tsr), whence Abû Ḥadrad al-Aslamî, a Companion (KF), while no other ُقُعَلَل, with repetition of the ع, occurs (Jh, KF, Tsr), and أَلْحَصَدُزْرَن meaning the short——so in the CT (KF),] it is rad. And, when the quad. is formed of two letters, then, (1) if its third be not omissible, the whole are rad., as in سَجَمِس [311, 674, 677] (Aud), the measure of which is ُقُعَلَل [392], because the radicalness of the two letters is certain, and there must be a third to complete the [number of] rad.s.; while neither of the remaining two is superior to the other, so that both are
judged to be rad.: (a) it is transmitted from Khl and the KK that its measure is َنَفُرْ، it فَبِّمَا being repeated; but this is improbable (Tsr): (2) if its third be omissible, as in لَيْسَهُ i. q. لَمْ يُعْتَبَّر reunited it, that third is, (a) as the KK say, an aug. substituted for a letter resembling the second (Aud), the o. f. of لَئَلَم، according to their saying, being لَئَلَمْ where, the succession of three similars being deemed heavy, they substitute for one of them a letter resembling the ف: but this is refuted by the fact that they say َفُعُلْلَا for its inf. n. [332]; whereas, if لَئَلَمْ [a tril.] reduplicated [in the medial], its inf. n. would occur on [the measure of] َتَفْعِيلْ [332] (Tsr): (b) as Zj [among the BB (Tsr)] says, an aug. not substituted for anything: (c) as the rest of the BB say, a rad. (Aud): (a) the opinion of the KK is preferred by BD, who says that it is better than making لَئَلَم a repeated [formation] agreeing in sense with the reduplicated tril., as the BB say of its similars, like قَضَّعْتُ I crushed, كَاشَكِنَّتْ I restrained, and كَبْكَبَتْ I overturned (Tsr). The second sort, [vid. what is not added for repetition (Tsr),] is peculiar to the letters collected by IM four times in one verse

(1100)

( Aud), i. e. (1) in Congratulations and
salutation (are a matter that), (2) in the day of his friendliness, (3) in an utmost craving (of desire), and (4) in protection and facilitation [above] (Jsh).

And they ought to reckon the in such as I honored thee [617, 680], in the 2nd pers. fem.; for, if they say "This is peculiar to pause", we say "And so is the of silence" [615, 644, 679] (Tsr). Mb omits the s from the letters of augmentation; but the refutation of his opinion will be given [679] (A). These [ten letters, exclusively of others, are peculiar to augmentation, because the most suitable augments are the letters of prolongation and softness, since they are the lightest [and least troublesome (Jrb)] of the letters (Jrb, Tsr). As for the saying of the GG that the and are heavy, it is [said of them] in relation to the l [643]; while, in relation to the other letters, they are light (Jrb). And the rest of the ten letters are assimilated to them:—for (1) the Hamza is adjacent to the l in outlet [732], and is convertible into a soft letter upon alleviation [658]: (2) the s also is adjacent to the l in outlet [732] (Jrb, Tsr), while Akh asserts that their outlet is one; and it is faint; and is sometimes substituted for the in [690], and for the in [171, 174, 275, 648, 690] (Jrb); (3) the is [uttered]
from the outlet of the ج [732], vid. the lip; and contains a nasality [akin to the softness of the soft letters (Jrb)]: (4) the ن [also (Jrb)] contains nasality [270]; and is prolonged in the upper part of the nose, like the ل in the throat: (5) the ت is a surd [734] letter; and is substituted for the ن in تُنْجِةٌ (Jrb, Tsr) and تُرَاتُ [689] (Jrb): (6) the س is a sibilant [734], surd, letter, [whose surdity is akin to the softness of the soft letters (Jrb)]; and its outlet is near to that of the ت [732] (Jrb, Tsr), for which reason they substitute it for the latter, saying سَتْ يُنْجِدَ [759], the converse of which is سَتُّ يُنْجِدَ, orig. سُدُسَ [307, 316, 689, 758] (Jrb): and (7) the ل, though a vocal [734] letter, resembles the ن; and is near to it in outlet [732] (Jrb, Tsr), for which reason the ن is incorporated into it [749, 751], as مَلْدُنَّةٌ لَعْلَيْي [170], as with its like in لَعْلَيْي and كَلْتَي (Jrb). Measurement [of words] is also named exemplification (Aud), from the resemblance of the letters of the measure to the letters of the measured in number and conformation. The use of measurement is to explain the states of the formations of words in eight matters, (1) vowels, (2) quiescences, (3) rads., (4) augs., (5) priority, (6) posteriority, (7) elision, and (8) absence of elision. And the measure is the crude form of
[below] (Tsr). There must be a measure, whereby the *aug.* may be differentiated from the *rad.*; while it is not possible for the word to be measured by itself; and therefore they constitute, for that [purpose], the crude-form of فَعَلَ [below], because it is the most general of the *vs.* in sense, and may be employed for every *act*, as فَعَلَ الْأَصْبَرُ He did striking and فَعَلَ الْمُنْصَرِ He did helping, whence الْفَعَلُ الْمُنْصَرِ الْكُوْةُ فَأَعْلَيْنَونَ XXIII. 4. And who are doers of almsgiving, i.e., مُرْكَبُونَ الْمُرْكَبَةُ الْكُوْةَ almsgivers (Jrb), where الْكُوْةَ is meant to be an abstract n. [3], vid. the deed of the almsgiver, i.e., التَّرْكِيْبَةُ almsgiving (K). What is intended is the crude-form of فَعَلَ [above], not its conformation, since the measure does not always keep to this conformation (Sn). The *rads.* are represented [in the measure] by the ف, [then (Aud)] the ع, and [then (Aud)] the ج [368, 369.] (SH, Aud), in the order imported from the word "then" (Tsr); and such [rads. (R, Jrb)] as exceed [three (R, Jrb)] by a second or third ج (SH); the letters of the measure being (Tsr) given such [original (Tsr)] mobility or quiescence as belongs to their measured (Aud). This means that, when you want to measure a word, [in order to know its *rad.* and *aug.* (A),] you represent its *rads.* by [the letters of فَعَلُ, the first by (A)] the ف, [the second by (A)] the ع, and [the third by (A)] the ج (R, A), i.e., 115a
you put, in the measure, these three letters in place of the *rad.* letters (R), making the measure and the measured equal in vowel and quiescence [253] (A), as you say "ضَرَّبِ" [below] (R). You, therefore, say (1) *فَعَلْ* [with quiescence of the ع(Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] [368] (Aud, A), among *ns.* (Tsr): (2) *فَعَلْ* (Aud, A), with *Fath* of the [ع(Tsr)] ف (A, Tsr), for [the measure of (Tsr)] ضَرَّبِ [above] (Aud, A), among *vs.* (Tsr); and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] قَامَ [403, 482] (Aud, A), in the hollow (Tsr), and *شدَّ* [482] (Aud, A), in the reduplicated (Tsr), because their o. f. [before conversion or incorporation (Tsr, Sn)] is قُوَمَ [403, 684, 703] and شَدَّة [731]: (3) *فَعَلْ* [with *Kasr* of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] عَلِيمَ [432, 440, 482]; and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] حَابِبَ [in the hollow (Tsr)] and مَلِّ [403, 684, 703] and مَلِّلَ *loathed, was weary of* [731] (Tsr, Sn), with *Kasr* of their second (Sn): (4) *فَعَلْ* [with *Damm* of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] طَرَفِ [331, 432, 482]; and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] طَالَ [432] and حَبِّ [476] (Aud, A), because their o. f. is طُوَّلَ [403, 684, 703] and حُبِّ [731] (Tsr, Sn), with *Damm* of their second (Sn). And
by that means the explanation of the original vowels and quiescences is effected (Tsr). Then, if any of the rads. of the word remain, you add (1) a second ١ in [the measure of (Tsr)] the quad., saying ١٠٠٠ for [the measure of (Tsr)] 
[١٠٠٠] [392]: (2) a second and third [١ (Tsr)] in [the measure of (Tsr)] the quin., saying ١٠٠٠ for [the measure of (Tsr)] 
[١٠٠٠] [245, 401] (Aud). What IHsh mentions as to the measurement of the tril. is agreed upon. But what he mentions as to the measurement of the non-tril. is disputed, there being two opinions, (1) what he mentions, which is the saying of the BB, founded on [the theory] that the whole [of the letters in the quad. and quin.] are rads.; and is correct: (2) that whatever [letter] exceeds three is aug., which is said by the K.K, being founded upon their theory that the extreme number of rads. is three [368]. Then they diverge into three opinions, (1) that the non-tril. is not measurable, because the mode of measuring it is not known; (2) that it is measurable, but that its final is represented by its own letter; (3) that it is measurable, but that its penultimate is represented by its own letter: which [divergence between the second and third opinions] is founded upon the question whether the aug. [in the quad.] be the final or the penultimate, the first [opinion] being held by Fr, and the second by Ks [368]. Thus, as to whether [the
measure of) [392], as the BB say, or فعَّل (392) بعَر (392), as the BB say, or فعَّل (392) بعَر (392) with the ر aug., or فعَّل (392) بعَر (392) with the ف aug., or what it is be not known, there are four [different] sayings (Tsr). And the aug. is represented by its own [original] letter, [in order that it may be differentiated from the rad. (Tsr),] so that one says (1–8) فعَّل (332), و فعَّل (332, 482, 674], and فعَّل (482, 675) (Aud), with the aug. Hamza, ى, and و, respectively (Tsr): (4) for [the measure of (Tsr)] [667] (Aud), with the aug. Hamza and ت (Tsr); and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] [692, 756] and د (693, 756], because the o.f. is فعَّل (332, 482, 483, 493] (Aud), where the numbers of the augs. and rads. are equal (Tsr). When, however, the aug. is a repetition of a rad., [whether co-ordinative or not (Tsr),] it is represented, (1) according to the majority, by what that rad. is represented by (Aud), because, repetition of the rad. in the science of etymology being on a par with lit. corroboration [132] in the science of syntax, as that [lit. corrob.] is given the predicament of the ant., and therefore imitates it in its inflection, so this [repetitive aug.] is measured by the same measure as the rad., in order to make known that


this is a repetition of what precedes (Tsr), as in your saying [beginning of rain and wind (Tsr, Sn)—so says SBd (Sn)], and [482, 483, 675] (Aud), respectively; the [second] in جُلْبِيَت [253, 396, 674, 677] and cartilage [396], respectively; while the [second] د in [482, 483, 675] is non-co-ordinative: (2) according to some, by its own letter, unrestrictedly, even though it is a repetition of a rad.; so that one says جُلْبِيَت , and for the [above], جُلْبِيَت , and [above], respectively (Tsr). The aug., (1) when it is not one of the letters of [above], is a duplicate of a rad., like the ب in جُلْبِيَت [above]; (2) if it be one of them, is (a) a duplicate, as in ٍسَال [661, 738]: (b) not a duplicate; but having the semblance of a duplicate, though some evidence, [like the extraordinariness of without repetition of the and (Sn),] indicates that reduplication is not intended by it, in which case it is represented in the measure by its own letter, as in سَنَان, a [place wherein is (Sn)] water belonging to the بنو رابع'a, the measure of which is ٍفُلَلٌ, not ٍفُلَلٌ, because ٍفُلَلٌ is an extraordinary measure,
no instance of which occurs without repetition [of the ن and ع (Sn)], as in زَرَّال [273, 332, 396], except حَرْعَالٌ [396] and كَفْقَارٌ denoting [hard (Jh, KF)] stone, [to which the KF adds دِسَّمَةٌ dust and حَرَطَالَ oats (Sn).] while بَهْرَام Bahrām and شَهْرَام Shahrām are foreign (A) proper names: (c) not a duplicate, nor in the semblance of one, like the Hamza in أَكْرَمَ above (Sn). What is considered in measurement is the form to which the measured was entitled before alteration [by incorporation, or conversion, of one letter into another]: so that one says فَعُلٌ for the measure of رَّد [331] and مَرْنَ repelling, respectively, because their o.f. is رَدّ and مَرْنَ (A); and similarly, as before mentioned, قَامٌ and شَدّ, because their o.f. is قَمَّ and شَدّ; and so هَابَ and مَلّ, and طَالِ and حَبَّ [above] (Sn). But, when there is, in the measured, a transfer [from one place to another, which is named transposition (Tsr)], or an elision [of some of the rads.], you put the like [transfer or elision] in the measure, saying (1) فَلَعَ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ٗنَأّ [pret. of یَنَأّ (Tsr), a dial. var. of i.q. بُعَدَ was far away (Jh)], because it is from (Aud), the o.f. being َنَأّ; but the J, vid. the َنَأّ, being transferred to the position of the ع, vid. the Hamza, so that it becomes ُنَا; and the َنَأّ then converted into ٗنَأّ [684, 703], because mobile, and preceded by a
letter pronounced with Fath; so that it becomes ﺲآ with prolongation (Tsr): (2) ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] [210,324], because it is from ﻭْ ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] unity (Aud), the o. f. being ﻭ, vid. the ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] [482, 699] (Aud), being transferred to the position of the ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] of the ج, vid. the ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] and the then made to precede the ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] with which it is impossible to begin, so that it becomes ﺲآ and the ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] converted into ﺲآ [685, 721], because occurring as a final after Kasra; so that it becomes ﺲآ (Tsr): (3) ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] of which is elided, the o. f. being ﺲآ, because it is orig. with Kasr [of the َُ], and is afterwards pronounced with Fath because of the guttural letter; so that the elision is from ﺲآ with Kasr: so says Sd on ﺲآ [482] and its congeners (Tsr): (4) ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ٍْ [703] (Aud), imp. of ٍْ, the o. f. being ٍْ, but its َُ being elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents [663] (Tsr): (5) ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ٍْ [16] (Aud), the ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] of which is elided, the o. f. being ٍْ, but its ٍْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] being elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents [663]. The measurement of some words is impracticable, like
and 382, 679, 680], because we consider the original vowel and quiescence; and, the \( \text{س} \) in those [words] being orig. quiescent, while the \( \text{s} \) and \( \text{ز} \) [also] are quiescent, a concurrence of two quiescents would ensue in the measure; so that the right course is to say \( \text{فعل} \) for their measure, because they are orig. \( \text{أَرْيَقَ} \) and \( \text{أَطِرَعَ} \), the \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{s} \) being aug. (Tsr). IM says (Aud), in the Alfiya (Tsr), The letter, if it be inseparable [from the word in all its variations (A)], is a rad.; while that which is not inseparable, [but is elided in some of the variations (A),] is the aug., like the \( \text{ت} \) of \( \text{أَخْتَدَى} \) [below] (IM). Thus he defines the rad. letter as being that which is inseparable in all the variations, and the aug. as being that which is not inseparable in all the variations; while he exemplifies the latter by the \( \text{ت} \) of \( \text{أَخْتَدَى} \), which is aug., because it is elided in some of the variations (Tsr), since you say \( \text{خَذَّا خُذَّرَ} \) (A, Tsr), i.e., as in the KF (Sn), \( \text{ديُذ} \) as \( \text{ديُذ} \) (KF, Sn); so that, by the elision of the \( \text{ت} \) [in \( \text{خَذَّا خُذَّرَ} \), you know that it is aug. in \( \text{أَخْتَدَى} \) was imitated, or was put on or worn (A). \( \text{إِخْتَدَى} \) is imitation; or putting on, or wearing, sandals (Tsr). One says \( \text{إِخْتَدَى} \) \( \text{يَو} \) imitated him (A), [and] \( \text{إِخْتَدَى} \) \( \text{مِثَالَة} \) imitated his example (Jh, KF), i.e. \( \text{إِخْتَدَى} \) \( \text{يَو} \) (Jh, KF, A); and
also (A) put on, or wore, sandals, i.e., whence

The foot-sore barefooted man puts on any sandal, being a sandal [329] (Jh, A). But [both (Tsr)] the definitions require consideration:—the first [definition, vid. that of the rad. (Tsr).] because the of َكُرَكَب [253, 373] and the of َقَرْنَفِل [392, 395] are aug., as you will [soon (Tsr)] recognize [675, 677], notwithstanding that they are not elided [in all the variations (Tsr)]; and the second [definition, vid. that of the aug. (Tsr).] because the of َغَرَا, the of َقَالَ, and the of َلَفَدَ are rads., notwithstanding that they are elided in ِبَعْدَ [482, 699], ُقُلَ [663, 703], and َكَمْ َيَغْرَ [404, 719] (Aud). Thus the definition of the rad. is not inclusive, and the definition of the aug. is not exclusive (Tsr): [or rather] neither of the two definitions is inclusive or exclusive:—

the definition of the rad., because such as the of َغَرَا is excluded [from it], while such as the of َقَرْنَفِل is included [in it]; and the definition of the aug., because the second is excluded from it, while the first is included in it (Sn). And the accurate formula for recognition of the augs. would be "Know that a letter is not judged to be aug., unless the remaining letters of the word exceed two rads. (Aud). But [IUK replies that (Tsr)] the
\( \text{rad.}, \) when elided for unsoundness, [like the \( \text{ر} \) of \( \text{يَعْدَ} \) (A.);] is constructively present, [contrary to the \( \text{aug.} \) (Tsr)]; while the \( \text{aug.}, \) when inseparable, [like the \( \text{ن} \) of \( \text{قَرْنَفْلُ} \) and the \( \text{و} \) of \( \text{كُوْكَب} \) (A.);] is constructively elided. And therefore the \( \text{aug.} \) is said to be what is elided, really or constructively, in the original constitution (A, Tsr). The indications of the augmentativeness of a letter are ten:—(1-3) elision from (a) an \( \text{o. f.} \), like the elision of the \( \text{i} \) of \( \text{صَارِبَ} \) [343, 369, 373] in its \( \text{o. f.} \), i. e., the \( \text{inf. n.} \) [331]; (b) a \( \text{deriv.} \) form, like the elision of the \( \text{i} \) of \( \text{كَتَاب} \) [above] in its \( \text{pl.} \) [246, 256]; (c) a counterpart, like the elision of the \( \text{ي} \) of \( \text{ difícil} \) [674] in \( \text{إِيْلْ} \) [363], [which is like \( \text{يَيْلَ} \) in sense and crude-form (Sn)]: (a) the condition requisite, in order that elision of the letter from an \( \text{o. f.} \), a \( \text{deriv.} \) form, or a counterpart, may be adducible as an indication of its augmentativeness, is that its elision should not be for unsoundness; for, if its elision be for unsoundness, like the elision of the \( \text{ي} \) of \( \text{يَعْدَ} \) [above], or in \( \text{يَعْدَة} \) [401, 482, 699], it is not an indication of augmentativeness: (4, 5) the letter’s occupying, in the \( \text{non-deriv.} \) [word containing it (Sn)], a position wherein it is \( \text{aug.} \) in the \( \text{deriv.} \), (a) invariably, like the \( \text{ن} \) [673, 677], when it occurs as a quiescent, unincorporated, third, and is followed by two letters, as in \( \text{بَرَتْنَيْلُ} \) [675, 677], which is an \( \text{evil} \), [a calamity, and
a great matter (KF),] ُشَرْطَبَتُ [677], which is thick in the hands and feet, and ُعَصْنَصْرُ، 'Asansar, which is a mountain, the ُن في these [words] and the like being aug., because it occupies a position wherein it is only aug. in the deriv. (A), even though [the derivation be] from a concrete ُن [3], as is proved by what follows, derivation [here] being in the sense of mere taking (Sn), as ُجِهَتَلْ [393, 395] from ُجِهَتْلَة [677], which in the solid-hoofed [animal] is like ُشَفَةُ lip in man, ُجِهَتْلُ being big in the lip, and also a great army: (b) frequently, like the Hamza [672], when it occurs as an initial, and is followed by three letters, in which case it is judged to be aug., even if the derivation be not known, since it is frequently aug. when it occurs similarly [situated] in a word whose derivation is known: thus the Hamza of ُأَرْنَب [18, 249] and [249, 372] is judged to be aug., because made to accord with [the Hamza of] a word whose derivation is recognizable, as ُأَحَبَر [249, 372]: (6) its being peculiar to, [i. e., found in (Sn).] a position wherein only a letter of augmentation occurs, like the ُن of [such as (Sn)] ُكِنْتَأْوُ (A), with which ُكِنْتَأَو [380] is synonymous (Sn); and of such as ُرَدَأْوُ، ُسَنَأْوُ، ُذَأْوُ، ُذَأْوُ، ُسَنَأْوُ، ُذَأْوُ، ُذَأْوُ، ُذَأْوُ, and ُذَأْوُ, the last two meaning the light, active, man: (7, 8) that, by the assumption of radicalness, unprecedentedness would be entailed
in [the formation of] (a) that word [to which the letter belongs], as in تًتَنْفَلُ [372, 678] with Fath of the first ت, and Damm of the ف, meaning the young of the fox; for its [first] ت is aug., because, if it were held to be rad., the measure of تًتَنْفَلُ would be فَتَعَلَّلُ [392], which is not found: (b) the counterpart of the word to which that letter belongs, as in تًتَنْفَلُ [372], according to the dial. of those who pronounce the [first] ت and the ف with Damm; for its [first] ت is aug., according to this dial. also, because, although unprecedentedness would not ensue [in this dial. var.] from the assumption of radicalness, since, if the ت were held to be rad., the measure of تًتَنْفَلُ would be فَتَعَلَّلُ, which is found, as بُرْتُسِ [392], still unprecedentedness does ensue in its counterpart, i. e., the dial. var. with Fath; so that the ت, when its augmentativeness is established in the dial. var. with Fath, is judged to be aug. in the dial. var. with Damm also, since the rule [in dial. vars.] is identity of crude-form: (9) the letter's indicating a meaning, like the aoristic letter [369, 404] and the ت of the act. part. [343, 369]: (10) inclusion [of the word] in the wider of two cats upon [its] exclusion from [the formations sanctioned by] precedent, vid. in كَتَنَّفَلُ [394, 677], [according to the dial. of those who pronounce the ب with Damm, as is proved by what follows (Sn),] since its measure, upon the assumption of the radicalness of the ن, is فَتَعَلَّلُ
[with Damm of the second J (Sn)], like سَلَّمُ، with Damm of the ج، which is not found [401]; and, on the assumption of its augmentativeness, is فَتَعَلَّلَ [394, 677], which also is not found; but the formations of the augmented [quad.] are more numerous [than those of the unaugmented quin.], and it is one of their principles, [i.e., rules (Sn),] to have recourse to the numerous: (a) this [indication] is mentioned by IAz and others; but IUK says that it is implied in the seventh (A), i.e., that, by the assumption of radicalness, unprecedentedness would be entailed [above] (Sn). Augmentation has certain conditions, [by which its use is restricted] (Tsr). I have previously set out, in the Parts of the Noun [368-401] and Verb [482-496 A], when mentioning the augmented formations, a portion of the discourse upon these letters; and I shall mention here [672-681 A] what serves to differentiate between the places where they occur rad. and the places where they occur aug. (M).

§. 672. The Hamza is judged to be (1) aug., when it occurs as an initial, and is followed by three rad. letters, [ns. and vs. being alike in that respect (IX),] as in أَرْنِبُ (M) and أَذْهَبُ [249 أَضْفَرُ] [671] أَتْكَلُ [671] and I 9َ and I نَ I sit (IX), and أَكْرَمُ [671] (M): (a) that is because the Hamza, when initial, is prevaently
and frequently **aug.** in those words whose derivation is recognizable, as in **أَحْضَرُ** [above], **أَصْنُرُ** [above], **أَحْضَرُ** [above], **أَجِلْسُ** [above], **إِجْفِيلُ** [379], from **حُضْرَة** redness, **صُفْرَة** yellowness, and **حُضْرَة** **جِلْسَة** greenness, **جِلْسَة** **ذُهِبُ** went and taking fright and fleeing, and **ذُهِبَ** depilation; and is therefore decided to be **aug.** in those words of that class which are uncertain [in derivation], as **إِيْدَعُ** and **أَنْكَلُ** [above], **إِيْدَعُ** [below], **أَنْكَلُ** (IV), n. un. of **أَنْكَلُ** [372] (Jh), and **إِصْبْعَ** [372], by making them accord with the more numerous [division of the class], which is making the unknown to accord with the known (IV): (b) some of the ancients differ from that, saying that what we do not know, by derivation, to be **aug.** we judge to be **rad.**; so that **أَنْكَلُ** is said by them to be like **جِفْرِرُ** [392]: but S refutes them by the argument that **أَنْكَلُ** [18], if used as a name, would necessarily be diptote; whereas, if it were **تَعْلِلُ** [392], it would be triptote: and also that, if it were **تَعْلِلُ**, a formation whose initial is Hamza would be allowable in the **مَجْعََّر** of **تَعْلِلُ**, **آوَر.** **يَقْعَلُ**, **آوَر.** **نَقْعَلُ** (R): (c) thus the Hamza is judged to be **aug.** in all of that [class] (IV), except when something intervenes, which requires (a) that the Hamza should be **rad.**, as in **إِعْلَمَة** [374] and **إِصْرَعُ** weak-minded (M), because there is no **إِعْلَمَة**; while, if we judged
the Hamza in them to be *aug.*., the word would be of the *cat.* of *كَوْكَبُ* [357; 674], which is rare, not to be acted upon (IY): (b) that both matters should be allowable, as in [below] (M): (α) the Hamza, if accompanied by a letter that may be *aug.*, as in [249, 674] and a short tent-rope, with which the lower part of the tent is fastened to the peg, is not judged to be *aug.* [below], except upon proof: for the Hamza is one of the letters of augmentation, and so is the *ي*; except that the [usual] way is to judge the Hamza to be *aug.*., because the Hamza, when first, is prevalently *aug.*., in comparison with the *ي* when second: so that in the Hamza is *aug.*., because of what we have mentioned; and because they say *يَدَّعُنتُهُ I dyed it with* *أَيَدَّعَ*, *inf. n. كَيْدِيَعُ*, [with elision of the Hamza.], this being a proof that the Hamza is *aug.*: while in *أَيَцَرَ*, if we were left to analogy, the Hamza would be *aug.*., because of the prevalence of [augmentativeness in] the Hamza when initial; but they say in the *pl.* *إِصَارَ*، as

*رَيْكْبُعَ دَأَ بِنْهِنَ آَلِ مَارَا*

*And this unites between them the short tent-ropes; so that the elision of the *ي* is an indication that it is *aug.* (IY): (β) the language of [IY and] IM intimates that, when the Hamza precedes three [letters], of which the whole are not certainly *rad.*, but one is*
ambiguous, the Hamza is not judged to be \textit{aug.} [above], except by reason of some indication: but this is contrary to what \textit{IM} decisively asserts in the Tashil, which is the well-known [rule], vid. that, when the Hamza precedes three letters, one of which admits of being \textit{rad.} or \textit{aug.}, the Hamza is judged to be \textit{aug.}, and that ambiguous [letter] to be \textit{rad.}, unless some indication exists to the contrary, for which reason the Hamza of \textit{اَحْنُقَ} [673] and \textit{أَيْذَع} [above] is judged to be \textit{aug.}; but that, if some indication shows the Hamza to be \textit{rad.}, and that ambiguous [letter] to be \textit{aug.}, one judges accordingly, as the Hamza of \textit{أَلْقَى} and \textit{أَرْضَى} [below] is judged to be \textit{rad.}, according to those who say \textit{أَذِّمَ مَأْروط} [673] and \textit{مَأْلَوَق} [below]: (γ) such as \textit{أَرْطَى} [673] is excluded [from the presumption that the Hamza in such a position is \textit{aug.}], since \textit{مَأْروط} and \textit{مَأْروط} have been heard for \textit{dyed with} [the leaves of (Jh on \textit{رطَى}) (Rtí)]: he that says \textit{مَأْروط} makes the Hamza \textit{rad.}, and the \textit{ aug.} ; while he that says \textit{مَأْروط} makes the Hamza \textit{aug.}, and the \textit{ a subst. for a rad.} and, according to the first, the measure of \textit{أَرْطَى} is \textit{خَلَى}, its \textit{ a being \textit{aug.}} for co-ordination; so that, if used as a name, \textit{أَرْطَى} [18] would be diptote, because of the quality of proper name and [the \textit{l} of (Sn)] quasi-feminization, [which is the \textit{l} of co-ordination (Sn)]: while, according to the second, its
measure is ُأَرْطَبُ; so that, is used as a name, it would be diptote, because of the quality of proper name and the measure of the v. [18]: but the first saying is more obvious, because the variations of مَآَرْطَبُ are more numerous [than those of مَآَرْطَبُ], since they say ُأَرْطَبُ The camels ate ُأَرْطَبُ The land produced ُأَرْطَبُ; while ُأَرْطَبُ The land produced ُأَرْطَبُ, [inf. n. ُأَرْطَبُ, as in the KF (Sn),] is also said: (8) similarly ُأَرْطَبُ [above] (A): as for ُأَرْطَبُ [674], which is a kind of madness (IV), it is said that (A) the Hamza [in it (IV)] is rad., [and the, aug. (A),] because they say ُأَرْطَبُ The man was demented, [a pass. formation (Sn), i. q. ُجُنُبُ (A),] pass. part. ُمَأَلْرُبُ upon the measure of ُمَأَلْرُبُ (Jh), which is a proof that the Hamza is rad., and the, aug. (IV); and its measure then is ُكُرَعُ (IV, Sn), like ُجَوْكُرُ [369]; so that, if used as a name for a man, it would be triptote: this is the opinion of S; and the [conclusive] evidence is in ُمَأَلْرُبُ [above]; while in ُأَرْطَبُ the Hamza may be orig. a, which is converted into Hamza because pronounced with Damm, as in أُجُرُ.
for أُلْقِيَ [683] (IY): and [it is said that (A) may be [an act. formation (Sn),] i. q. hastened (IY, A), whence إذ تلقوه يا لستنكتم

XXIV. 14. When ye were speaking it hastily with your tongues, [so read by ʿAʿisha (Jh),] and the saying of the poet [Al Kūlākh Ibn Ḥazn (TA, MAJh)]

A strong she-camel has brought him from Syria, hastening (IY); and, according to this, the Hamza is aug., and the َ rad. (IY, A), its measure being أَفْعَلُ (A); so that, if used as a name for a man, it would be diptote [18]: moreover they say أَلْقَى for a swift charge, which shows that its ف is sometimes Hamza, and sometimes َ, as in أَوْصَدْتُ الْبَابَ, I shut the door and أَمْسِدْتُ (IY); but the first is preferable: (e) similarly أُرْكُنُى denoting a bad sort of date, [the َ of which is decidedly aug., the discussion not being about it, but only about the Hamza and َ (Sn),] oscillates between two measures, like أَجْفَلُى, أَفْعَلُى [381]; and نَوْعَلُى, like حُرْزُلُى [380] (A): (2) rad., (a) when it [occurs as an initial, but] is followed by two rad. letters, as in إِنْبُ [a shirt without sleeves (IY)] and إِلْزَار* a waist-wrapper, [the paradigms of which one يَفُدُ and يَفَعَّل, like جُبل and جَبَل, respectively (IY)]; or by four, as in إِفْطَبُلُ stable
[283], [which, IAI says, is not of the language of the Arabs (Jh),] and نَخْنُّشْرُ Iṣṭakhr (M), the name of a territory (Jk, MI) in Persia (MI), which also is foreign (Jk), the paradigm of both being فُعَّلْ, like جَرِّدُ جُنْب [401]; and hence إِسْمَعِيلُ and إِبْرَاهِيمُ [283, 291], the measure of which is فِنَّكَ لِي (IY): (b) when it occurs as non-initial, and nothing intervenes to necessitate its being aug., as in (a) شَمَالَ [374] (M), where the Hamza is aug., because they say شَمَالُ أَرْبَيْحٌ [373, 681]. A] from شَمَالُ north wind [below] (IY); (b) or شَمَالَ nightmare, where the Hamza is aug., because they say شَمَالُ with the ئ, and Damm of the د, the elision of the Hamza being an indication of its augmentativeness (IY)]; (c) جُرَّآقُضٌ [384] (M), i.e., a bulky camel, where the Hamza is aug., because they say, in the same sense, جُرَّآقُضٌ a strong he-camel, i.e., شَمَيدُ (IY); (d) شَهَياَةُ (M), i.e., that does not menstruate, where the Hamza is aug, because they say شَهَياَةُ a woman that does not menstruate, without Hamza (IY). The language of [Z and] IM intimates that the Hamza, when medial or final, is not judged to be aug., except by reason of some indication, as in (1) شَمَالُ [681. A], where the indication is elision of the Hamza in some of its dial. vars., of which there are ten, (a) شَمَالُ [374]: (b)
(1122)

[373]; (c) شَمَالٌ [above], upon the measure of قَدَ اَلَّٰلَ [246]; (d) ۶ُمُولُ, with Fath of the ش; (e) شَمَالٌ, with Fath of the م; (f) شَمَالٌ, with quiescence of the م; (g) شَمَالٌ, upon the measure of صِيَاقَلْ [253]; (h) شَمَالٌ, upon the measure of طَوِيلٌ [246]; (i) شَمِيلاً, upon the measure of كَتَابٌ [246]; (j) شَمَالٌ, with [Fath of the ش, quiescence of the م, Fath of the Hamza, and (Sn)] reduplication of the ل (A): while the KF adds (k) ۷ُوُمْلُ, like جُوْمْرُ [369] (Sn): (a) IU and others adduce, as evidence that the Hamza of شَمَالٌ is aug., their saying شَمَلَتْ الْرَّيْخُ [above], meaning blew northerly; but it is objected that شَمِيْلَتْ admits of being orig. شَمَاَّلَتْ, [the vowel of the Hamza (Sn)] being transferred [to the م, and the Hamza afterwards elided (Sn)], in which case it is not adducible as evidence: (2) [he was swollen in his belly (Sn)], where the indication is the elision of the Hamza in جَبَهَتْ [681. A], as جَبَهَتْ بَطْنَهُ His belly was swollen [482]. But from that [rule] is excepted the final Hamza after an [i preceded by more than two rads., as will [now] be explained (A). The final [Hamza (Tsr)] is made aug. upon two conditions [677], vid. that it be preceded by an [i, and that this [i be preceded by more than two rads. [below], [whether the initial of its word be pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm (Tsr),] as in
contrary to [the Hamza of (Tsr)] such as ʿ Albā and ʿ Abā [326, 683] (Aud), where the ل is preceded by one rad. (Tsr); and ʿ Abn [683] and ʿ Abn [667] (Aud), where the ل is preceded by two rads., not by more: and contrary to such as ʿ Nhā tidings, where the Hamza is not preceded by an ل (Tsr). [See §. 677 for a third condition.]

IM's saying [in the Alfiya] “more than two letters” [instead of “more than two rads.” (above)] requires that the Hamza [677] should be judged to be aug., whether all the letters preceding the ل be decidedly rad., or two be decidedly rad., and the third be ambiguous. But that is not so, because the word whose final is a Hamza after an ل separated from the ف by a double letter, as in ʿ Scūk [prickles of the palm-tree (Sn)] and ʿ Ĥūr [below], or by two letters, one of which is a soft letter, as in ʿ Zīrā and ʿ Ĥūbā[273], admits of two alternatives, that the Hamza should be rad., and one of the two similars [in such as ʿ Scūl and ʿ Ĥūr (Sn)], or the soft letter [in such as ʿ Zīrā and ʿ Ĥūbā (Sn)], should be aug.; or the converse.

If, then, the Hamza be made rad., ʿ Scūl is ʿ Fāl [from ʿ Scūl ʿ Tāl]. *I pulled off the prickles of the palm-trees (Jh)*, and ʿ Ĥūr is ʿ Tāl ʿ Fāl from ʿ Ĥūr īya collecting; while, if it be made aug., ʿ Scūl is ʿ Fāl [from ʿ Scūl pulled out (KF)], and ʿ Ĥūr is ʿ Fāl greenish black or
blackish red, [and Eve (MAZ, Nw, KF), Adam's wife (KF), the mother of mankind (MAZ, Nw),] is 
from حَرَّةٌ (A) blackness inclining to greenness or redness inclining to blackness (Sn). If, however, one of the two alternatives be strengthened by some indication, it is adopted, and the other neglected: and, for that reason, the Hamza of حَرَّةٌ is judged to be aug. when حَرَّةٌ is diptote (A), because the diptote declension indicates that it is the Hamza of femininization [263, 683], which is aug. (Sn); and rad. when حَرَّةٌ is triptote, like حَرَّةٌ denoting one that charms snakes: while the preferable [alternative] in سَكَّةٌ is that its Hamza should be rad., because, in plants, فَعَالٌ is more numerous than سَكَّةٌ [273]. If, then, IM had said "more than two rads", [as IHsh says in the Aud above,] it would have been better. The Hamza is made aug., in the n., when (1) first, as in أَخْرُجَ [372, 671]; (2) second, as in شَأْمِلٌ [373]; (3) third, as in مِلْثَ [above]; (4) fourth, as in حَكَّاَتِنِ [384], i. e., short; (5) fifth, as in حَرَّةٌ [385]; (6) sixth, as in عَفْرَتُ بَأْ [273, 399], which is a country; and (7) seventh, as in بَرْنَاَسَةٌ [273, 400], i. e., mankind (A).

§. 673. An ! that accompanies more than two rads. is [judged to be (IA, A)] aug., without any lie (IM), as
in [below] (IA, Aud), [248, 250], and (Aud) with Damm of the س, small bones in the fingers and toes (Tsr), because in most words, where the ﹪ occurs like that, [i.e., accompanying more than two rads. (Sn),] the derivation indicates that it is aug.; and the rest are made to accord therewith (A), i.e., with the most (Sn): contrary to such as ﴿ ﴾ [below] and ٖ ﴿ [719] (Aud), where the ﹪ is not aug., because it does not accompany more than two rads. (Tsr). IM [here (MKh)] means the soft ﹪ [668]; and, as for the [mobile ﹪, which is named] Hamza, it has been mentioned [672] (Sn, MKh). The [soft] ﹪ is not made aug. at the beginning [of a word] (M, A, Tsr), because it is impossible to begin with it (M, A), since [it is only quiescent, following Fatha; and (IY)] to begin with a quiescent is impracticable [667] (IY, Tsr). But, when not initial, it occurs only as an aug. [below], when three or more rad. letters are with it, as in ﴿ ﴿ [247, 373] [below], ﴿ ﴿ [below], ﴿ ﴿ [396], and ﴿ ﴿ [below] (M). If it accompany two rads. only, it is not aug.: but is [either rad., as in ﴿ (below); or (IA)] a subst. for a rad. [ٗ or (A)], as in ﴿ and قَالَ [703] (IA, A), ٗ and ﴿ [684], and ٗ and ﴿ [684], and ﴿ and ﴿ [16, 719] (A). But what is mentioned by [Z and] IM is [true] only in vs., and in [Arabic (Sn,
decl. [i.e., infl. (Sn).] ns., [whether prim. or deriv. (MKh)]: while in uninfl. [ns.], and in ps., the l is not judged to be aug. (A, MKh), with more than two rads., as in [501, 540] and [181]; or to be a subst. for another [letter], with less than two rads., as in [500] and [206]: but it is rad., unconverted (MKh): and similarly in foreign [676] names, like [672] (A, MKh) and Eshekî [Isaac (A)]: because that [augmentativeness or substitution] is recognizable only by derivation, which is lacking (A, MKh) in what is [here] mentioned (MKh). The l is made aug., (1) [in the n. (A),] when (a) second, as in ٦ [671]; (b) third (IY, A, Tsr), as in ٦ [below] (IY, A); (c) fourth (IY, A, Tsr), as in ٦ [below] and ٦ [above] (A); (d) fifth (IY, A, Tsr), as in ٦ (IY, A), a plant (Jh, IY), which the vulgar name convolvulus (Jh); (e) sixth, as in ٦ [below] (IY, A, Tsr) and ٦ [671] (IY); (f) seventh (A, Tsr), as in ٦ [272] (Tsr): (2) in the v., when (a) second, as in ٦ [490]; (b) third, as in ٦ [482, 483, 487, 678]; (c) fourth, as in ٦ [482]; (d) fifth, as in ٦ [The horse (Sn)] was of dark chesnut color; (e) sixth, as in ٦ overcome [432, 496] (A). But [the l, when it accompanies more than two
rads. in (Tsr)] the reduplicated quad. [674], [whose first ١ is homogeneous with its ١, and whose second ١ is homogeneous with its ع (Sn),] such as ضْرَضَى [674] (A, Tsr) shouted in battle (Sn), and عَازٍ [674] (A) chid sheep, saying عَا or عَرَ or عَزَ (Sn), is excepted [from IM's language (A)]: for the ١ here [i.e., the ١ of ضْرَضَى , as also each of the two ١s, the first and the second, of عَازٍ (Sn),] is a subst. for a rad., [their measure being ١َفَٰعَلَ (Sn)]; and is not aug. (A, Tsr). When the ١ is accompanying two rads. and a third [letter] that admits of being rad. or aug., then, if this [ambiguous letter] be assumed to be rad., the ١ is aug.; and, if it be assumed to be aug., the ١ is non-aug.: but, if the ambiguous be an initial Hamza [672] or م [676], as in ْفِي [672] and مُرْسَى razor [676], [not Moses, the name of the Prophet, because it, says Dm, is foreign (Sn),] or a quiescent ن third [671, 677] in a quin., as in ْفِي [which I have not found in the KF (Sn),] if it be found in their language, the preferable [alternative] is to judge the ambiguous to be aug., and the ١ to be converted from a rad., so long as no indication shows these letters to be rad., and the ١ to be aug., as in أَرْطَى [below], according to those who say أَدْيَمْ مَأَرْطُت, meaning a hide dyed with مَأَرْطُت [672]; and in مَعْرَى [below], because of their saying مَعْرَى and مَعْرَى; while, if the ambiguous be any other
letter than these three, we judge it to be ṭāl., and the  to be *aug.* (A). The  does not occur as a co-ordinative, except when final, as in مُعَرْي [below] (M), سُلْقَى [482], and  جَفَّ بَى threw down on the ground [674]. When medial [below], it is *aug.* only for elongation of the word, and multiplication of [the letters in] its formation, not for co-ordination: so that كِتَاب [671] is not said to be co-ordinat-ed with مِمْقَسِس silk (IY), like حُزَّرَر [392] (KF); nor عُدَأَر [395, 677] to be co-ordinat-ed with فُذْعَرْعِل [401]: because the unsound letter, when it occurs as a medial, and is pre-ceded by a vowel homogeneous with it, like the  وعَجْبْرَز and the  ي of سَعْيَن [369], is treated as a prolongation of the vowel; and does not co-ordinate one formation with another, the co-ordinative[unsound letter] being only what is not for prolongation. When final, the  is made an *aug.* of three kinds, (1) co-ordinative, as in أَرْطَى [248, 272, 326, 375, 671, 672] and مَعَرْي [272, 375, 671, 676], which are co-ordinated by the  جَفَّ بَى and دِرْهَم [392], respectively:

(a) what indicates that the  is *aug.* in أَرْطَى is their saying أَظْرَى مُلْذَى [above], the elision of the  in مُلْذَى being an indication that it is *aug.*; while their saying مَعَرْي [above] and مَعَرْي [255, 257] is an indication that the  is *aug.* in مَعَرْي:

(b) their saying أَرْطَى and مَعَرْي with Tanwîn indicates
that the † is not for feminization, since the † of feminization prevents triptote declension [18]; so that Tanwin is not affixed to it [17,609], as سَكْرَىٰ and حُبْلَىٰ [below]: (a) moreover أَرْمَالٍ [258], has been heard from them, with affixion of the ء of feminization; whereas, if the † were for feminization, another sign of feminization would not be affixed to it, so as to combine two signs of feminization: (b) one indication that the † in مُعْرَىٰس is not for feminization is their making it masc., as مُعْرَىٰس هَدْبَا إِلَّهٍ [249], their qualification of it by the masc. being an indication that it is masc.; whereas, if the † were for feminization, it would be fem.: (c) it is proved, then, by what we have mentioned, that the † here is aug. otherwise than as a denotative of feminization: and to attribute it to co-ordination is more appropriate than to attribute it to another process [vid. multiplication], because co-ordination is a desirable idea; even though both processes are one thing, since the meaning of co-ordination [671] is multiplication, and elongation, of the word; so that every co-ordination is a multiplication, though every multiplication is not a co-ordination: (2) denotative of feminization, as in حُبْلَىٰ [18, 248, 272, 375], سَكْرَىٰ [248, 272], and جُمَادَىٰ Jumādā [328]: (a) what indicates that the † here is aug. is the derivation, since حُبْلَىٰ is from pregnancy, سَكْرَىٰ from drunkennes, and جُمَادَىٰ from جَنْدُ being frozen: (b) what indicates that it denotes
femininization is the impossibility of Tanwīn’s being affixed to it in the state of indeterminateness [609]; whereas, if it did not denote femininization, [the n. ending with] it would be triptote [17]: (3) of the same kind as when medial [above], [i.e., multiplicative,] as in قَبْعَثْرَى [272, 326, 401, 497, 671], كِنْثُرَى [311], and سُمَانِى [671], and quail, a kind of bird: (a) the l in the whole of those [ns.] is aug., because, with three or more rad. letters, it is only aug. [above]: (b) it is not for femininization, because these ns. are triptote, and moreover بَاقِلَة a bean and a quail have been transmitted, this being a proof that it is not for femininization: (c) nor is it for co-ordination, because, among o. fs., there are none of this number [of letters] and measure, with which these [ns.] might be co-ordinated: (d) since it is not for femininization, nor for co-ordination, it is for multiplication of [the letters in] the word, and completion of its formation (IY). In كَنْثُرَى [and كَنْثُرَى (IY)] it is like the l of كَتَب [401], because it exceeds the limit (M). Z means that the l in كَنْثُرَى and كَنْثُرَى is sixth; whereas the extreme number of letters in original, [i.e., unaugmented,] ns. is five [368]: so that, among o. fs., there are none of this number [of letters], with which they might be co-ordinated; and, in that case, it is multiplicative, like the م of كِتَب and حِمَار [671] (IY).
§ 674. The ى [below] and َ [675] are similar (IM) to the ٍ [673], in that each of them, when it accompanies more than two rads., is judged to be aug. (A), as in ْتَنِئُلُ [269, 347] and ْمَقْتَوْلُ [347] (Sn), if they do not occur [repeated (A).] as they are in ٌبُرُّ (IM), the name of a bird [of prey (Jh).] having talons, that resembles the ٌبَاشَقُ sparrow-hawk (A), and ِبُعْؤَعُ (IM), i.e., made a noise, in which sort [of formation] all the letters are judged to be rad., like the letters of ١سِسُمُ [671] (A); and if they be not initial, the َ, unrestrictedly, according to the majority [675]; and the ى before four rads., in any [formation] other than the aor. [below], as A will mention (Sn). The division previously made in the ١ [673] applies here also, so that we say:— the ى and َ have three states: for, (1) if either of them accompany two rads. only, it is rad., as in ٨بُجُتُ and ٤سُوَطُ [697]: (2) if it accompany three or more decided rads., it is aug., except in the repeated bil., [just now described as "the reduplicated quad." (673) (Sn).] as above mentioned [by IM] in the text: (3) if it accompany two rads. and an ambiguous third, then, (a) if the ambiguous be an initial Hamza [672] or َ [676], the initial is judged to be aug., and the ى or َ to be rad., as in ٌأَيْلَعُ [672] and ٌفَزَرُ [676]. [like ٩مَنْبُرُ (372), the bag for the traveller's provisions (Sn).] unless some indication shows (a) the
initial to be \textit{rad.}, and the \textit{ى} or \textit{و} to be \textit{aug.}, as in [672] according to those who say \textit{مَلُوِق} and \textit{أَلِق} \textit{أَلِق}; and as \textit{يَلُق} [671], because of their saying \textit{يَلُق}: or (b) the whole to be \textit{rad.}, as in \textit{مرَيَم} \textit{Mary} [the mother of Jesus (Nw),] and \textit{مَدْيِنَ} \textit{Midian} [a well-known district in Syria (Bk),] their measure being \textit{تَغَيِّبُ}, because it is not [found] in the language; nor \textit{مَفْعُول} [below], otherwise transformation [of the unsound letter] would be necessary (A), since \textit{مَرَّ} [712] would be said, by transferring the vowel of the \textit{ى} to the preceding quiescent, and then converting the \textit{ى} into \textit{i} because \textit{orig.} mobile, and now preceded by a letter pronounced with \textit{Fath}: (α) this requires \textit{مرَيَم} to be an Arabic name, otherwise no judgment as to radicalness or augmentativeness could be passed upon [the letters in] it, because of what \textit{A} has previously mentioned [673] (Sn): (β) IAl says that (Jh) the measure of (K, B on II. 81.) \textit{مرَيَم} is [above] (Jh, K, B), according to the GG (K), from \textit{زَامَرَ} (Jh), because \textit{تَغَيِّبُ} [with Fath of the \textit{ف} (K)] is not found (K, B) among the formations, as \textit{عَقَرَ} and \textit{عَلَّيَب} [374] are found (K): (γ) [some say that] \textit{مرَيَم} is a foreign name (ID, Jk), there being no \textit{تَغَيِّبُ}, with Fath of the \textit{ف} and \textit{ى}, in the language of the Arabs (ID): (b) if the ambiguous be any [letter] other [than the
initial Hamza and م (Sn), it is judged to be rad., and the ی or ی to be aug., so long as no indication shows the contrary of that, as in (α) ینَبَّر [with the ی doubled (Jh, Sn)], which is hard stone; and says IS, one of the names of the vain, unreal, naught; and is said to be the miracle, as أَكْذَبْ مِن أَلْيَهْبَرْ Falser than the miracle (A): (α) IS says that they sometimes add an ی to it, saying ینَبَّر [272] (Jh, Md, A): (β) the letter which, but for the indication of augmentativeness, would be ambiguous, is the first ی (Sn): (γ) the first ی is decided to be aug. (A), [so that] ینَبَّر is ینَبَّر (Jh, Md), because ینَبَّر is not found in the language (Jh, Md, A), while there is no obscurity about the augmentativeness of the ی in such as ینَبَّر is red (A): (β) the یs are not both rad., because ی is not rad. with trils. in the non-replicated: nor are they both aug., because a ی is not formed of two letters: nor is the second ی the aug., because ینَبَّر, with Fath of the ی, is not found in the language; while ینَبَّر, which is found, has Kasr of the ی; so that, if the second ی were aug., ینَبَّر, with Kasr of the initial, would be said, like ینَبَّر [374] and ینَبَّر skillful: and therefore the first must be the aug. (IY): (β) یَزَت [675], which is the name of a place; and is said to be also [an ep., meaning] short: (α) the ی
is decided to be \textit{rad.}, and the \textit{ی} [below] and \textit{و} \textit{aug.} because its measure cannot be \textit{فِرْعَیلٰ}, since this is not found in the language; nor \textit{فِرْعَیلٰ}, because the \textit{،} is not \textit{rad.} in \textit{quads.} [675]; nor \textit{عَرَبیتٰ}, because the word becomes without \textit{ا ل} : so that its measure must be \textit{عَرَبیتٰ}, like \textit{عَرَبیتٰ} [646] (A) : (β) A's mention of the \textit{ی} [in \textit{عَرَبیتٰ}] as \textit{aug.} is unnecessary, since it is not imagined [by any one] to be \textit{rad.} (Sn). When three \textit{rads.} other than the \textit{ی} are found, the \textit{ی} is \textit{aug.}, whether it be at the beginning, as in \textit{یَلْتَع} [below] and \textit{یَنْضَرُب} \textit{strikes} [404]; or in the middle, as in \textit{رَجِیم} [349] and \textit{قَلَبِیق} [calamity (MAR)]; or at the end, as in \textit{الْیَلَیَّی} the nights [255]. And similarly with four or more \textit{rads.}, when the \textit{ی} is non-initial, as in \textit{سُلْسَبیل} [398], \textit{کُنَتْغُور} [368, 401], and \textit{سُلْكَفیّ} [399]: whereas, if it be initial, with four \textit{rads.} after it, then, if the word be a \textit{v.}, like \textit{یَدْخَرْج} \textit{rolls down} [404], in this case also the \textit{ی} is \textit{aug.}; but, if not, it is \textit{rad.}, as in \textit{یَتَغْور} [below] (R). The \textit{ی} is made \textit{aug.}, (1) in the \textit{n.}, when (a) first, as in \textit{یَلْتَع} \textit{mirage} (Sn); (b) second, as in \textit{ضِیْمَم} [373]; (c) third, as in \textit{قَضْبَم} [385]; (d) fourth, as in \textit{جَدَریّة} [385]; (e) fifth, as in \textit{سُلْخَفیّ} [above]; (f) sixth, as in \textit{مَفَناطیس} magnet, \textit{lode-stone}, [which is arabicized (Jh, KF)]; (g) seventh,
as in حُذْرَةٌ دِيْبَةٌ [with a single إ، meaning pride (Sn)]: (2) in the v., when (a) first, as in يَضْرِبُ [above]; (b) second, as in بَيْطَرُ [671]; (c) third, according to those who authorized [482] among the formations of vs., as تُقَبِّلُ مَا رَأْيُهُ His judgment was unsound and (A on the Augmented Triliteral Verb)] رُغْيَةً (A), i.e., عَلَّمَ He blundered (A on the Augmented Triliteral Verb), which refers to the two vs. before it, as SBd says, though, in the [Jh and] KF, the first v. is not mentioned at all, but only [the inf. n. of the second v., vid.] رُغْيَةً, which is interpreted in various senses, among them weakness, [incapacity (Jh),] flagging, and unsoundness, [and infirmity (Jh, KF),] of judgment (Sn on the Augmented Triliteral Verb); (d) fourth, as in قَلْسَيْتُ (A), e.g., قَلْسَيْتُ cap [675], where قَلْسَيْتُ [482] also is said (Sn); (e) fifth, as in تُقَلْسَيْتُ I put on him a cap; (f) sixth, as in إِسْلَنْقَيْتُ [482, 483] (A), i.e., I slept on my back (Sn). The following are [additional] exs. of the aug. يَرَمَعُ (1) when first, يَرَمَعُ and يَلْمَعُ [372]; and, in the v., يَقْفُدُ sits [482]: (2) when second, صَيَّرَتُ [373]: (3) when third, سَعِيدُ [671]: (4) when fourth, دُهْنِيَّةُ [385], دُهْنِيَّةُ vestibule, [which is Persian (Jh, Jk), arabicized (Jh),] and تَدْيِلُ [396]: (5) when fifth, عِصْتِرْسُ [283]: (6) when sixth, عِصْتِرْسُ 119a
and 

[678], according to what As transmits. We know the to be aug. in all of that, because it is not rad. in words of three or more [rad.] letters. As for spur [of the cock (Jh, KF)], the two in it are rad., even though three rad. letters are with you, because the word is compounded of صي of twice [uttered]; so that the first is rad., lest the word remain with [only] one letter, vid. the ص; and, since the first is rad., the second also is rad., because it is the first repeated. And hence I called [goats (Jh, KF)] and [673], where the is rad., because it is the first repeated; while their measure is قوق، the o. f. being حَرَح، but the first being converted into ٰ because of the Fatha before it, as they say يَدَج [684]. And similarly I clucked and [673], where the second is rad., because it is the first [و] repeated, their o. f. being ضَرَصَت and قوق، the second [و] of which is converted into ٰ, because it occurs fourth, as in أَذَعَت and [629]. If it be said “Then why is it not aug., as in [673]?”, the reply is that, if this were so, صَرَصَت and قوق would become of the cat. of was agitated, flurried and سَلَس was loose, slack, which is small, while the cat. of قوق and [332] is
more numerous, and only the more numerous is acted upon. And, if it be said "Then make the in them aug., as in I collected [675]and خولت [482]," the reply is that, if this were done, they would become of the cat. of دن and كرك [357, 671], whose ف and ع are homogeneous, which is smaller than [the cat. of سلس and قل ق] [above] (IX). When the is initial, then, if followed by three rads., it is aug., as in يلبع above; but, if followed by four rads., in any [formation] other than the aor. [above], it is rad., like the in ُسيستفُور [401, 678] (A), upon the measure of ُفعلول [401] (Sn), because the derivation does not indicate augmentativeness in such cases, except in the aor. [404, 497] (A), like نك حرج [above] (Sn). يسيستفُور [in the poem of Urwa (Jh) Ibn AlWard al‘Absi, who says

أطفت الآلابرين يضرم سلسي فطاروا في بلاد آنيسيستفور

I obeyed those who bade (me) to part from Salmā; then they fled away into the regions of AlYasta‘ur (ISk),] is the name of a place (Jrb, A), a district (R) in AlHijāz (R, A), near the stony ground of AlMadīna (Jrb), remote, entered by hardly any one (ISk): and it is [also the name of (A)] a tree, [the wood of] which is used for tooth-picks (Jrb, A), its tooth-picks being extremely good (KF); and a cloth put upon the crupper of the camel; and one of the
names of calamities (Jrb); and [i. q. the vain, unreal, naught, because (R)] َمَحَبُّ فِي الْأَلْيَسْتَعْف اَرَّهِ, or
*It, went into, i. e., came to, naught is said (R, Jrb), i. e., مَحَبُّ فِي الْأَلْيَسْتَعْف اَرَّهِ (Jrb). As for Ya‘jaj, which is
the name of a place [eight miles from Makka (MI)], the ى at its beginning is rad., that being indicated by
the display of the reduplication; whereas, if the ى were
*aug., يَا جَحْمٍ would be from ْأَجْمَجْ, aor. ْيَا جَحْمٍ; and it would
be necessary to incorporate, and say ْيَا جَحْمٍ [482], like
*يَفْصُّ is choked and يَفْصُّ lowers: so that, since they do
not incorporate, this indicates that the last َجْحْمٍ is *aug.,
for co-ordination with the paradigm of ْجَعْفَر [392]; for
which reason they do not incorporate, since, if they
incorporated, the object would be nullified, and the
commensurability would cease. But some of the Traditionists
pronounce the [first (Bk, MI)] َجْحْمٍ with Kasr,
saying ْيَا جَحْمٍ: and, if what they transmit be correct, the
ى is *aug., because there is no ْجَعْفَر, with Kasr of the
ف, in the language; and the display of the redupli-
cation is anomalous, of the same class as [in] ْمَلْحَبُّ

§. 675. The ُ, like the ُ[673], is not made *aug.
when initial: and their saying ْرَنْتَل ِ [671, 677] is like
ْجَكْنَفُل ِ [671] (M), the ُ, in it being part of the word
itself; while the ن [677] is aug., co-ordinating [it] with ضرجر [393, 401], its measure being فعلل [395] (IY).
The opinion of the majority [674] is that the ‛ is not made aug. when initial, because of its heaviness, as
some say: but, as others say, because, if made aug. [at
the beginning] when pronounced with ِ Damm, it would
be regularly convertible into Hamza [683]; and similarly
when pronounced with Kasr, although conversion of the
[ ' ] pronounced with Kasr into Hamza is less frequent;
and, when pronounced with Fath, it would be liable to
conversion into Hamza, because the initials of the n.
and v. are pronounced with ِ Damm in the dim. [274]
and pass. [436, 482], respectively: so that, since making
it aug. at the beginning would lead to its conversion
into Hamza, they avoid doing so, because conversion of
the ‛ into Hamza would sometimes occasion confusion
(A) with the word whose [initial] Hamza is original,
unconverted, as in ），left, which, in the pass. [ ），
was left], is liable to conversion of the ‛ into Hamza,
in which case it would be confounded with ）。 was
eaten, the Hamza of which is rad. (Sn). Some,
however, assert that the ‛ of ）ل [above] is aug.,
extraordinarily, because the ‛ is not rad. in quads.: but
this is weak, because it leads to the formation ），
which is not found; while the correct [opinion] is that
the ‛ is rad., and that the ل is aug., as in 》，i. q:
a mode of walking with the toes turned in, and the heels turned out (A), or, as A. afterwards says, i. q. [681] (Sn), and in i. q. [a worn-out garment (Sn)], since there are precedents for the augmentativeness of the َل when final, contrary to the augmentativeness of the َع when initial (A). When not initial, [but medial, with three or more rad. letters (IY),] it is only aug., as in َعَرْسَجٌ [373] and َكُرَفْلَ [482], َخَسَّوتُ َل [283, 385], َعَنْفُوْانٌ [283, 389], and َقُلْنَسٍ َوْى [254; 390, 674], except when that [indication of radicalness] intervenes which is [found] in َمِزْوَيْتٌ [674] (M). In that [position as medial, with three or more rads.,] it occurs (1) second, as in َجُهْرٌ [369] and َصُوْمَعٌ [674]; (2) third, as in َجُدْوُلٌ [671] and َرَهْمَلَ آَلَرُجَّلَ The man swaggered in his walk; (3) fourth, as in َعَنْفُوْانٌ [above] and َعْلَوْطَ and َخَرْوَطَ [482]; (4) fifth, as in َعَضْرُفُوْطٌ [368, 401] and َمَنْكَيْنُونٌ [398, 676] (IY). The َل is made aug.: (1) in the n., when (a) second, as in َعَجْبُرٌ [671]: (b) third, as in َعَجْبُرٌ [369, 673]: (c) fourth, as in َعِرْفُوْطٌ [248, 301]: (d) fifth, as in َقُلْنَسٍ [above]: (e) sixth, as in َأَرْبَعَائِي [272] (A), with َدَم of the Hamza and َب as in the KF; but with َفَث of the Hamza on the authority of Syt and َدَم (Sn): (2)
in the v., when (a) second, as in حَوَّلْ [above]: (b) third, as in جَهْوُرٌ [482, 671] (A), i.e., raised his voice: (c) as for جَهْوُرٌ جَفْفُرٌ [392], it is the name of a place (Sn): (c) fourth, as in إِعْمَدَرُدَانِ [482, 671] (A).

§. 676. The case of the م, in respect of augmentativeness, is [exactly (IY)] like that of the Hamza [672]. For the position of its augmentativeness is [mostly (Jrb)] where it occurs as an initial in trils., because the Hamza is [uttered] from the first outlet of the throat, vid. what is next to the thorax [732]; while the م is [uttered] from the lips, which are the first outlet from the other end [of the vocal organs]: so that the م [like the Hamza] is made aug. when initial, in order that their two outlets may correspond to the position of their augmentativeness (IY, Jrb). And, when non-initial [below], they are not judged to be aug., except when some indication shows them to be so (Jrb). But [the Hamza is made aug. in the n. and v.; whereas (Jrb)] the م is made aug. only in the n. [253] (IY, Jrb). The م is not made aug. in the v., [being one of the augments of ns., wherein vs. have no portion (IY)]: and, for that reason, [the saying of 'Umar (ID, Jh, IY, KF), according to Jh, but, rightly, of the Apostle of God, transmitted by Abū Ḥadrād, the Companion (KF).] Imitate the sons of Ma‘add is cited as evidence that the م of مَعْدُ [375] is rad.; while such as
and ُبَنْدَلُ, َتَبَنَّدَلَ, ُتَبَنَّدَلْ, ُتَبَنَّدَلْ, are not taken into account (M), being rare, like the [v.] derived from the n. by means of an augment, as ُسَبِّحَلَ, He said ُنَحْدِلَ ِبِلِّلَّهِ [41] and ُسُبَحَانَ ٌٱللَّٰهِ. He said ُحَدَّلَ I. 1. [141, 504]. On the whole, however, the م when initial is ُعَجَّل more often than the Hamza when initial (IY). It is universally made ُعَجَّل in the act. part. [343], pass. part. [347], inf. n. [333], n. of time and place [361], and instrumental n. [366]. That is recognizable by the derivation; and, if anything be uncertain [in derivation], it is made to accord with what is known. Thus the م in مَبِيج [below] the name of a city, is ُعَجَّل, and ُرَاد., since you may not make them both ُرَاد., because there is no ُجَعَرْب with Kasr of the ف among o. fs.; nor both ُعَجَّل., because the inf. word would remain with [only] two letters, the ب and ج: so that one of them must be ُرَاد., and the other ُعَجَّل.; and we judge the م to be ُعَجَّل., because the ن [677] is rarely ُعَجَّل. when second (Jrb). مَبِيج [below] is made to accord with ُمَقْتِل [671] and ُمَضْرَب [333, 361] the unknown being made to accord with the known. And, as for ُمَعَد [above] and ُمَعْرَب [875, 673], their predicament, and their variance from this rule, have been already mentioned (R). The derivation of ُمَعَد is from [one of] two things, ُمَعَد being either مَكْفَعَلٌ from عَدَد number, as though it were ُمَعَد.
and then the $ were incorporated; or [transferred] from 
which is the flesh on the lower portion of the 
horse's shoulder-blade, and [in accordance with the 
latter view] I account its derivation to be from 
$q$ hardness (ID). As for $Mz$ says that its 
origin is foreign: but (Jk), if it be foreign [673], 
still, being arabicized as an indet., [not as a mere 
proper name] it is treated as Arabic; [and the Araba 
make the $m$ part of the word itself (Jk)]: so that its $m$ is 
rad., because of their saying $m$ and $m$ [673], which 
are $n$ and $n$; whereas, if the $m$ in $m$ were $aug.$, 
and those paradigms were formed from it, $m$ and $m$ would be said (1Y). The $m$ is made $aug.$ on three 
conditions, (1) that it be initial, (2) that it be followed by 
three rads. only, and (3) that it be not inseparable in 
derivation. That [combination of conditions] is [found in] 
such as $m$ [361] and $m$ [above], [which, says Jh, 
is the name of a place (Tsr),] contrary to such as (a) 
$\text{lion}$, because the $m$ is not initial (Tsr)]; (b) 
$\text{cradle}$, because the $m$ is not followed by three rads. 
(Tsr)]; (c) $\text{marjoram}$, [the arabicized form of $m$ (below)] (Aud), i. q. 
$\text{dead ear}$, the $m$ of which they pronounce with Fath. 
(KH$^f$), a sweet-smelling plant, because the $m$ is not 
followed by three rads. only, but by more (Tsr);
and (d) [soft wool (Tsr)], because they say قَرْبُ مَرْحَنٌ a garment made of soft wool, retaining the م [inseparably (Tsr)] in derivation (Aud), with which [argument] IM refutes the saying of S that the م in it is aug. [below]. It is also a condition of the augmentativeness of the م that its word should not be a quad. composed of two letters [repeated], like مَرْحَنٌ marble, alabaster and مُهَمَّة vast desert (Tsr). What fulfils the conditions mentioned is judged to be aug. so long as no indication of radicalness is opposed to such judgment. For, if an indication of radicalness be opposed to it, one acts as required by the indication, as in the م of مَرْحَنٌ [α comb, and a cooking-pot of stone or copper (Sn)], مَغْفُور manna, [a thing, like honey, exceeded by the مَشَام panic-grass, مُغَيَّر gigantic swallow-wort, and مَضَمَّدنَمَّденَاُّرُ دَمِّرَجُّل [above] or مَرْحَنٌ [272] (A) or مَرْحَنٌ [273], with Kasr, and sometimes Fath, of the م in all (Sn), which is judged to be rad., although it is followed by three rads. [only]. As for مَرْحَنٌ [above], the opinion of S and most GG is that its م is rad., because of their saying مَرْحَنٌ أَلْحَلَّيَكَ أَلْتَرْبَ The weaver wove the cloth decorated with figured work called مَرْحَنٌ [below] (A); whereas, if the م were aug., they would say مَرْحَنٌ by eliding it (Sn): IKh says "The مَرْحَنٌ is a cloth
worked with circles like the مُراجِّيل [above], which are cooking-pots of copper” (A), or of stone (Sn). But AAMr holds that the م of مَرْجُل is aug., relying upon the rule mentioned; and pronounces its retention in derivation to be like the retention of the م in [above] from مَسْكَنة lowliness, from مَنْدَل from مَدْرَعُ tunic, where the م is aug.; though he has no argument in that, because the most frequent [formation] is تَسْكَنت [483], تَنْدَل, and تَدْرَع, which, Mz says, is the most frequent in the language of the Arabs. As for مَغْفَر [above], two sayings about it are reported from S, one that the م is aug.; and the other that it is rad., because of their saying مَغْفَر They went gathering [above], which is [here said by A to be] a kind of truffle. And as for مُزْعَر [above], S holds its م to be aug. [above]: but some, and among them IM, hold it to be rad., because of their saying كِسَّة مُزْعَر wrapper made of مَزْعَر (A); while IM, says IUK, avers that S is bound to agree that it is rad. in مُزْعَر, or to differ [from the opinion that it is rad.] in the whole (Sn). The language of IM [and Jrb and IHSh] intimates that (A), when non-initial [above] (R), [i. e.,] when medial or
final (A), the $m$ is not judged to be $aug.$, except by reason of some plain (R) indication, as in (1) دَلْيِصُ $[384, 631.A]$ (R, A) دُمِيِّبُصَ دُمَالِصُ $[below]$ (A) in some MSS, but, in other MSS, دُلْيِصُ $[below]$, and دُمِيِّبُصَ دُلْيِصُ $[below]$, and دَلْيِصُ $[below]$, and دُمِيِّبُصَ دَلْيِصُ $[below]$, and دَلْيِصُ $[below]$, and I made it glitter: (a) Mz holds that the م in دُلْيِصُ $[and its fellows, adds IUK (Sn),]$ is $rad.$, although دُلْيِصُ agrees with دَلْيِصُ in sense; so that according to him, it is of the cat. of سَيْط $long$, extended and سَبْطُر $[245, 392, 679, 681]$ (A), i. e., of syns. agreeing in the bulk of the letters, the $r$ not being $aug.$, but $rad.$, since it is not one of the letters of سَأَلْتُ بَيْنَيْهَا $[671]$, nor a duplicate of a rad. (Sn): (b) as for $نبَارُص$ sour, as لَبَنُي تَبَارُص sour milk, as though it $يَقُرُّ آلِيْسَانَ$ were biting the tongue, the $m$ in it is $aug.$, because of the derivation [just] mentioned by us, derivation being decisive in its indication, without regard to the rarity of augmentativeness in that position, since they are agreed that the $Hamza$ and $ن$ in إِنْقَحُلْ $[382]$ are $aug.$, because of their saying $زَرْعُ$ and $قَحْل$ in the same sense, although two augments are not combined at the beginning of a $n.$ not conformable to a $v.$ $[331]$: (c) the م in $ءَرْمَاسُ$ also,
which, according to what As transmits, is a name of the lion, is aug., its paradigm being قمالَ, because it is from قرس crushing: this is a sound derivation, since he is said to crush the prey, so that it is crushed beneath him; and he is also called قرس [strong (Jh, KF), from the crushing (Jh), or ravenous (KF)], as says the poet

Strong in the two fore-arms, a master of springing, mighty in his make, strong or ravenous, treading softly; and this is a proof that the م is aug. here (IY): زرقم (2) [below] (R, A) and its cat., i.e., every tril. to whose final م is added for multiplication of the letter, and intensification of the sense (Sn),] as دُلَّم, [an old woman, and an aged she-camel whose teeth are broken (Sn)], فسخم, [like زَجْر (392), a she-camel aged, or having some remains of youth in her, or old and giving little milk (Sn),] فسحا [a spacious place, and a man easy in mind (Sn)], and دُرَّم [with Kasr of the two س, a woman that comes and goes by night, and an aged she-camel (Sn)], because they are from نَزْةُ blueness, إنَّهاُ coming out, فِرْزِزِ niggardly and إَفْسَاحُ a she-camel giving little milk, إِفْسَاحُ being spacious, and دُرَّت losing one's teeth, becoming toothless, the qual. from which is أدْرُ toothless and
(1148)

\[\text{دُرُّ} \text{(A)}\], on the measure of \[\text{فرُّ} \text{[348]} \text{(Sn)}\]. When the \(\text{م}\) precedes three letters, one of which admits of being \(\text{رَد} \text{. or} \text{اُرَد} \text{.}, the \(\text{م}\) is judged to be \(\text{اُرَد} \text{.}, and that ambiguous [letter] to be \(\text{رَد} \text{., unless some indication exists to the contrary: and therefore the} \text{م} \text{of} \text{مُوسَى [673]} \text{and} \text{مُرَّد [674]} \text{is judged to be} \text{اُرَد} \text{.; while, as to the} \text{م} \text{of} \text{مٓذن [shield (Sn)]}, two sayings are transmitted from S, the sounder of which is that it is \(\text{اُرَد} \text{.: but, if some indication shows the} \text{م} \text{to be} \text{رَد} \text{., one judges in accordance therewith, as the} \text{م} \text{of} \text{مٓذن} \text{Mahdād, [a woman's name (Sn),] and} \text{مٓذن Ma'jaj, [a place (Sn),] is judged to be} \text{رَد} \text{., and one of the two similar letters to be} \text{اُرَد} \text{., since, if the} \text{م} \text{were} \text{اُرَد} \text{., the measure would be} \text{مٓذن مَعِلٗلٗ}, so that incorporation would be necessary [712]; though Sf allows the} \text{م} \text{of} \text{مٓذن} \text{and} \text{مٓذن to be} \text{اُرَد} \text{., their dissolution [of incorporation] being anomalous, like that of} \text{اللَّٰلِجُل} \text{بَلَدٗ لِلُّهِ الْعَلِيّ الْأَلَّهِ} \# \text{الْوَاهِدِ الْفَضِّلٗ الْوَهِيدُ الْجَبِرِّ} \text{,A), by Abu-nNajm al'Ijlī, Praise be to God, the High, the Most Great, the Giver of bounty, the Liberal Giver, the Munificent! (MN, Jsh). When the} \text{م} \text{precedes four or more} \text{رَد} \text{s., as in} \text{مُرَّدْجَعٗش [above] or} \text{مُرَّدْجوَش \text{marjoram, [the arabicized form of} \text{مُرَّدْجوَش mouse-ear (KF),] it is judged to be} \text{رَد} \text{., except when the word containing it is one of the} \text{ns. connected with} \text{وَس} \text{.[330,]}

like مُّذَخْرِج an act. part. [343], and مُّذَخْرِج a pass. part. [347] and a n. of time or place [363] (R). As for مُنْتَجِنْنَة [398, 675], S has two sayings about it, the sounder of which is that the م is rad., the ن after it rad., and the second ن a ل; the word being quad. in origin, but the second ن being repeated in order that it may be co-ordinated with عَضْرَنْفُط [368, 401]; and its paradigm being مُنْتَجِنْنَة. And, as for مُنْتَجِنْنَة ballista, the م in it is rad., and the ن after it aug., because they say in its pl. مَكَانَانِي [283] and مَكَانَانِي, the elision of the [first] ن in the pl. being an indication of its augmentativeness; and, since it is established that the [first] ن is aug., the م is judged to be rad., in order that two augs. may not be combined at the beginning of a n., that [combination] not being found, except in what is conformable to its v. [below], as مُنْتَجِنْنَة [382] and مُسْتَخْرِج [387]. This is the opinion of S and Mz; and, according to them, its measure is عَتَّرْتِرِسِسْ نَتْعَلَّيلِ, like عَتَّرْتِرِسِسْ نَتْعَلَّيلِ [283, 290, 674]. Others, however, say that the first ن and the م are augs., together, inasmuch as some of the Arabs say مَنْفِعْيُمُم meaning We shot them with the ballista, while AU transmits from some of the Arabs مَرِنَا نَتْعَلِيِمُم meaning We have not ceased to shoot with the ballista; and, according to this, its measure is مُنْفِعْيُمُم: but the correct
opinion is that of S, because of their saying, in the broken pl., مَجَانِينٍ [above] (IY). The م is made aug. when (1) first, as in مَرْحَبٌ spaciousness [60]: (2) second, as in دِلْيَصٌ [above]: (3) third, as in دِلْيَصٌ [above]: (4) fourth, as in زُرْقَمٌ [above]: (5) fifth, as in حُضُّرُمٌ sturdy, strongly made, because it is from ضَرُرٍ, which is strength of make; but IU holds that in حُضُّرُمٌ it is rad.: (a) Jh says in the شاهٕ "The حُضُّرُمٌ in the strongly made lion" (A).

§. 677. The ن, (1) when final, is made aug. upon the two conditions [672] (Aud) mentioned for the final Hamza, vid. that it be preceded by an ل, and that this ل be preceded by more than two rads. [below], the substantive and ep. being alike in that respect (Tsr), as in عَشْقُانٌ [250, 274, 385] and عَفْضِيَابُ [250, 348]; contrary to such as حُمَالٍ protection and سِنَانٌ spear-head (Aud), where the ل is preceded by two rads., not by more than two (Tsr); (a) it is prescribed as a [third] condition for augmentativeness of the [final] ن, in addition to what has been mentioned, that the excess of what precedes the ل over two letters should not be a reduplication of a rad., [i.e., of the ف, not of any rad. unrestrictedly, otherwise A's saying "and this condition is imported etc." (below) would not quite hold good (Sn)]; so that
the [final] ن in such as چنگَجان with Kasr of the first head of a rib, like سَسْمُ (below) (Sn),] is rad., not aug.: and this condition is imported [above] from IM’s saying “And judge [all (IA)] the letters of [671, 674] to be rad.” (A), because چنگَجان is orig. چنگَجین, like سَسْمُ, as above stated: (b) apparently this [third] condition ought to be put in the [final] Hamza [672] also, though A has not mentioned it there (Sn): (c) the general rule is for this ن to be affixed to the eps. whose fem. is ڀضَبَان [272], as ڀضَبَان [above], سَسْمُ [250; 348, 385], and سَسْمُ [250], because eps. are more fit for augmentation than substantives, inasmuch as they resemble vs. [330], and the v. is more adapted to augmentation than the n.; while the augmentativeness of the [1 and ن in substantives, such as ڀنَرَان [4] and ڀنَرَان [above] is because they are made to accord with eps.: (d) in this sort [of formation], therefore, judge them to be aug., unless some indication points to the contrary, as S says that the ن of مَراَن [with Damm, a tree of which spears are made (Jh on مَرَن), spears, n. un. مَراَن (Jh on مَرَن),] is rad.; and that is [فعَال] مَراَن (Jh)] from i. q. لَيْنَ softness, smoothness: (α) مَران Marrān, with Fath [of its first (Bk)] and doubling [of its second (Bk)], is the name of
a place (Jrb), [a journey of] two nights from Makka, on the road to AlBasra, wherein is the grave of Tamim Ibn Murr (Jh): (e) as for قَبَلَانَ [having beautiful long hair (MAR)], the derivation teaches us that three rads., exclusively of the ٰ and ُ, are not attainable in the word, since it is فَتْنَمَنٌ (T) from فَتْنَمَنٌ [branch (T), lock of hair, tress]; and similarly in حَسَانِ Hassan [below] and حَمَارُ قَبَلٍ [7], when triptote, we recognize, by the triptote declension, that the ُ is one of the three rads. (R): (f) حَسَانٌ [below] is either from حَمَارُ القِمَمُ meaning Killed the people quickly, aor. ٰخُسُصُ, inf. n. ُحظٌ; or from حَمَارُ beauty: and, if it be from حَمَارُ, the ُ is rad.; but, if it be from حَمَارُ, the ُ is aug. (ID): analogy requires the ُ to be aug., and حَمَارُ to be diptote, in accordance with the most frequent [usage, vid. that the ُ and ُ, when final, are aug.] but it may be derived from حَسَانٌ, in which case the ُ is rad., and it is triptote: (g) [the حَمَارُ قَبَلٍ is properly فَتْنَمَنٌ went away through the land, i. q. دَهْبٌ (IY on §. 7)], and diptote: but it may be دَهْبٌ [above]; and, according to this, it is triptote, because the ُ in it is rad. (IY): (h) the looseness of IM's language [in the Alfiya, "And the ُ at the end is like the Hamza" (672).]
requires the ن to be clearly aug. in the case where a
double letter, as in حَسَن [above] and رُمَان [below], or a [sound] letter and a soft letter, as in عَقْيَان [native gold (Sn)] and عَنْوَان superscription, title are
interposed between the ﯼ and the ﯹ; and this looseness
is in agreement with the opinion of the majority, who
judge the ن in such as حَسَن and عَقْيَان to be aug.,
unless some indication shows it to be rad., because
the diptote declension of حَسَن in the saying of the
poet [Umayya Ibn Khalaf alKhuzā‘i, satirizing Ḥassān
(MN, Sn) Ibn Thābit alAnṣārī (MN).]

اَلَا مَن مُتِلَّع حَسَن عَنِي ﻦَفْطَة ﺗَذْبُ ﻏَلَى مُعَكَاِل
[Now who will be conveying to Ḥassān from me a
message carried from town to town, that will creep to
‘Ukāz? (MN, Sn)] shows its ن to be aug.: but in the
Tashīl and the Kāfiya he holds the ن in that case to be
like the Hamza in equality of the two alternatives,
neither of which is negligible except by reason of
some indication; and this is the opinion of some of the
ancients: (i) some add another condition for the aug-
mentativeness of the ن when final, vid. that it should
not be in a n. whose first is pronounced with داَمَم, and
whose second is doubled, when [such n. is] a name
of a plant, as رُمَان [above], in which case they make it
rad., because نَفْعَل in names of plants is more fréquent
than \( فَعَلَنُ \); and IM adopts this [opinion] in the Kāfiya: but it is refuted by the fact that augmentativeness of the \( \text{l} \) and \( ن \), when final, is more frequent than the occurrence of [the name of] a plant upon [the measure of] \( فَعَالٌ \); while the opinion of Khl and S is that the \( ن \) of \( رَمَانٌ \) is aug.: S says "I asked him", i.e., Khl, "about \( رَمَانٌ \) when used as a [proper] name; and he said 'I do not decline it as a triptote in the det.' [i.e., when it is a proper name (Sn),] 'but make it accord with the most frequent [usage],', [vid. augmentativeness of the \( \text{l} \) and \( ن \) (Sn),] 'since it has no meaning whereby it is recognizable'", [i.e., because it has no sign whereby the state of its \( ن \) is recognizable (Sn)]: (j) Akh, however, says "Its \( ن \) is rad., like [the final of] \( قَرَاضَ \) [chamomile (Sn)] and [384], because it is more frequent than \( فَعَالٌ \), meaning "in [the names of] plants"; and the correct [opinion] is what he holds, not because of what he mentions, [since it is refuted, as before explained, by the fact that augmentativeness of the \( \text{l} \) and \( ن \), when final, is more frequent than the occurrence of (the name of) a plant upon (the measure of) \( فَعَالٌ \) (Sn)]; but because the \( ن \) is retained in derivation, as \( أَرْضٌ مُرْمَنةً \) [364]; whereas, if the \( ن \) were aug., they would say \( مُرْمَنةً (A) \): (2) when medial, is made aug. upon three conditions, that it be exactly in the middle
between four [letters (A)], that it be quiescent, and that it be unincorporated, as in عُقَّنْتُلْ [�قُن (Tsr)], عَقْنُتْلُ [�قُن (Tsr)], ٌّرْنَتْلِ [ٍّرِنْتَلِ], [384, 671] حَبَّنَّطَلِ [383, 671], [671, 675]; contrary to عَتْبَرْ [عَتْبَرَ], َأَبْتَقَ [أَبْتَقَ] ambergris, [where it is preceded by one letter, and followed by two (Tsr.)] يَرْتَبْ [َرْتَبْ] stork, crane, [an aquatic bird, long in the neck, where it is mobile, not quiescent (Tsr.),] and [عَكْسَن [عَكْسَن] below] (Aud) a bulky, [hardy, strong (KF)] he-camel, where it is incorporated (Tsr): (a) the ن in what contains the restrictions mentioned is regularly aug., because of three matters, (α) that it there occurs in the place of what is certainly aug., like the ي of سَيّدَع [سَيّدَع] [395], the of جُحْشَادِب [جُحْشَادِب] [395], and the ل of عُدَدَافْرَ [عُدَدَافْرَ], جُكْسَ [جُكْسَ] [395]; (b) that it is mostly interchangeable with the soft letter, as in their saying شَرَبْتُ [شَرَبْتُ] and شُرَبْتُ [شُرَبْتُ] [671] and, [like عَلَابِط thick, corpulent (Sn.),] for thick in the hands, جُرْفَشْ for burly, and عَرْقَقَانَ for Fath of the and ى, quiescence of the ن, and Fath of the ع (Sn) and عُرْقَقَانَ [400] for a plant; (c) that it is found to be aug. in every [word] whose derivation or variation is known, [such as عَقْنُتْلُ جَحَنَّفِ (671) (Sn),] with which the others, [like شَرْبَتُ (Sn),] are made to accord (A): (b) they say عَرْقَقَان [672, 675], where the [first] ن is aug., because of what we have mentioned,
[vid. that this is a position where the ن is frequently **aug.**]; and sometimes **قَرْنَتْنِي** [392], with elision of the [first] ن; (c) they say **قَرْنَتْنِي** i.q. **هَارِد**, where the ن is **aug.**, because of what we have mentioned, vid. that this is a position where the ن is frequently **aug.**, and because it is elided in the var. **قَرْنِي** (below); while the last د is **aug.**, co-ordinating **قَرْنَتْنِي** [401] (IV): (d) the first restriction [mentioned by IHsh above, vid. that the ن should be medial,] excludes the ن occurring as an initial [below], which is **rad.**, as in **هَمْسَل** [wolf (Sn)]; unless some indication decide it to be **aug.**, as in **نَرْجِس** narcissus, [681. A], because, if the ن were **rad.**, its measure would be **قَعْلٌ** [with Kasr of the first ل (Sn)], which is not found [392]: (e) the second restriction, [vid. that the ن should be exactly in the middle between four letters,] excludes such as **قَنْطَار** a hundred weight, **كَنْنَدَرِيسُ سُعْنَقُرْدُ**, [253, 396, 674, 253, 401], and **عَنْدَلِيب** nightingale, where it is **rad.**; unless some indication decide it to be **aug.**, as in (a) **عَنْبِس** lion, because it is from **عِرَس** frowning; (b) **حُظَلَتْ آلَبُل** [The camels ate much colocynth (Sn)]; (c) **عَنسَلْ** [373], because it is from **عَسْلَان** going swiftly; (d) **عِرْنَدُ** [374], because it is from their saying **شَيْءٌ عَرْنٌ** a hard thing
[above], i. e., صُلْبَٰبُ [394, 671], [with Fath or Damm of the ب (Sn),] because they say, in place of it, كَهْبُ [with Fath of the ب (Sn)], and because of the unprecedentedness [of the formation in the dial. var. with Damm of the ب] on the assumption of radicalness, [together with inclusion in the narrower of two cats, since unprecedentedness ensues on the assumption of augmentativeness also, as there is among measures no تعْنِيلُ with Damm of the doubled ل, so there is among them no تعْنِيلُ with Damm of the first ل (Sn)]: (f) the third restriction, [vid. that the ن should be quiescent,] excludes such as عَرْنِيق [above], which is [an aquatic bird, and (Sn)] the exalted chief [396] خَرْنُوبُ a kind of tree, and كُناَبِيلُ Kunā`bil, [with a quiescent Hamza, the name of a place in Al Yaman—so in the Tsr (Sn),] where the ن is rad., since there is no فُعْنِيلُ or فَعْنِيلُ or تعْنِيلُ in the language: (g) the fourth [restriction, vid. that the ن should not be incorporated,] excludes such as عَكِبَّس [above] (A): (a) here the augmentativeness of the ن contends with the augmentativeness of reduplication; and reduplication prevails, because it is more frequent: (b) the measure of عَكِبَّس is held to be تعْنِيلُ [396], like عَدَّتَس [strong (Jh, KF, Sn), firmly made (Jh, KF)]: but A.H says "What I hold is that the two
\( n \) are \textit{aug.}, its measure being \( \text{ضَفَنَنَتَ} (A, Tsr) \); and the proof is that we find the two \( n \) to be \textit{aug.} in those words whose derivation is recognizable, as \( \text{ضَفَنَنَتَ} \) [with a double \( n \) (Sn), \textit{fat, flabby} (KF)] and \( \text{زَوْنُكُ} [\text{short and mean-looking} (Jh)] \), which are from \( \text{ضَفَنَنَتَ} \) [\textit{bigness of belly} (Sn)] and \( \text{زَوْنُ} [\textit{walk of the crow} (Sn)] \); so that those whose derivation is not recognizable are made to accord with them" (A): (3) when initial [above], is made \textit{aug.} in the aor. [404] (Aud), as \( \text{كُصَرَب} \). The \( n \) is regularly made \textit{aug.} in (1) the aor., as \( \text{إِنْفَعَلُ} \) [above] ; (2) \( \text{إِنْفَعَلُ} \) \( 332, 667 \), \( \text{مَنْطِلُ} \) \( 483, 382 \), etc. ; (3) \( \text{إِخْرِنَجَمُ} \) \( 332, 667 \), \( \text{إِخْرِنَجَمُ} \) \( 495 \), etc. : and the reason why IM is silent about them is only that they are manifest. He does not mention the Tanwin [608, 678, 679], the \( n \) of the \textit{du.} [228] or \textit{pl.} [234], the sign of the \textit{ind.} in the five paradigms [405], the \( n \) of protection [170], and the \textit{corrob.} \( n \) [610], because these are specific augments; while the intent of the [present] chapter is to specify the augments needing specification because of their being so mixed up with the \textit{rads.} of the word as to become [like] part of them (A). The \( n \) is made \textit{aug.}, when (1) first, as in \( \text{كُصَرَب} \) [above]; (2) second, as in
(1159)

(3) third, as in غَصَنَفر [above]; (4) fourth, as in عَصِبَان [375, 671]; (5) fifth, as in (A, Tsr) عَصِبَان [above] (A) [and] سَرْخَان [250] (Tsr); (6) sixth, as in عِبْوَتَرَان [283, 399]; (7) seventh, as in (A, Tsr) عِبْوَتَرَان [283, 400] (A) or (Sn) عِبْيِتَرَان [400], which is a sweet-smelling plant (Tsr, Sn). In other cases it is rad., except in such as (1) عَنْسَل [above]: (2) عَفْرَنَى [253, 378] (M), which is one of the names of the lion, as though he were so named because of his strength: (a) its measure is نَعْلُنَى, the N and L in it being aug. (IV):

(3) بَلْهَنْية [248, 331] (M), meaning a pleasant life, as فِئَان فِى بَلْهَنْية مِنِّ النَّعْش Such a one is in ease of life, i. e., فِى سَعَة: (a) the N and L are aug. for co-ordination with قُدِمْعَبُ [401], but the L becomes ي because of the Kasra before it; and their saying عَيْشُ أَبَلَهُ careless, or easy, life, i. e., having few grieves, indicates that the N and L are aug. (IV): (4) خَفَتْفَقَق [M], which is calamity; and also light, or active, said of a woman: (a) the ن in it is aug., because it is from خَفَق fluttered, aor. يَخْفَق; and it is co-ordinated with عُرْطَلِل [399] (IV).

§. 678. The ت is aug. in [four positions (A),] (1) the fem. 263 [IM], as (a) ضَارِبة [263, 265] and ضَرْبَت 122a
[161, 607, 646] (A), like قَامَتْ [263, 264, 267, 679] (IA, Aud) and قَامَتْ [263, 646] (Tsr); and ضَرَبَتْ [265, 336] (A), so in some MSS, with the tied ّ, meaning the n. un. from ضَرَبَتْ; but ضَرَبَتْ in other MSS, with an extended ّ, as being a pass. v.: (a) as for the notion that it is pronounced with Kasr, it is a blunder, since this ّ is a n., because it is an ag.; while the discussion is about the aug letters: (b) A explains “the fem.” as comprising the fem. of the n. and v.; and then he ought to include in it the fem. of the p. [263, 402, 646], like رَبَتْ [505], ّمَتْ [540], and لَاتْ [109] (Sn): (c) “in the fem.” means “in a sing.” as IA exemplifies it; or “a pl.,” like مُسْلِمَاتْ [234, 646] (MKh): (d) IHsh says “In my opinion, the [quiescent] ّ of [femininization in [above] and the like should not be reckoned in this cat., because it is an independent, self-supporting word [607], contrary to the ّ of مُسْلِمَاتْ [402] and مُسْلِمَاتْ [above], which is part of a word, for which reason the inflection settles on it [402, 607]” (Sn): (e) as for the [mobile] ّ [679] of femininization, [which, like the quiescent ّ, is not mentioned in the SH under the aug. ّ, R says that] it [also] is a p. [294], not a formative letter (R): (b) أَنَتْ and its variations [161, 561], according to the
well-known [opinion, mentioned in §. 161 as that of the BB] (A): (a) opposed to it are two sayings [161], (a) that the ٠ is the pron. and ٠ a p. of support; and it is obvious that the ٠, according to this, is not an aug. letter: (b) that the whole is the pron. the ٠ being a part of it; but its being a part of the n. is sometimes said not to be incompatible with its being aug., as will not escape notice (Sn): (2) the aor. [404] (IM), as [165] (IA), like تُصِرب Thou [masc.] strikes or She strikes (A): (a) IHsh says "IM does not reckon [among the augs.] any of the aoristic letters except the ٠, although there is no difference between it and the others " (Sn, MKh): (b) in my opinion, the aoristic letters are ps. ; not formative letters, like the ٠ of the du., the ٠ of the pl., and the Tanwin [677, 679] (R on the ٠): (3) such [inf. ns. (A)] as (a) [332, 667] (IM), where it is made aug. together with the س [680] (IA), and ا٠ (R, Aud, A, MKh), like ٠ (IA, A, Tsr) and ٠ [667] (A, Tsr, MKh); ٠ (R, Jrb, Aud, MKh) and ٠ (R, Jrb, Tsr, MKh), as تَكْسَر breaking [intrans.] in pieces [486] and ٠ fighting together [487] (Tsr), like ٠ تَكْسَر تَقَارِبٌ [332] and ٠ fighting together (MKh); and ٠ [like ٠ تَدْحَرْ (below)] (R, Jrb); and the deriv. thereof (R, IA, Aud, A, MKh), vid. the v. and part. (Tsr, Sn),
like طَفَعِيلُ (493) and مُسْتَخْرَجَ (387) (IA). (b) تَرْدُّيدُ (332) and فَعَالٌ (332, 334) (R, A, Tsr, MKh), as much rejecting (A, Tsr), like تَقَديمُ hallowing, sanctifying, consecrating (MKh), and تَرْدَعُ (334); without their derivs. (A, Tsr, MKh), because there is no ت in their derivs. (Tsr), as رَدَّتُ rejected much and رَدَّتْ rejecting much (Sn), like قَدْسُ hallowed, etc., and رَدَّتْ rejected (MKh), which are without a ت (Sn, MKh): (4) the quasi-pass. (IM) of فَعَلَ [or فَعِلَ] (IA), from the tril. and quad. (Tsr), as (a) تَعَلَّمَ He learnt [432] (IA, Aud, A), inf. n. تَعَلَّمَ [332] (A), quasi-pass. of I taught him (IA); (b) تَدَّحَرَ [495. A] (IA, Aud, A), in. n. تَدَّحَرَ [332]; (c) تَقَافَلُ [332] and تَفَاقَلُ [487], inf. n. تَقَافَلُ and تَفَاقَلُ [332] (A). As for the ت of such as تَرْمَسُ [482], its augmentativeness is not regular (Sn). In any [position] other than those mentioned, the ت is not judged to be aug., except by reason of some indication (A). IM's confining himself to what is mentioned intimates that the ت of تَرْجُمَنَ interpreter, translator, with Fath or Damm of the ت and ج, or Fath of the ت and Damm of the ج, is rad.; and this is the sounder [opinion], as is proved by the retention of the ت in the remaining variations of the word, which is arabicized, or, as is said, Arabic (Sn). The ت
is made *aug.*, (1) when initial, in which case its augmentativeness is (a) regular, which has been mentioned above; (b) restricted to hearsay, as in \(\text{ضَنُصِّب} [\text{below}], [\text{a Hijazi tree}, whose thorns are like those of the عَوسَعِْ} (373), and *Tanqub*, a town near Makka (Sn),] \(\text{تُنْفِّل} [\text{the fox, or its cub (372, 671) (Sn)},] \(\text{نَذَرْ أَ} [331, 372], \text{and} \(\text{تَحْلِي} [274, 372] (A): (a) as for the irregular augmentativeness of the \(\text{ت} [\text{when initial}, it is [also in] such as ٖبِجْفَانَ} (283, 334, 379), which is *تَفَعَّل* from جَفَ آلَشِئٍ, *the thing was dry and hard, i. q. بَيِّس* and تَبِيَّانَ (7) \(\text{بِنْتُحَال} [334, 379] \text{from} \*\text{مِلَّ} \text{likeness}; \(\text{صَلَب} [332, 334, 379] \text{from} \*\text{بَيِّان} \text{plainness}; \(\text{ثَلْقَاءٌ} [332, 334, 379] \text{from} \*\text{قَآ} \text{meeting}; \(\text{ضَرْب} [334, 379] \text{from} \*\text{شَرَب} \text{covering}: and, in all of that, the \(\text{ت} , but for the derivation, would be *rad.*, because it corresponds to the of قَطْٰر [253] and the س of سِرْحَانِي [250] (IY): (2) when final, in which case likewise its augmentativeness is (a) regular, which has been mentioned above: (b) restricted to hearsay, like [the augmentativeness of] the ي in (a) such as رَغْبَوَتَ *humbly petitioning, supplicating*, رَحْمَوَتَ \*mercy, pity, مَلَكَوْت kingdom 681. A], and رَجَبَوْتُ خَيْرَ مَنْ \*they say رَحْمَوْتُ \*Fear is better than pity, [i. e., That thou
shouldst be feared is better than that thou shouldst be pitied (Md)]: (β) and رَحْمُوتِي are said, upon the measure of فَعْلُوْتِي [272]; but this is rare, not to be copied (IY): Mb says رَهْمُوْتِي خُيْرُ مُنَ رَحْمُوْتِي (Md): (β) تُرَنُّمُوْتُ twanging, which is the sound of the bow upon shooting, because it is from تُرَنُّمُوْتَ trilling, quavering, its measure being ُعَنْكُبُوْتَ (c): تُقَفُّعُلُوْتَ [399, 646] (A): (α) when the ت is at the end of the word, after the aug. و , and is preceded by three or more rads., S does not hold this to be one of the prevalent [augs.], for which reason he says that سُبْرُوتُ [a desert land, and a man having nothing (MARt),] is فَعْلُوْتُ [below]; but he holds augmentativeness in the like to be recognizable only by derivation, as in جَبْرُوْتُ and مُكَرُوْتُ [above], because they are from جَرَِّيْة haughtiness and مُلْكُ dominion [681. A]; and so in رَغْبُوْتُ [above], رَحْمُوْتُ, and رَكْبُوْتُ (β) similarly S does not hold the ت which is at the end [of the word], after the [aug.] ی , when preceded by three rads., as in عُفْرِيْتَ [646, 674, 681. A], to be one of the prevalent [augs.], the augmentativeness of the ت in عُفْرِيْتُ being, according to him, recognizable by derivation from عِفَرُ [343], which is the wicked, crafty: (γ) in سُبْرُوتَ S makes unprecedentedness preponderate over derivation; and therefore says that it is فَعْلُوْتُ [above],
like ُعَصْفُورُ [253, 396]; not ُفَعَّلَتْ [below], because this is extraordinary: but the better [course] is what some take, vid. to make derivation preponderate, and judge it to be ُفَعَّلَتْ co-ordinated with ُعَصْفُورُ, although ُفَعَّلَتْ is extraordinary, on the evidence of the obvious derivation, because ُسَيَّروُت is the skilful guide, who ُسَيَّرَ بُنْ اَلْطَرِيقُ has explored the way, and tried it; for this derivation is manifest; not far-fetched, so that another [indication] should be made to preponderate over it (R) : (5) the opinion of S is that the ُن of ُعَنَّكَبَرُت is rad., because they say, in the sense of it, ُعَنَّكَبُ; so that, according to him, it is quad.: but some of the GG hold it to be tril., and its ُن aug.: (3) when medial, in which case its augmentativeness is not regular, except in ُعَتِسَفَعَلُ and ُعَتِسَفَعَلُ and their derivs.; but it is made aug. in a few words: (a) on account of its being seldom aug. when medial, the majority hold it to be rad. in ُيُسَمَّعَرُ [401, 674], and a subst. for the ُو in ُكُلُّتا [263, 307, 689] (A). In other cases, it is rad., [wherever it be found (IF),] except [when there exists an indication of its being aug. (IF),] as in ُتُرَتْب (1) [274, 372] (M), i. q. ُآلَسَّىِ، أَرَتَبُ the established thing, where the first ُن is aug., because, according to S, there is no [paradigm] in the language like ُجَعَّرَ with Damm of the ُجَ [392] while, according to
Akh also, it is aug., because ُترتبُ is derived from ُترتبٌ was established; so that it is aug. because of the derivation, not on account of the paradigm: (a) the counterpart of this is ُتنصبُ [372, 681. A] for a kind of tree, where the ﮭ is aug. because there is no [paradigm] in the language like ُجعفرَ with Damm of the ﮮ [392, 671]: (b) similarly ُتتُقلُ [above] with Damm, and ُتتُقلَ [372] with Fath, of the ﮮ are said, where the first ﮭ is unavoidably aug., according to him that pronounces with Damm, because of the unprecedentedness [of ُتتُقلُ]; and is also aug. according to him that pronounces with Fath, because it is not rad. in one dial. var., and aug. in another (IY): (3) ُتَرَأَجَ [689] (M), which, according to the Bdd, is ُتَتُعلُ, the ﮭ, according to them, being aug.; while Z follows that opinion, for which reason he excepts it from being rad., and reckons it with what is aug. (IY): (3) ُسَبَتَةَ [385], meaning a period of time, the first ﮭ of which is aug., because they say, in the same sense, ُسَبَتُ and ُسَبِّبُ, like ُتَمَّرَ and ُتَمَّةَ [254]; so that the elision of the ﮭ is an indication of its augmentativeness (IY).

§. 679. The ﮱ is aug. in pause, [in the interrog. Hamza governed in the gen. (IA),] like َلِ For what? [615, 648]: and [in the v. whose ﮱ is elided for uninflectedness, like َرُ See thou; or apocope, like (IA)]
Thou didst not see [615, 644] (IM). The s [below] and the l [681] are rarely aug., like [the s in (Tsr)] اَمَّهَاتُ mothers [below] and اَهْرَاقُ poured out, shed [382, 671, 680]; and [the l in (Tsr)] طَيِّبٍ [below], i. q. كَثِير many, much: as is indicated by the elision thereof, [i. e., (Tsr)] (1) [of the s (Tsr)] in (a) [the inf. n., as (Tsr)] اَمْرُ motherhood (Aud); and in the pl. also as

فرَجْتَ آنَظَلاْمَا بِأَمْلَانِكَ [below] (Tsr): (a) the s is added in اَمَّاتُ mothers, as it is added in اَهْرَاقُ poured out, shed [below], where اَهْرَاقُ is said (K on XVI. 80.): (b) اَمَّاتُ is said [by some] to be pl. of اَمْهَةٌ [below], as

إِنَّى كَذَا الْكُرْبُ رَحْيِ الْلَّبْبِ # مُعَتَّر مُضْرُعًا عَالِيًا نَسْبٍ اَمَّهَيِّي جَنِّيْدٍ وَأَلِيَّيْنِ أَبِي

(Tsr), by Kušayy Ibn Kilāb [Ibn Murra (N)], an ancestor of the Prophet, Verily I am easy in mind in battle (Jsh, N), the lion of (Jsh), [or] resolute in (N), attack, lofty in lineage: my mother is Khindif [309], the cognomen of Laila [Biut Ḥulwān Ibn 'Imrān (Jsh)], wife of Ayās Ibn Muḍār [Ibn Nizār (Jsh)], and AlYās is my father (Jsh, N), the s being aug. in the sing. and pl. (l'sr): but the addition of the s in the sing., as 123a
[above], is anomalous (K); (b) (Aud), inf. n. of [below] (Tsr): (2) [of the J (Tsr)] in ٨٨ (Aud), which is the great number; and all that is on the surface of the ground, such as dust and sweepings; or creatures breeding much, like flies, ants, and reptiles: so in the Kf (Tsr); or particles of sand, and the ocean; like طَيِّّسُ [above] in all [these senses]; and abundance of everything, such as sand and water, etc. (KF). But, as for the exemplification, by IM [in the Alfiya (Tsr)], his son [in the C (Tsr)], and many GG, of the ُس [below] with such as لِيّم and لَثُرَة [above], and of the J [681] with [the masc. and fem. dems. in distance (Tsr),] ٨٨٨٨٩٩٩ [173, 599], it is rejected, because the ُس of silence [615] and the J of distance [599] are, each of them, an entire word, not part of another [word] (Aud); nor [is either of them] equivalent to part of what precedes it, [the addition of this clause being necessary] lest it be said against IHsh "And so is the [mobile] ُس of feminization, as in ٨٨٦٨٩ [678], an entire word, not part of another [word]; and yet he exemplifies with it" (Tsr). The ُس is a letter of augmentation, as before stated [671], except that its augmentativeness is rare in any [position] other than pause. It is not regular except in pause upon (1) the interrog. مَا governed in the gen. [648], as لِيّم [above]
(2) the v. whose i is elided for apocope or uninflect-

(3) every [word] uninfl. upon a vowel inseparable [from the word, as in ٌةٌ and ٌةٌ, contrary to the (word) uninfl. upon a vowel supervening for a cause that sometimes ceases, like the voc. and the sub.
of ٌ (Sn)], save what has been previously excepted in the chapter on Pause (A), vid. the pret. v. [648] (Sn). It is necessary in some of those cases, and allowable in others, as before explained [615, 644, 648]. Mb denies the augmentativeness of the s [671], saying that it is affixed in pause, after completion of the word, only to make [the vowel plain, and the ] perfectly (Sn)] plain, like the s in such as LXIX. 28. and ٌةٌ [671]; or to make [pause, which is only upon a quiescent (Sn),] possible, like the s in such as ٌةٌ and ٌةٌ [671]: so that it is [a specific augment (Sn),] like the Tanwîn [608, 677, 678], [besides being a p., like the Tanwîn] and the prep. ب [503]. But the correct [opinion] is that the s is a letter of augmentation, although its augmentativeness is rare. The proof of that is their saying ٌةٌ [above] for ٌةٌ, its measure being ٌةٌ, because it is pl. of ٌةٌ mother; while sometimes they say ٌةٌ (A). The author of the saying

إذا الامهات قبعت الوجهة # فرحت الامام ياماتيالکا

[above] When the mothers are ugly in faces, thou
dispel lest the darkness with thy mothers has combined the two dials. (M). They say that, in most cases, أمات is used for brutes, and مهات for mankind: but sometimes the converse occurs, as in إذا مهات تلبسُ النوى When mothers are ugly etc. [above] and

 культ معرف وفعالة # عقار مثني أمهات آلربائع

A great sayer of what is kind, and a great doer thereof, a great slasher of the knee of the mothers of the young camels born in autumn (R). And they say أمات [above] for أم (A), making the sing. in the sing., as in the pl. (Sn). The measure of أمات is فعلة أمهات (A, Tsř), the s being multiplicative; or co-ordinative, according to those who authorize فعال [392] (Tsř). But IS allows the s [here] to be rad., [the measure of (Tsř)] أمات being فعالة, like [قلبة and (A)] أمهات (A, Tsř), which is grandeur (Tsř, Sn), splendour, and pride (Sn); and this is confirmed by [their saying (A)] أمات تلبسُ النوى meaning I took as a mother, transmitted by Khl in the Kitāb alʿAin: [so that the o.f. of أم is أمهات (Sn);] but afterwards the s is elided; and there remains أم, the measure of which is فعاله (A, Tsř). And, if this be established, [i.e., both what is transmitted by Khl, vid. that أم is a deriv. of أمهات, which alone is the o.f., and what is indicated by the preceding paragraph, vid. that the measure of أم is فعاله (Su),] then
and are two different o. fs., like سبطر and دمتر [676], and دمث and دمثر (KF, Sn), i. q. سهل smooth, level, said of ground (KF): so that, according to this, أمطات is pl. of أمته [above], and أمات of أم. But what IS holds is weak, because it is contrary to the apparent [weight of evidence] (A), since, in the case of أمته, what imports augmentativeness [of the s] is found, vid. أم, contrary to أمته and أمث; while the cat. of سبطر and دمثر [above] is small: so says SBd (Sn). And, as for the transmission [of أمطت] by the author of the ‘Ain, it is not adducible as an argument, because of the errors and discrepancies in that work. IJ says “I consulted our master F one day about the Kitāb al‘Ain; but he turned away from it, and was not satisfied with it, because of the rejected doctrine and vicious etymology that are in it” (A). And it is said in the Jh that أمطت is pl. of أمته, the o. f. of which is أم (Tsr). The s is also made aug. in أهربت ألباء I poured out the water, aor. أهربت, inf. n. إهرابت, the o. f. [of أهربق] يهربق (382), inf. n. إهرابق (Sn),] being أهربق [above], aor. يهربق, inf. n. إهرابق (A). And [they say that (Tsr)] Mb has no answer to the augmentativeness of the s in أهربق, except the allegation of blundering on the part of the
sayer thereof, who, since the Hamza is changed [into \( s(A) \) in \( هرَق (690) (Tsr) \)], imagines that the \( s \) is the ف of the word; and therefore prefixes the Hamza to it [in the pret. and inf. n. (Sn)], and makes it quiescent (A, Tsr). Khl asserts that the \( s \) in \( هَمْكُلَة \) which is [the girl (Jh)] big in the hips, is aug., the measure being ركَّل في مَشِيِّهَا kicks in her walk; but most hold it to be rad., the measure being مُقَوَّلة: and Akh says that it is aug. in بَلِلَّع and مَجَرَع, [372, 392], which, according to him, are مَفَعُول, because the first is from بَلِلَّع swallowing, and the second from مَجَرَع, which is the level place; but the argument of the majority [for the radicalness of the \( s \) in مَجَرَع (Sn)] is that the Arabs say of two long or tall [things or persons], هُذَا أَطْوَل مِن هَذَا This is longer, or taller, than that, i. e., أَطْوَل (A); whereas, if the \( s \) were aug., they would say أَجَرَع, with elision of the aug., and retention of the rad.; while [in أَجَرَع] they elide the \( s \), though it also is rad., without dispute, because elision is more suitable for finals (Sn). What Khl holds, however, [about the \( s \) in مَجَرَع] is right, because derivation, when it testifies to a thing, is acted upon, no attention being paid to the rarity of the thing (IY). And similarly [you say of \( A(L) \) مُقَوَّامَة which is [a name of (IY)] the lion, and
is [also (A) an ep. meaning] bulky, tall (IY, A), the s in it being aug., because it is from لَمْ (IY). And in سَلْهَب [392] the s may be aug., because سِلْبُ means long, tall, as سَلْهَبٰ a long horn [or سِلْبُ (A)], i.e., طَوْرُ (IY, A), this being a good derivation, apparent in sense and letter (IY); or سِلْهَبٰ may be of the cat. of سَبْطٰر and سِبْطٰر [above]. The truth is that the s of silence [680, 681] ought not to be mentioned with the letters of augmentation, because of what has been stated [by IHSh and A] above (A).

§. 680. The س is regularly made aug., (1) [together with the ب (A),] in إِسْتَفْعَالٌ [678] (Aud, A), like أَكْرَمَتْكُس I honored thee, which is [the s of] the كُسَكْسَةٰ [617]: but this sayer is bound to reckon the ش of the كُسَكْسَةٰ [617, 671]; and, the object of putting them being to make the Kasra of the ل plain, their predicament is [like] that of the s of silence [679] in respect of independence (A). The reckoning of the س of the كُسَكْسَةٰ is a blunder, [because it is a p., not a formative letter; and also (R)] because this entails [the reckoning of (R)] the ش of the كُسَكْسَةٰ (SH), which, by common consent, is not a letter of augmentation. This
is a refutation of Z, who reckons the س of the سَكَسَة among the letters of augmentation (Rt). In any other case the augmentativeness of the س is not regular, but preserved in the memory, like the س of the قِدْمَة [681. A]: [671, 681. A], with the disj. Hamza, aor. يُسْتَطَع [671], with دَمُّ of the initial; [contrary to إِسْتَطَاع, with the conj. Hamza, aor. يُسْتَطَع (382, 759), with فَتْح of the initial, i. q. يُسْتَطَع was able, aor. يُسْتَطَع (Sn):] for, according to S [below], its o. f. is أَطَلَع, aor. يُطَع; while the س is added as a compensation for [the departure of (Sn)] the vowel of the ع of the v. [from the ع (Sn)], because the o. f. of أَطَلَع (A), not for the departure of the vowel absolutely (Sn). أَسْتَطَع with فَتْح, and disjunction, of the Hamza occurs in their language: but the GG differ in accounting for it. S [above] says that it is of the conjug. of إِفْعَال, its o. f. being أُطْرِع, like أُقُرُع [703, 707]; but the س, being treated as unsound, and converted into ل after transfer of its vowel to what precedes it; and the س afterwards put as a compensation for the mobility of the ع, which has escaped it; as the س is put in أُهْرَق [382, 671, 679], with quiescence of the س, as a compensation for the like of that [loss of mobility in the ع]. And there is no doubt that the
mobility of the ُع has escaped because of the mobilization of the vowel of the ُف with the vowel of the ُع [below]. But, notwithstanding all of this, the putting of the ُس and ُس as compensation is anomalous. The aor. of ُصَطَاعَ, therefore, according to S, is ُيُضْطَعَ [671], with َبَم. But Mb, supposing S to say that the ُس is a compensation for the vowel, rejects that [account], saying "How shall compensation be given for a thing, when the thing for which compensation is given", i.e., the Fath transferred to the ُف, "is remaining?": whereas S's meaning is not what he supposes, but is that the ُس is a compensation for the mobility of the ُع; and there is no doubt that the mobility of the ُع has escaped because of the mobilization of the ُف with the vowel of the ُع [above]. Fr says that the o.f. of ُصَطَاعَ is ُإِضْطَعَ, of the conjg. of ُإِضْفَعَلَ, the ُت being elided for the reason assigned in the chapter on Incorporation [759]; so that there remains ُإِضْطَعَ [382], with Kasr of the Hamza, which is then anomalously pronounced with Fath, and made disj.: and, according to him, therefore, the aor. is ُيُضْطَعَ [759], with Fath of the aoristic letter. But, when the ُت of ُإِضْطَعَ is elided, because of the impracticability of incorporation, the well-known dial. makes the Hamza remain pronounced with Kasr, and conj., as it was [before the elision], whence ُفَا ُآسْطَاعَوا.
XVIII. 96. *Then they were not able (R).* The س is neglected by IM [in the Alfiya (Tsr)], and his son (Aud) in the C (Tsr). IM mentions in the Alfiya [only] nine \([672–679, 681]\) of the [ten] letters of augmentation \([671]\), and is silent about the س [680]. The excuse for him is that the س is not regularly *aug.*, except in one position, which he has exemplified in [mentioning] the augmentativeness of the د, since he says "such as لإستَفْعَال" [678]; so that he seems to content himself with that, for which reason he says in the Kāfiya, in mentioning the augmentativeness of the د, "and together with the س, it is made *aug.* in إِسْتَفْعَال and its *derivs.*" (A).

§. 681. The د is *aug.*, (1) in (M, IM) the well-known *dem.* [below] (IM) ns., regularly (IA), as (IA, A) دَلِيكُ [679] (IA, A), تَلَّكُ [175] (M, IA A), and أَلَّكَ (A) [pronounced] أَلَّكَ [173], whence أَلِيكُ فَنَّى لَمْ يَكُونَا *أشَابَة* *رَهْلُ يَعْلَمُ الْضَّلَُّلِ يَُؤْلِفُ إِلَّا أَلَا لَكَ (M), by AlAʿshà, praising his people for purity [of race], and faithfulness in counsel, *Those are my people they are not a medley (of mankind): and shall any but those exhort the much-erring?, because of their saying, in the sense thereof, قَالُ [171] and ذَالِكُ [172] without a أَلَّكَ [175], and أَلْكَا [pronounced]
[172]: (a) the ج is added in the جم. to indicate the distance of the demonstrated [173, 599], and therefore is the opp. of the premonitory ها [174, 552]; for which reason they are not combined [173, 552], so that ها ذِلَّك is not said; because, the ها indicating the nearness, and the ج the distance, of the demonstrated, there are incompatibility and contradiction between them: (b) [except in ذِلَّك (173),] this ج is [mobilized to avoid a concurrence of two quiescents; and] pronounced with كسر, lest it might be mistaken for the ج of ownership [604], if [ذِلَّك that sounding like] دَا نِتْلَك. This belongs to thee were said (IY): (2) in عبدٌ slave, servant [671], زيدٌ Zaidal [283], and فتحٌ [675] (M), where their saying عبدُ slave, servant, زيدٌ Zaid, and [below] is an indication of the augmentativeness of the ج (IY): (a) [عَيْقَّل (IY)] is ambiguous (M): if you derive it from هَيْقَّم [male ostrich, like هَيْقَّم (Jh, KF), the م being aug. (Jh), and slender, tall (KF)], the ج is aug., its measure being فَعَلُ, and the ش is راد.; while, if you derive it from هَيْقَّل [with كسر (KF), young ostrich (Jh, KF), and tall, stupid (KF)], the ش is aug., and the ج راد., its measure being فَعَلُ; but the first [derivation] is more frequent, because they say هَيْقَّم and هَيْقَّم [i. q. هَيْقَّم (above), the م being aug.
and this is the meaning of ّs saying "is ambiguous", i.e., admits of the ّs being 
ach or rad., according to the derivation (IV). The ّ is one of the letters of 
augmentation (A). As for the ّ [679], it is rare, as in ُبَلَدٍ and ُبَلَدٍ [above] (SH), because it is the remotest of the letters of augmentation in resemblance to the letters of prolongation [671] (Jrb). Analogy requires that it should not be made 
ach, because of its remoteness from the letters of prolongation, for which reason it is the least 
ach of the letters. Its augmentativeness is not regular, except in the dem. [below]; and in other 
cases belongs to the cat. of hearsay. There have been heard, in their speech, (1) ُبَلَدٍ for ُبَلَدٍ [above]: (2) ُنَحَبٍ for ُنَحَبٍ [675], which is having the thighs wide 
apart: (3) ُقَللٍ for ُقَللٍ [above]: (4) ُقَللٍ for ُقَللٍ [675], which is the gland of the penis [below]: (5) ُقَللٍ for ُقَللٍ [679]. It is reported from Akh that the ّ of ُبَلَدٍ is rad., ُبَلَدٍ being compounded from ُبَلَدٍ ُبَلَدٍ. The servant of God, as they say ُبَلَدٍ [309, 311]; but this is rendered improbable by their saying ُبَلَدٍ for ُبَلَدٍ [above]. He says, however, in the Ausat [fi-
Naḥw (HKh)], "The ّ is made 
ach in ُبَلَدٍ alone", [not in the remainder, vid. ُبَلَدٍ, etc., as though he said that the remainder were of the cat. of ُبَلَدٍ and ُبَلَدٍ (Sn);]
"and its pl. is عبداء" so that he has two sayings (A) on عبد (Sn). The remainder, indeed, [i.e., all except عبد (Sn)] admit of being [derived] from two crude-forms, like سبت and ٨٦٧٦ (A); so that Akh's saying "[The ] is made aug. in عبد alone" is correct (Sn). Jr denies that the ج is a letter of augmentation. And the ج of distance in such as ديلك [above] is not opposed to this, because it is a ج. [599], like the Tanwin [608] (R). [For] the ج of the dem. [above] ought not to be mentioned with the letters of augmentation, because of what we said on the ج of silence [679], vid. that it is an entire word (A). And he holds that قيسلا [above], جيقل, and قيسلا are جيعل, saying that sometimes two synonymous words are supposed to coincide in derivation, because of their approximation in form, whereas each of them is of another composition, like سكر and كار [talkative woman (KF)], and جمث and جمث [679]. But all of that is forced, on his part: and apparently the ج is aug. in all those [words]; for its augmentativeness, notwithstanding the rarity thereof, is conclusively established, as in عبد زيد and جمث [above], i.e. عبد and دمث: whereas جمث and دمث are not like that, since augmentativeness of the ج is not established so that we are driven to judging it to be جمث. (R).
§. 681. A. Whatever is free from these restrictions [672-681] is judged to be *rad.*, unless some proof of augmentativeness exists, for which reason (1) the ḍālāmīṣ [672], the م of إِحْبَنُتْا [676] and إِبْنِم [677] and ٍسْبَبِلْears [of corn], the ٍك of مَلْكَرُت [678], and the َس of تَمُوس [680], are judged to be *aug.*, because of their elision in *شَمَوْل* [inf. n. of شَمُْل بَلْيَتْ أَلِيمَ (Tsr)] and ٌحَبُط [with two Fathas, *swelling of the belly* (Tsr)], َعْفَر [678] and مَلْك [667] بَنَّوَة, *glittering* and َكَلاَة*antiquity* and *طَلَّة* *obedience*, and in their sayings [677] when they have been harmed by eating colocyinth and َعْبَسُل بَلْيَت أَلِيمَ The corn put forth ears: (2) the ن of ٌحَتْبَر [677] and ٌحَتْبَر [with Damm of the ٍ, the name of a herb (401) (Tsr)], and the َل of ٍتَنْضَب [678] and َتْحَبَبِب (Aud) with Damm of the َل and َخ, [or Fath of the latter (KF) ُ and Kasr, [with doubling (Tsr).] of the َي (KF, Tsr), upon the measure of َفُقَلْل, with Damm of the َل and َف, [or َفُقَلْل with Fath of the َف, and Kasr, [with doubling,] of the َع (Jh), diptote [because of the verbal measure combined with the quality of
proper name] (Jh, KF), i. q. ٠ُبَاطِلٍ (Jh, Ts.;), as they fell into the valley of Disappointment, i. e., ٠ُبَاطِلٍ فِي زَادٍتْ تُحَفَٰثُ They fell into the valley of Disappointment, i. e., ٠ُبَاطِلٍ فِي زَادٍتْ فِي [بَاطِلٍ into a vain, futile state (Tsr), [or] meaning ٠ُبَاطِلٍ فِي فِي ٠ُبَاطِلٍ into the vain, etc. (KF)—so says Ks (Jh, Tsr)—are judged to be aug. (Tsr), because of the non-existence of ٠ُعَلِّلُ [392], ٠ُعَلِّلُ [with ٠ُذَاءٍ of its first, ٠ُذَاءٍ of its third, and ٠ُذَاءٍ of its fourth (401) (Tsr)], ٠ُعَلِّلُ [392], and ٠ُعَلِّلُ (Aud), with ٠ُذَاءٍ of its first and second, [or ٠ُذَاءٍ of the latter,] and ٠ُذَاءٍ, with doubling, of its third. But it is said that the mention of this ٠ُحَفَٰثُ requires consideration, because it is transferred from the v. [4], like ٠ُعَلِّمُ It was learnt [or ٠ُعَلِّمُ Thou teachest]: they distinctly declare that, and [therefore] they decline it as a diptote (Tsr).
CHAPTER IX.

THE SUBSTITUTION OF LETTERS.

§. 682. Substitution occurs in the three kinds [625], as [690], and [683] (M). IH says in the SH (KIF), Substitution [in conventional language (Tsr, Sn)] is putting a letter in the place of another letter (SH, Tsr, Sn, KIF), unrestrictedly (Tsr, Sn). By "substitution" the substitution arising with incorporation [735] is not meant, but only substitution without incorporation (IY): and [therefore the author of the KIF says that by "putting a letter"] IH means putting one of the [fourteen] letters of substitution, vid. the letters of [the mnemonic phrase] أَنْصَبَتْ يَوْمَ جَمِيدٍ طَالِبًا [below]; so that such as إِعْلَمْ [below], orig. إِعْلَمْ, [below], the [second] ب being put in place of the ت because of the intention to incorporate [756], is not adducible as an objection; for that is not named "substitution", since the ب is not one of the letters of substitution (KIF). The restriction "in the place" excludes compensation, which is [put] in another place than that of the original, like the ب of مَكَّة Script] [below] (Tsr, Sn). IH's saying "another" is a corroboration [or rather qualification] of his saying "letter",
in order to dispel the notion that the restoration of the 
J in such as إِبْرَيْ (KIF). 
And the restriction "unrestrictedly" excludes conver-
sion [below], which is peculiar to the unsound letters 
[of the Hamza] (Tsr, Sn). But Syt says in the IKn, 
in the [fifty-eighth (IKn)] section on the Novelties of 
of the Kur'ān (KIF), Substitution is putting one of the 
letters in the place of another: and IF holds 
فاَتْنَفَلَقَ 
XXVI. 63. Then it was divided to be an instance of it, 
i. e., فَنُكَانُ قَلْ بَرْتَي 
XXVI. 63. And each division was is said, the ر and ل being 
interchangeable (IKn)]; and it is transmitted from Khl 
that, in فَتَجَاسَسُوا خَلَالِ اَلْدِيْنَار 
XVII. 5. And they ransack-
ed the interiors of the houses, فَتَجَاسَسْوا 
is meant, the 
being put in the place of the ح 
(by Ṭalḥa (K)]; while F holds أَحْبَبْتُ حَبْبَكَ الْخَيْرِ 
XXXVIII. 31. have preferred the love of horses 
[508], i. e., اَلْخَيْل ، and AU holds لَا مَكَأ رَتْصِدِبَةٌ 
VIII. 35. Save whistling and clapping of hands [685], i. e., 
[رَتْصِدِبَةٌ , org.] 
, the [second] د being changed into 
(KF), to be an instance of it (IKn, KIF). And this 
sense [of substitution] is not identical with, but is ap-
proximate to, the sense mentioned by IH, because here, 
as will not escape notice, there is no stipulation that the 
substituted letter should be one of the [fourteen] letters 
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of substitution (KIF). Substitution is [said by IY to be] of two kinds, (1) putting a letter in the place of another letter, as in the [689]: (2) conversion [above], in the sense of transmutation, of the letter itself into the form of another [letter]: (a) this is [found] only in the unsound letters, vid. the ﯽ, ﯭ, and ﯧ [697]; and in the Hamza [658] also, because of its approximation to them, and the frequency of its alteration: (b) that is [exemplified in] such as (a) قَامُ, orig. قَوْمُ, the ı being a in the o. f. [684]; (b) مُسْرِيِّمُ, [the and in] which is orig. ﯽ [686]; (c) رَاسُ, and ﯬ, the ı being orig. Hamza, the rising [658] of which is softened, so that it is transmuted into ı [684]. Thus every conversion is a substitution; but every substitution is not a conversion (IY). IM [also] means by "substitution" what includes conversion, since each of them is an alteration [put] in the position [of the altered letter]; except that substitution [in the peculiar, real sense (Sn)] is removal, while conversion is transmutation: and hence conversion is peculiar to the unsound letters and the Hamza; while substitution is not peculiar, as you will see. But compensation differs from both of them, because (1) it is [put] in a place other than that of the original, like the ﯾ of ﯦ[699], the Hamza of ﯦ[667], and the [second] ﯽ of ﯦ[283, 284]: (2) it is [given] for (a) a consonant, as mentioned; (b) a vowel,
like the س of أسْطَّاع [680], as before explained (A). The first letter, i. e., the one in whose place another is put, is named "original"; while the second letter, i. e., the one that is put in the place of another, is named "substituted" and "substitute" [278] (KIF). The letters substituted for others are of four kinds, (1) what is commonly substituted for the sake of incorporation [735], vid. all the letters, except the ل [739]: (2) what is extraordinarily substituted, vid. six [or rather seven] letters [below], i. e., the خ, the خ, the غ, the ق, the ض, [the ط,] and the ذ, as in رُبُغ for young camel brought forth in autumn [696 A]; أُخُن for أَخَن [696 A]; رَقْنَة for رَقَنَة [696 A]; خَطَّر for خَطَّر [696 A]; لْكَنَّة [699 A], which is the nest of the sand-grouse in the mountain; جُمَّد for جَمَّد [696 A]; and تَلْعَدَم for تَلْعَدَم delayed [696 A]: (3) what is commonly substituted otherwise than for the sake of incorporation, which is of two kinds, (a) what is unnecessary in etymology, vid. twenty-two letters, combined in the spelling of your [mnemonic] phrase لِجَبِيِّ صَرُّف شَكِّيس آميِطِي طَلَى [below]; (b) what is necessary in etymology, vid. nine [letters], combined in the spelling of your [mnemonic] phrase هَدْفُ مُرْطِبَا [below], i. e., the ض, the ح, the Hamza, the و, the م, the د, the ط, the قد, and the ل (Tsr). The object of [IM in] this chapter is
to explain the letters that one commonly [below] substituted for others [in etymology (Sn)] otherwise than for the sake of incorporation. The incorporative substitution is not considered in this chapter, because it is [found] in all the letters of the alphabet, except the ی, as, for that [reason], the reduplicative مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی was still, finding [the camel-saddle (IA)] مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی easy to ride upon [above] (IM), مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی meaning مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی while مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی is [an act. part. (IA, Tsr)] مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی, except that its Hamza is alleviated by being changed into ی, because pronounced with Fath, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [658] (IA, Tsr). As for the letters other than these [nine], their substitution for others is anomalous or rare; so that IM does not advert to it (IA). By “common” are excluded (1) the anomalous substitution, like the substitution of the ل for (a) the مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی أَصِيَّلَان — an irregular مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی dim. of مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی [285, 286], like مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی مَغْرِب of مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی [286] — in مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی [691]; (b) the مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی مَغْرِب of مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی مَغْرِب [647, 691]: (2) the rare, like the substitution of the ج for the double ی in pause, as مَوْطِيَّا اَي ی حَلَّى
and sometimes (a) without pause, as in لَآَهِمُ إِنَّ أَلَمْ [694] for ويَلُ [694] [the mountain-goat (Sn)]; (b) without doubling, as in لَآَهِمُ إِنَّ أَلَمْ [694] (A). IM's mention of the ٓ [in the Alfiya (Tsr) is an addition to what is [mentioned by him] in the Tashil, where he combines the letters of substitution in طَمِّيْتُ دَأْنِبَا I was hungry continually [below] (Aud, A), which is open to criticism in three respects, (1) omission of the ٓ, as has been mentioned; (2) repetition of the ٓ; (3) making the pret. govern ٌدَأْنِبَا, which is like أَبَدَا for ever [206]: so says IHsh in the Glosses (Tsr). Moreover, [when IM mentions the ٓ (Tsr),] he does not discourse upon it here, notwithstanding his reckoning it, the reason being that its substitution [for the ت (A)] is regular only in pause upon such as ٍرَحْمَة and ٍنَعْمَة [638, 690], which is mentioned in the chapter on Pause [646]; while its substitution for any [letter] other than the ت is confined to hearsay, as in their saying إِيَّاَن (Tsr), أَرْقَتْ لَأَنَّكْ (Tsr), لَهَنِدْ تَآَيْمُ (Tsr), لَأَنَّكْ (Tsr), لأَرْقَتْ لَأَنَّكْ (Tsr), and أَرْقَتْ لَأَنَّكْ (Tsr), (Aud, A) for أَرْقُتْ لَأَنَّكْ [690], in all of which they substitute the ٓ for the Hamza because of the agreement of the two [letters] in outlet, since both are from the farthest [part] of the throat [658, 732] (Tsr). IM mentions in the Tashil that the letters of the [non-incorporative]
common substitution, meaning [common] in the speech of [all, or a body, of (Sn)] the Arabs, are twenty-two, these nine before mentioned being the letters of the [non-incorporative] substitution [common in etymology, which is the substitution (Sn) described in the Tsr above, and the Tashil below, as] necessary in etymology. For he says "The letters of the non-incorporative common substitution are combined by your [mnemonic] phrase لَعْجِدُ ِّمُّرُبُّ ُثُكَّمِنَا ُطَلِّيُّ ثُمَُّرِبُّ ُمُرُبُّ For seriousness is a hand-natured confident man's turning the fold of the garment of his dignity [above]; and [the letters] of the [non-incorporative substitution] necessary in etymology by the spelling of طَيْبُ دَأْمَنًا" [above]. This is his language, which implies that the remaining [seven] letters [above] of the alphabet, vid. the ح, the خ, the ذ, the ط, the ض, the غ, and the ق, [all dotted, except the first, which is undotted (Sn),] are sometimes substituted by way of anomaly [696 A]: and IJ says on the reading of AlA'mash [or, as Z says in the K, of Ibn Mas'ud] نَشْرُ الْبَحْمُ VIII. 59. Then terrify thou, by them [696 A], with the dotted ذ, that the ئ is a subst. for the د, as they say لَحْمُ خَرَادِلٌ meat cut up small for خَرَادِلٌ خَرَادِلٌ [in the KF خَرَادِلٌ (Sn)]; the idea connecting the د and ذ being that they are vocal [734], and approximate [in
outlet (732)]; while Z explains the reading as a transposition by putting the ل before the ﻋ, [in the sense of ٓعَرْقِيَ. Then scatter thou (K), as though it were a transposed form of ٓشَرْبَر (K, B),] from their saying ٓشَرْبَر مِّدَر [211] (A), a comp. meaning in every direction (Sn). It implies also that the above-mentioned substitution of the ٰل for the ٰن and ٰض, and of the ٰج for the ٰي, and similarly the substitution of the ٰن for the ٰل [688], like their saying ٰٓرَّلَلْ رَحْنَى for ٰرَّلَلْ رَحْنَى, which is the long-tailed horse, and for the ٰم, like their saying ٰاَمُّرَتْ ٰاَلْشَّاَةٍ ٰتَغْرَرْتُ for ٰاَمُّرَتْ ٰاَلْشَّاَةٍ ٰتَغْرَرْتُ. The sheep gave its milk red, when its milk comes forth red, like ٰمُّرَّتْ red ochre, are instances of the [substitution] common (A) in the speech of the Arabs, even though only a body of them (Sn). But that [substitution of the ٰل for the ٰن, and what follows it (Sn),] ought not [in every case] to be named “common”, the common being [only] what is regular, or frequent in some dial., like (1) the ٓعَجَعْسَجَةٌ, [i. e., the substitution of the ٰج for the ٰى (Sn),] in the dial. of ٰكُدَاءٰٰ [694]: (2, 3) the ٓعَنَعْسَةٌ, [i. e., the substitution of the ٰع for the ٰس (Sn),] as in their saying ٰطَمْتَ ٰعَنَكَ ٰذَلَعْبٓ I thought that thou wast going, i. e., ٰأَتَّكَ [527, 580]; and the ٰكَشْكَشْةٌ [below], as in their saying, when addressing a female, ٰمَا أَلْدَي ٰجَاءِ ٰيِنْش What is that which has
brought thee?, meaning 

اقعد ربى تختش سرياً XIX. 24. God hath made below thee a rivulet [617]: [both of which substitutions are] in the dial. of Tamim, [this clause referring to the عتنعة also, as is proved by the language of the CK to be shortly cited (Sn)]: (4) the كَسْكَسَة in the dial. of Bakr, as in their saying, when addressing a female, أبوه thy father and أمه thy mother, meaning أبوك and أمك [617, 680]. And, says IM in the CK; [even] this sort of substitution, [meaning the عُصْيَت and what follows it (Sn),] is fit to be mentioned [only] in books of lexicology, not in books of etymology, otherwise the ع would have to be mentioned, because its substitution for the mobile Hamza is regular in the dial. of Tamim, that being named عتنعة; and the ل also would have to be mentioned, because its substitution for the pron. is regular, as in يَا أَبَيْنُ الْرَبِّيْرِ الْهَب [129, 169, 696 A], meaning عَصِيَت. while the exs. of this [sort of substitution], among the letters substituted for others, are many: but in etymological substitution only that [substitution] ought to be reckoned whose omission would occasion error, as in your saying مَالُ for مال [278, 683, 703] (A), because the, must be converted into | [684] (Sn); or difference from the most frequent [formation],
as in your saying سَقَاهُ for سَقَاهُةُ [683] (A) fem. of سَقَاهُةُ [282] (Sn). This is his language. Many of the Etymologists reckon the letters of substitution [more general than the necessary (Sn)] as twelve, which they combine in many [mnemonic] phrases, whence طَالِ يَوَمٍ أَنْجَدَتُهُ He bestowed benefits on the day I succoured him (A), with the adv. pre. to the prop. [124] (Sn). Some drop the J [691], reckoning them as eleven, which they combine in the phrase أَجِدَ طَوْبَتُ مِنْهَا Do well (mayst thou be destroyed for it!) [below] (A), where أَجِدَ is an imp. v. from إِجَادَةُ (Sn). And some add the ص and ز, reckoning them as fourteen, which they combine in the phrase أَنْصَتْ يَوُمٍ زَلَّ طَالِ جُدُّ A grandfather was silent on the day a cook slipped (A), where زَلَّ, act. part. of طَالَ, aor. يَطَالُ, i. q. طَبَحُ, is ag. of زَلَّ; while جُدُّ is ag. of أَنْصَتْ (Sn). The letters of substitution, [i. e., that are sometimes substituted for others (R)], are [fourteen, which are combined in their phrase (Jrb) أَنْصَتْ يَوُمٍ جُدُّ طَالِ زَلَّ [above] (SH) Be silent on the day the grandfather of Tāh, a [proper (Jrb)] name [of a man (MAR)], has slipped (Jrb, MAR), i. e., on this day (Jrb). And [A asserts that] Z reckons them as thirteen, which he combines in إِسْتَنْجَدَةٍ يَوُمَ طَالَ He asked him for succour
on the day he bestowed benefits [below]. But this [combination], says IH, [who calls it "the phrase of one of them," without specifying Z,] is erroneous, because it drops the ص and ز [695, 696], which are letters of substitution, as in ضاقط for road and صقر hawk; and adds the س [696A], which is not a letter of substitution. For, if more be adduced [by way of exemplifying the occurrence of the س as a subst. (Sn)], then [below] and إطلم [above] are adducible, because إستع [696A] belongs to the cat. of [substitution for the sake of (Sn)] incorporation] [756], not to the cat. of substitution stripped (A) of incorporation (Sn). This is the language of IH [in the SH, with some explanatory modifications and additions by A and Sn]; but I say that the GG allow إستخض to be orig. إستخض [696 A, 759]; so that they substitute the س for the first ت, as they substitute the ت for the [second] س in سست، orig. سستش [689, 758]; and perhaps, therefore, Z takes that into consideration (A). [R, like A, asserts that] إستنجدت [above] is the phrase of [Z,] the author of the م (R): but, according to what Z [really] mentions [in the م] (H), the letters of substitution are (M, H) fifteen (H), the [ten] letters of augmentation [671], and the ط, the د, the ج, the ص and the ز (M).
which are combined by your phrase اَسْتَنِجّدَهُ یَرَمُّ صَالِرٌ رَثْأٌ. He asked him for succour on the day some Zu'll [a race of Hindus, arabicized form of جَثَت with Fath (KF),] attacked (M, H). As for the restriction of the letters of substitution within the number mentioned by Z, what is meant [by it] is the letters that are often substituted, and that are strong in, and notorious for, that (IY). According to what S mentions, [which is adopted by IJ (B on II. 1.),] they are eleven letters (B, A) eight letters of augmentation [671], vid. all but the ج and س: and three others, vid. the د, the ط, and the ج (A): which are combined by أَجْدَدُ طَرَیْتَ مِنْهَا [above]. And some add seven others, vid. the ل in أَصْبَلَنَّ [above], the ب in أَجْدَفَ [695] and ز in زِرَاطْ [above], the ف in [below]; the ع in عِنْ [580], the ت in تُوْرَعُ الدّلَوْرُ [below], and the ب in بَا آَسْمَكْ [696A]; so that they become eighteen (B). But the first opinion, vid. that of S, is the well-known one (IY). S does not reckon the س and ز [above] in the chapter on Substitution, but Sf reckons them at the end of [his commentary on] the Book. And with them he reckons the ش of the كُشْكُشْة [above], which is a subst. for the ل of the fem. [696A], as in تَضْحَكُ مَنْى آلْع [617]: but, as for that which is added after the ل of the fem. as in أَکْرَمْتُكْ [617, 671], it does not belong to this [cut., being an addition, not a
substitution]. And S does not reckon the س [above], as Z reckons it. They say that the ت occurs as a subst. [696A]: F transmits, on the authority of Ya‘kūb, فَرَغَ الْدِّمْلُ the outlets for the water between the cross-pieces of the leathern bucket [above] for فَرَغْهَا which is from تقْرِيب emptying. And similarly the ب: F transmits, on the authority of As, مَا أَسْلَك [696A], i.e., What is thy name? (R): [while] مَكْكَة Makka and بَكْكَة Bakka are two dial. vars. for the proper name of the Sacred City, like their saying آلُ النُّبيّط AnNubait and آلُ النُّبيّط AnNumait for the name of a place in AdDahna; and similar instances of interchangeability are زَاتُم أَمْرٌ رَأَب an established matter and [B on III. 90], and حُنَى مُغْبِطَة continual fever and مُغْبِطَة (K on III. 90). The ح [696A] occurs anomalously, in poetry, as a subst. for the خ: the poet says, [describing the beauty of the women by the brilliance of their faces (MAR).]

يَنْفَضُّ مِنْهَا كَلِثْباً مَنْفِرَحاً * لَمْ يُرِيَ لَا ذَاكِيًا مَقْدُروحاَ [They blow from it (the face) a flame blown, a gleam that is seen to be not blazing, nor struck from a flint, orig. مَنْفِرَحا (MAR)]; and Ru’ba says

غَمَّرَ الْأَلْجَارِيٰ كَرَيْمٌ أَسْتَعْ [أَبْلَجَ لَمْ يُولِدَ بِنْجَمٍ أَلْشَعَ (R) Liberal in his ways, noble in origin; having a
wide space between the eyebrows, not born at the rising of the star of niggardliness, where he changes the of سُنُح for the exigency of the rhyme (MAR). The ب occurs anomalously as a subst. for the ج, as in نُنَتْلَة and نُنَتُرَة for a coat of mail [696A], because they say نُنَلََّ عَلَيْهِ دُرَّة He put on him his coat of mail, not نُنَرَا; so that the ج, being more generally employed, is the original. The ف is a subst. for the ث:

F transmits, on the authority of Ya‘kūb, قَامَ رَيْبَنْ فِمَ عَبُور Zaid stood, and afterwards 'Amr [696A], i. e., ثُمَّ عَبُور [540]; and they say جَدَفُ and جَذَفُ [540], the ف being a subst., because they say أَجْدَاقُ graves [below], but not أَجْدَافُ [above] (R); [though] Fr says that the Arabs make the ف and ث interchangeable in the language, saying جَذَفُ and جَذَفُ, pl. أَجْدَاقُ and أَجْدَافُ (Jh). The ل occurs as a subst. for (1) the ن, as عَرَبِيُّ فَخْعَأ a pure Arab and كُ الصَّحَاحُ [696A], pl. آَكْصَاحُ, but not آَكْصَاحُ; (2) the ث, as يَا آبِنُ أَلْزِبْيَرُ أَلْحَمْ [above]; though this may be a putting of the acc. pron. in place of the nom. [169]. And the أ in [the dial. of (MAR)] Tamīm is a subst. for the Hamza in [كُن orig. (MAR)] أَنْ [508], which is the عَنْتَعَنَة [above] of Tamīm: the poet says أَعْمَنْ قَرْسَبْتُ اللَّه [580, 683] (R); and they say
that Zaid is standing for [696A],
and recite

فَعِينَاكِ عَينَاهَا وَجَدْكِ جَدَّهَا
سَوَى عَنْ عَظْمٍ آسَانِي مَنْكِ دَقِيقٍ

[617] except that the bonc etc. (IX). And it is only because these things are rare and anomalous that IH does not mention them. As for the [original] letters, for which these letters are substituted, they will be mentioned in the [subsequent] analysis [683-696A] (R). Substitution is recognizable by reversion to the original in some of the variations [of the word containing the subst. (Sn)], (1) invariably, as in جَدَّ [above], because in the pl. they say أَجَدَّ [above] with the ت only: (2) prevalently, as in أَنْفَلَت [below], i.e., أَنْفَلَت saved, where the ط is a subst. for the ت, because the ت is more prevalently used in it; and similarly in أَنْفَلَت [below] for أَنْفَلَت thief, robber [689], the ت being a subst. for the س, because its pl. أَنْفَرُ is more frequent than أَنْفَرُ (A): (a) the exemplification of the second [case], vid. reversion prevalently, by أَنْفَلَت [above] is not correct, because the prevalence of reversion to the ت is in أَنْفَلَت itself, which is more used with the ت than with the ط; not in its variations, like أَنْفَلَت saving, أَنْفَلَت saved, and
and [act of] saving, because the ٌّ, as Dm says, is
inseparable from its variations: so that A ought to
exemplify the first [case] by it also, and to confine
himself to such as لَصَـت in exemplifying the second: (b)
لُصَـت with Kasr of the ج is chaster than [ لُصَـت with]
Damm or Fath; but لَصَـت [above] is with Fath of the ج :
that is transcribed by SBd from the commentary [of
Jrb] on the SH [689] (Sn). And, if that [reversion,
invariably or prevalently (Sn),] be not established in the
case of a biform [expression (Sn)], then the latter is
from two ٌّ fs., as أَرْخ and أَرَخ dated, and أَرْخ and أَرَخ
corroborated, because all the variations occur with both
[letters], so that one [letter] is not a subst. for the other
(A). The subst. is [said by IH to be (A)] recognizable
(1) by [the multitude of (A) the paradigms of (SH, Sn)]
its derivation, [i. e., by the multitude of paradigms
coinciding in derivation with the expression that con-
tains the subst., but containing the original letter, for
which it is substituted (Sn),] as in تُرَف in inheritance,
heritage [689] (SH, A), i. e., property inherited (Jrb,
Sn), since “the paradigms of its derivation” are كَرَت
he inherited, [ كَرَت he inherits (482, 700) (R),] كَرَت
heir, [and (A)] كَرَت inherited (R, A), all of which
are derived from كَرَت inheriting, as كَرَت is derived from
it (R); and similarly (R)] in ٌْاُجِةَ [ٌ٠٨٣٠ (SH), pl. of ٌْاُجِةَ face (Jrb), since ٌْاُجِةَ betaking oneself, ٌْاُجِةَ facing, and ٌْاُجِةَ worthy of regard are derived from ٌْاُجِةَ, from which ٌْاُجِةَ is derived (R): (a) ٌْاُجِةَ [above], ٌْاُجِةَ, and ٌْاُجِةَ, and similarly ٌْاُجِةَ, ٌْاُجِةَ, and ٌْاُجِةَ indicate that the o.f. of ٌْاُجِةَ is ٌْاُجِةَ; and similarly ٌْاُجِةَ, ٌْاُجِةَ, and ٌْاُجِةَ indicate that the Hamza in ٌْاُجِةَ is a subst. for ٌاُجِةَ (Jrb): for, when, in place of one letter is an expression, all "the paradigms of its derivation." contain another letter, you recognize that the letter in it is a subst. for what is found in place thereof in "the paradigms of its derivation" (R): (2) by the paucity of its usage, [i.e., of the usage of the expression containing the subst. (R, Sn),] as in ٌْاُجِةَ (SH, A) for ٌْاُجِةَ the foxes, and ٌْاُجِةَ the hares; while S cites ٌْاُجِةَ لَعِيْبَ٤ اَلْهَبَى ٌاُجِةَ اَلْمَرْأَبَى [ٌ٠٨٥٠ (A): for, being more used than ٌْاُجِةَ التَّعَلَّاَبُ ب (Jrb): (a) IH means that, when there are two synonymous expressions, between which there is no difference in form, except for a letter in one of them, which may be a subst. for the letter [similarly situated] in the other, then, if one of the two expressions be less used than the other, that letter in that less used [expression] is a subst. for the letter similarly situated in the more used, as
and the "ثَعَالِب" [above], which are synonymous, while the first is less used than the second (R): (b) the substitution in "ثَعَالٍ" is recognizable by "the paradigms of its derivation" [above] also, because "ثَعَالٍ" is pl. of "ثَعَلَب" (Jrb): (c) IJ says "And "ثَعَالٍ" may be pl. of "ثَعَالٍ" [7], being [orig. "ثَعَالٍ", but (Sn)] transposed [by putting the ل before the Hamza (Sn)]; so that it is like شَرَّافْثَعَالٍ شَرَّامَى statutes, ordinances, [except that the Hamza, when postponed from its place, is changed into ى for alleviation (Sn)]: but what S says is more appropriate, in order that "ثَعَالٍ" may be like أرْنِيَهَا [in the verse]; and also because "ثَعَالٍ" is a generic n., and the pl. of generic ns. is of weak authority," where by "generic n." he means generic proper name (A), and by "generic ns." generic proper names (Sn): (3) by the fact that it, [i.e., expression (R, Jrb, Sn) containing the subst. (Sn),] is a deriv. [of another expression (R, Jrb, Sn)], while the [original (R, Sn)] letter is an aug. [in the o. f. (Jrb), like the ١ of ضَارِب (R), in which case the letter in the deriv. corresponding to the aug. letter in the o. f. is a subst. for it (Jrb)], as in ضَوْرِب [686] (SH, A), dim. of ضَوْرِب [273]; for, since the o. f., [vid. the
non-dim. (Sn),] is known, this is known to be substituted for the \textcolor{red}{l} (A): (4) by the fact that it, [i.e., the expression (R, Jrb, Sn) containing the original letter (Sn),] is a deriv., while it, [i.e., the original letter (R, Sn),] is a rad. [in the deriv. (Jrb), like the \textcolor{red}{s} and \textcolor{red}{d} of 
\textcolor{red}{مَرَيْه} (R), in which case the letter corresponding to it in the o.f., is a subst. for it (Jrb)], as in \textcolor{red}{مَرَيْه} \textcolor{red}{[275]} (SH, A), which is [a deriv., because it is (Jrb)] the dim. of \textcolor{red}{سَمِّ} \textcolor{red}{[683]}; for, since the dim. is \textcolor{red}{مَرَيْه} [with the \textcolor{red}{s} (Jrb)], it is known that [the s is original, because the formation of the dim. restores things to their o.f. (278, 282); so that (Jrb)] the Hamza [of \textcolor{red}{سَمِّ} (Jrb)] is a subst. for the \textcolor{red}{s} (Jrb, A): (a) IH's sayings "by the fact that etc." [in cases 3 and 4 above] mean by the fact that one expression is a deriv. of another, as the dim. is a deriv. of the non-dim. \textcolor{red}{[274]}; while, in the place of a letter in the o.f., the deriv. contains a letter, which can be a subst. for the letter in the o.f., as the \textcolor{red}{ضَرِب} is a subst. for the \textcolor{red}{l} of \textcolor{red}{صَارِب}; or for which the letter in the o.f. can be a subst., as the \textcolor{red}{l} and Hamza of \textcolor{red}{سَمِّ} are subs. for the \textcolor{red}{s}, and \textcolor{red}{d}, respectively, of \textcolor{red}{مَرَيْه}: (b) by the fact, however, that one expression is a deriv. of another, while a letter in one of them differs from the [corresponding] letter in the other, you recognize only that one [letter] is a subst. for the other; but do not recognize which of them is a subst. for the other, the
recognition of that being dependent upon another thing, which is this:—you look at the deriv. and then, if the motive for substitution in the o.f. be removed in the deriv., as the cause of conversion [684] of the, into 1 [in َمَّ] is removed in ُمَّةٍ by the preceding letter's being pronounced with Damm, and [as] the cause of conversion [683] of the s into Hamza-[ii َمَّ], vid. the occurrence of the s, which is a quasi-unsound letter, after the l, which is quasi-augmentative, [is removed in ُمَّةٍ by the disappearance of the l,] you recognize that the letter in the deriv. is original; but, if a cause of substitution, not [found] in the original, supervene in the deriv., as the cause of conversion [686] of the l in ُضَّرَبٍ into ّضَرَّبٍ, supervenes in ُضَّرَّبٍ by reason of the s being pronounced with Damm, you recognize that the letter in the deriv. is a subst.: (c) there is no doubt as to the obscurity of IH's expressions here (R): (5) by the fact that an unknown formation would be entailed (SH, A), if you did not judge a [particular] letter in a word to be a subst. for another (R), as in (a) ُكَرَاقٍ [690] (SH, A), which is [judged to be (A)] orig. ُأَرَاقٍ (Jrb, A), since, if it were not so, its measure would necessarily be ُهُمْعَل, which is an unknown formation (A), not recognized among the measures (Sn), because there is no ُهُمْعَل [482] (Jrb); (b) ُصَطِبَرٍ [692] (SH), which is
because there is no \( \text{i\-\ء\-ك} \) (Jrb); this is \( \text{ن\-ك} \), its \( \text{ت} \) being changed into \( \text{ت} \) because of the intention to incorporate, and the conj. Hamza put because of the impossibility of beginning with a quiescent, that being predicated because there is no \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \) (MASH),] or \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \) (Jrb); (α) this [argument that such formations are unknown] is true of \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \) and \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \), but not of \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \) and \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \), because in every v. of the two formations, \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \) and \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \), when the \( \text{ف} \) of the first is a letter of covering [734], and the \( \text{ف} \) of the second is a \( \text{ت} \), \( \text{د} \), etc. [757], the \( \text{ف} \) of the first must be followed by a \( \text{ط} \) [756], and the \( \text{ف} \) of the second may have the preceding letter incorporated into it; so that these two are regular, not unknown, formations: (β) you recognize the two letters in these two formations to be substs. by the fact that the \( \text{ط} \) does not occur in place of the \( \text{ت} \) of \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \) except when preceded by a letter of covering [692, 756]; while, the \( \text{ط} \) being akin to the \( \text{ت} \) in outlet [732], and to the preceding letter of covering in covering [734], the substitution of the \( \text{ط} \) for the \( \text{ت} \) is a probable supposition, because of the heaviness of the \( \text{ت} \) after the letter of covering, and the affinity of the \( \text{ط} \) to the letter of covering and to the \( \text{ت} \): and the incorporated letter, as in \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \) [above] and \( \text{إ\-ن\-ك} \) [757], may be similarly accounted
for (R). Substitution is [employed] (1) for the sake of lightening [the pronunciation of the word]: (2) because of the conformity of the letters, and their approximation in (a) outlet [732]; (b) qualities, like vocality, surdity, etc. [734] (Jrb).

§. 683. The Hamza is substituted for (M, SH, A) seven letters (A), (1—3) the letters of softness [663, 697, 734] (M, SH), vid. the ٩, ٠, and ی (IY, A); (4) the ٧; (5) the َ (M, SH, A); (6) the ُٛ; (7) the ُ (A).

Its substitution for the letters of softness is of two kinds, regular and irregular. And the regular is of two kinds, necessary and allowable (M, Jrb). As for the necessary, it is [found] in (1) the ی, as َ and َ َ [328, 723]; (2) the ُ, as ﺑَذْٔ and َ َ [708]; (3) the َ, as َ َ[below]. And, since alteration is more appropriate in the final [than in the medial or initial], what has the substitution in its ی is put by IH [and others] before what has it in its ُ, and what has it in its ُ before what has it in its َ (Jrb). The Hamza is [necessarily (A, Tsr)] substituted for the ٠ and ی in four cases, (1) where the ٠ or ی is final, [whether a ی or a co-ordinative aug. (Tsr, Sn),] after an aug. ٩, [whether the initial of its word be pronounced with Kasr, Fath, or Damm (Tsr, Sn)—so in the Tsr (Sn),] as َ َ [above], َ سَا [246], and َ دُمَا prayer, [where the
Hamza is substituted for a, the o. f. being گسارد، ٌسارد، and دُغَار (Tsr); and as یٌبٌ، gazelles [237, 260] (Aud. A), and ٌیٌبنٌ, evanescence (Aud) and ٌقِئٌس, decree (A), where the Hamza is substituted for a م, the o. f. being ٌتٌنٌ، ٌطبٌَ، ٌبنٌاءٌ, and ٌقِصٌأٌ, [and ٌقِصٌأٌ] (Tsr); and, [says Kh in the Tsr (Sn),] as ٌلٌعٌبٌ and ٌتٌعٌبٌ [248], where the Hamza is substituted for a م added for co-ordination with ٌتنٌس, قِئٌس and ٌتنٌس, قِئٌس [273] (Tsr, Sn): contrary to such as (a) كَأرُل, conversed with [708] and ٌبٌعٌ trafficked with [686] (Aud, A), ٌتٌعٌز, helped one another and ٌتٌبٌٌ became separated (A), ٌداٌرزٌ and ٌهٌدٌاٌة [below] (Tsr), for want of finality (A), because the و and ي occur as an ع (Tsr, Sn) in the first two [exs., as also in the next two]; while the last two words are formed with the [inseparable] ل of feminization [266], contrary to the adventitious [ ل of] feminization, which does not prevent substitution, as مٌبنٌاءٌ, fem. of مٌبنٌ maker [below] (Tsr): (b) طٌبٌّ and طٌبٌّ [643, 719] (Aud, A), for want of the ٌ (A, Tsr): (c) ٌذٌزٌ [below] (Aud, A), the name of the [particular (Sn)] letter (Tsr, Sn), and ٌنٌ [below] (Aud, A), pl. of ٌنٌزٌ [684] (Tsr, Sn) ل mark, and a verse of a chapter [in the Kur] (Sn), for want of augmentativeness in the ٌ (A), because the ٌ in both [exs.] is [converted from a (Sn)] ٌأ (A, Tsr), so
that there is no substitution [in the final], otherwise two transformations, [vid. conversion of their ّ into ٍ, and conversion of their ُ into Hamza (Sn),] would occur in succession, which is disallowed (A): (a) as for ٍ ٍ ٍ [723], its measure is ّ ّ ّ with two Fathas: but as to whether its ّ be a ّ or ّ, there are two sayings, the first by F, and the second by Akh [698]; and, according to both sayings, the ّ is converted from a rad.: (b) as for ٍ ٍ ٍ ٍ [302], its o. f. is ّ ّ ّ ّ with two Fathas; but the first is converted into ّ, because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684] (Tsr): (c) the ّ shares with the ّ and ّ in that [predicament; so that, when final after an aug. ّ, it is changed into Hamza (Tsr)], as ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ [273, 385]: for its o. f. is ّ ّ ّ ّ [with an abbreviated ّ (Tsr)], like ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ [250, 272]; but an ّ is added before the final for prolongation, like the ّ of ّ ّ [671, 673] and ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ ّ [369]; and, [two ّs then concurring, which it is not possible to articulate (Tsr).] the second ّ (Tsr) is changed into Hamza (Aud, A), because this is from the same outlet as the ّ [732]; and the vowel [of inflection], which was assumed on the ّ [16], appears on it (Tsr): (d) this substitution is retained in company with the adventitious ّ of feminization, as ّ ّ ّ ّ fem. of ّ ّ ّ [above]: but, if the ّ of feminization be unadventitious, substitution is disallowed, as ّ ّ ّ ّ guidance
enmity, because the word is formed with the [inseparable] ظ, i.e., is not formed [without a ظ (Sn)] as a masc. (A), being either not constituted as a masc. at all, like سَقَاءةِ [above]; or shaped as a masc. in another sense, like سَقَاءةِ [above], since سَقَاءةٌ is the skin of a lamb, or kid, prepared [as a vessel] for [holding] water, or milk (Sn): (c) IM says in the Tashil that the letter of softness is sometimes sounded true, [i.e., retained without conversion (Sn),] with the adventitious, and changed with the inseparable [ظ of feminization], the first as in the prov. إِسْتَقْيِ رَقَّشُ فَانَا سَقَّائِةَ Give water to Rakūsh [a woman's name (Md)], for verily she is a great giver of water, [applied to the beneficent, meaning "Be beneficent to him because of his beneficence" (Jh, Sn),] where, since it is a prov., and provs. are not altered [1], سَقَائِةٌ resembles what is formed with the [inseparable] ظ of feminization; [but this, in my opinion, requires consideration, because it is good as an assignment of the cause for the ظ's being sounded true after this phrase became a prov., not for its being sounded true when this phrase was first spoken (Sn);] while some say ُقَانَهَا سَقَائِةٍ with Hamza, as when not in a prov.: and the second as in سَقَائِةٌ for سَقَائِةٌ [266, 721]: (f) the predicament of the two augments [228] of
the du. is like that of the i of feminization in being accompanied by this substitution, as رَجُلَةٌ and كُسَاءٌ (A); i. e., allowably, which is not incompatible with IM's saying "And such as كُسَاءٍ, عُلْبَاءٍ [are dualized] with a, or Hamza" [230] (Sn); but, if the word be [orig.] formed as a du., substitution is disallowed, as in their saying عُقُلَتُهُ يُثِنَاءِيَّةٍ [228, 230, 721]. (g) it is objected that such a rel. n. [below] as غَارِي, when you curtail it according to the dial. of those who do not understand [the elided letter] as expressed [58], contravenes the rule mentioned [in IM's saying "Then substitute the Hamza for a, and ى, when final after an aug.`"] because constructively "for every, and ى" (Sn): for you say ُنَا غَارُ with Damm of the, without substitution, notwithstanding that it falls within the rule mentioned; the reason that substitution is not employed being that ُنَا has already been transformed by elision of its ج [301], [on account of the ى of relation, as is expressly stated by IUK (Sn),] so that two transformations are not combined in it (A): (h) this objection is not restricted to the "rel. n." [above]: for, when [the voc.] غَارِي, without [the ى of] relation, is [similarly] curtailed, its predicament is like that [of the voc. غَارِي, since here also you say ُنَا غَارُ ]; and hence Syt, when he quotes the language of IUK, omits this
expression ["rel. n."] from it: but the condition of the
curtailment of خَارِيٍّ or خَارِيٍّ is that it should be a proper
name, as is plainly laid down [58]: (i) the objection is
answered by saying that what is mentioned does not
contravene [the rule], because the مُغَارِب is not
'final'; but medial, the elision being accidental (Sn):
(j) [A suggests that,] if IM had put "when a ج" in
place of "when final", saying "when a ج after an aug.
ل", it would have been right (A), because it would have
excluded مُغَارِب, where the ج is an ع: but the expression
"when a ج" is open to the objection that it does not
include such as مُلَبَّى and مُنْبَّأ [above], where the
Hamza is substituted for a ي added for co-ordination;
and therefore IUK says that the rule should be correct-
ed by saying "for a ج or ي that is a ج or co-ordinated
with one": while A's expression "when a ج" and IUK's
correction of the rule are both open to the objection
that they do not include such as خَرَّر [above], where
the Hamza is substituted for the ِ of femininization
(Sn): (k) the manner of this substitution is disputed:—
(α) it is said that the ي and ج are changed into Hamza,
which is apparently the language of IM: (β) critical
judges of etymology say that an ِ is substituted for the
، and ي, and afterwards the ِ is changed into Hamza:
for, when دَانِيٍّ and دَانِيٍّ are said, the ِ and ي are mobile
after a Fatha [684], there being no barrier between them except the \textit{aug.} š, which is not an insuperable barrier, because of its quiescence and augmentativeness; and, in addition to that, they are in the seat of alteration, vid. the end [of the word]; so that they are converted into š, because made to accord with [the \textit{š} and \textit{š} in] the \textit{cat.}
of and \textit{rā.standard} [719]; and, two quiescents then concurring, the second š is converted into Hamza, because this is from the same outlet as the š [732] (A.): the first š not being converted, because its conversion would defeat the object of [putting] it, vid. prolongation; and because alteration is more suitable to finals; and because mobilization of the second results in the appearance of the inflection, by which the distinction between the meanings is produced [19] (Sn): (2) where the \textit{š} or \textit{š} occurs as an ĕ of an \textit{act. part.} from a v. whose ĕ is transformed, [whether the \textit{act. part.} mentioned be, or be not, denuded of the sign of the \textit{fem.}, \textit{du.}, and \textit{pl.} (Sn),] as \textit{qātātul} and \textit{bātiṭul} [above] (Aud, A), which are orig. \textit{qārul} and \textit{bāyīl}; but are [transformed, because (Tsr)] made to accord with the v. (A, Tsr) in transformation (A), though the transformation in them is by conversion of the ĕ into Hamza [below], and in the v. by conversion of it into š (Sn): contrary to such as \textit{ghir} was blind of one eye [684], \textit{act. part.} \textit{ubaar} [708], and \textit{fisn} was large in the eye, \textit{act. part.}
(A), because the ṣ, being sounded true in the n., from fear of confusion with ʿar rendered blind of one eye and ʿan smote with the evil eye, is sounded true in the act. part. [also] (Tsr): (a) this substitution is current in what is on the measure of فاعل or فاعلة when not an act. part., like جآئر [247], which is [spelt with a ج and ز] by Kh, who expounds it as (Sn) a garden, whence

صَعِدةٌ نَافِيَةٌ فِي جَآئِرٍ أَيْنَّا أَلْبَرْعُ نُطَلْهَا تَمِلُّ [419] (A), where it is spelt with a ج and ز [247] by AlʿAinī, who expounds it as a place where water collects (Sn); and like جآئر, which is a piece of timber put in the middle of the roof: but the language of IM here and in the Kāfiya does not include that, [because it has no n., nay, is not really an act. part. (Sn)]; though he notices it in the Tashil (A): (b) Kh says in the Tsr (Sn):—What IM mentions, following others, vid. that the act. part. is subordinate to the n. in transformation and sounding true, is dubious for two reasons, firstly that transformation is sometimes introduced into the act. part., when it has no n. at all, like جآئر [with the ج and ز, which is a garden (Tsr),] and [its fem. (Tsr)] جآئر, which is the piece of timber in the middle of the roof (Tsr)]; for, if they assert that these two are
transferred from act. parts., they multiply transfer in
generic substantives, where it is rare, nay, is said to be
disallowed: and secondly that, according to the sound
[opinion], the qual. is subordinate to the inf. n., not to
the v. [331] (Tsr, Sn): but the answer to the first
[reason] is that the transfer is a necessary inference
[from the formation], while the multiplication is denied;
and to the second is that the subordination of the qual.
to the inf. n., according to the preferable [opinion], is
in respect of derivation, which is not incompatible with
what they say here, vid. that its subordination to the
v. is in respect of transformation and sounding true
(Sn): (c) [the manner of] this substitution also is
disputed:—(a) it is said that the ә, or ә is changed into
Hamza, as IM says (A); but, if A had said, "which is
apparently the language of IM", as he says in the
corresponding passage [of case 1 (k, α)] above, it
would have been better (Sn): (b) the majority say
"Nay, they are converted into ә, [because each of them
is mobile after a Fatha separated (from it) by a not
insuperable barrier (Sn)]; and afterwards the ә is
changed into Hamza, as before mentioned [under case 1
(k, ә)] in connection with ә ә and ә ә; while the
Hamza is pronounced with Kasr, according to the o. f.
of [mobilization in] the concurrence of two quiescents
[664]: (c) Mb says that the ә of ә is inserted before
the converted ٰ in قَالَ and بَأَعَ [684, 703], and their likes; so that, two ٰs then concurring, both of which are quiescent, [the one representing] the ٰ is mobilized, because it is orig. mobile; and the ٰ, when mobilized, becomes a Hamza [below] (A): (d) according to the saying of Mb, then, the ٰ and ٰ are not regarded in the act. part., contrary to their case according to the two previous sayings: this is what appears to me to be the truth; and by it the saying of Mb differs [from what is apparently the language of I.M, as well as] from the saying of the majority (Sn): (e) such [formations] as ُبَايَعْ and ُبَايَعْ are written with the ٰ, according to the predicament of alleviation [by softening the Hamza between pure Hamza and pure ٰ, as is proved by what follows (Sn)], because the rule of the Hamza in those [formations] is to be softened between Hamza and ٰ [658], for which reason it is written as a ٰ: (f) as for changing the Hamza in those [formations] into pure ٰ, they categorically declare it to be a solecism: and so [do they declare] sounding the ٰ true in بَايَع, [i.e., pronouncing it as though it were the rad. (ٰ), not changed from the Hamza, so that this (solecism) is not the same as the preceding (Sn)]; while, if the ٰ might be sounded true in بَايَع, the ٰ might be sounded true in قَايَع، (g) for that reason, [i.e., because the "changing" or "sounding true" mentioned by A is a solecism (Sn),] the
dotting of the ی of قَالَ and بَأَنَّ is disallowed: MM says "The dotting of the ی of قَالَ and بَأَنَّ is vulgar: and", says he, "I have seen in one of IJ's compositions that F entered the presence of one of the so-called learned; and lo, before him was a piece of paper having قَالَ written on it with two dots below [the ی ]: so F said to that Master 'Whose writing is this?', and he said 'My writing'; whereupon F turned to his companion, and said 'We have wasted our steps in visiting his like', and instantly went out" (A): (3) where the ی occurs [in the pl.] after the ی of مَفَاعَلْ [18, 256], while, in the sing., it is an aug. letter of prolongation [third], as [کُبْرُسُ, pl. (Tsr) وَكُبْرُسُ, صَحِيفَةٌ, pl. (Tsr) صَحِيفَةٌ 246, 703, 717]: (a) the ی shares with the ی in this case, as قَلَّةٌ, necklace, collar, pl. قَلَّةٌ, رَسَائِل, and ی 246, 717 (Aud): (b) IM indicates the third [case] by his saying "And the [letter of (Sn)] prolongation", [whether a ی, a ی, or an ی (Sn),] "when an aug. third in the sing., is seen as Hamza in the like of [the pl.] قَلَّةٌ [above]." i.e., The aug. letter of prolongation third [in the sing.] must be changed into Hamza in the pl. on the paradigm of مَفَاعَلْ, as قَلَّةٌ, pl. قَلَّةٌ [above]; عَجِبُزُ, صَحِيفَةٌ, pl. صَحِيفَةٌ; and
(A): (c) that [conversion of such a letter of prolongation into Hamza] is because, when you pluralize مَفَاعِلْ [and رسالةُ (Tsr)] on the paradigm of مَفَاعِلْ, the ٰ of the pl. occurs third, while the ٰ of رسالةُ (Tsr) occurs after it; so that, two ٰs being combined, elision or mobilization of one of them is unavoidable; and, if the first [ٰ (Tsr)] were elided, the indication of the pl. would escape; while, if they elided the second, the formation of the pl. would be altered, because this pl. must have a letter pronounced with Kasr between its ٰ and the letter of [its (Sn)] inflection, in order that the pl. may be like مَفَاعِلْ; so that nothing remains but mobilization of the second [ٰ (Tsr)] with Kasr, in order that it may be like the ُ of مَفَاعِلْ; and the ٰ, when mobilized, is converted into Hamza [below]: while the ٰ and the ُ of صحَّفة [above] are assimilated to the ٰ of رسالةُ (Tsr), because they are preceded by a vowel homogeneous with them, [and are quiescent; so that they are treated (Tsr)] like the ٰ: this is the reason given by IJ: (d) Khl says that the ٰ, ُ, and ِ, are turned into Hamza in صحَّاتَنِف،رسَائِل، and عَجْبَائِرْ، because the letters of softness in these words are not orig. mobile; but are only dead letters, not entered by a vowel: so that, when they occur after
the l, [which, being quiescent, requires to be followed by a mobile,] they are turned into Hamza; and do not appear [in their own form], since they have orig. no vowel (Tsr, Sn): so in the (Tsr): (e) [the preceding exs. are] contrary to [such as (A.)] (a) قَسَّوْرَةٌ [قَسَّوْرَةٌ or قَسَّوْرَةٌ, which is a lion (Tsr, Sn)], pl. قَسَّوْرُ [253, 675] (Aud, A), because the [in the sing.] is not a letter of prolongation (Tsr): (b) [مَعَاشٍ, pl. مَعْاشٍ (A),] [desert, pl. مَعْآذَرٍ (A),] [246, 717] (Aud, A), and مُّثْوَةٍ recompense, pl. مَتْوَهْ (A), because the letter of prolongation in the sing. is rad., so that it is not changed [in the pl.] (Tsr): (α) مَصْبَحٍ [affliction, pl. (Aud)] [مَصَابٍ, and [مَصَبَّرٍ minaret, pl. (Aud)] مَكَانْرُ], [with change, notwithstanding that the letter of prolongation in the sing. is rad., because it is the e of the word (Tsr),] are anomalous (Aud, A), what facilitates its change being the assimilation of the rad. to the aug. (Tsr); and the o. f. is مَصَبْرٍ and مَصَبْرَ, which also are said (A): β مَعَانِشُ also, with Hamza in one version transmitted from Nāfi', is anomalous, the well-known [version] transmitted from him being with ي, as [mentioned] in [the Commentary of] IUK [on the IM] (Sn): (c) [صِبَّرٌ [عَسَمِّي [373, 674], and [صَبَّرٌ [373, 675], and [حَكَّانِ [247]; and [فَتَأَّجٍ [366, 379], and [فَتَأَّجٍ [253, 396], and [مُكَرَّرٍ a certain dry measure [685]: because the unsound
letter is not third (A); while ْمَسْحٍ ٌ and ٌصَٰرِفَةً are [also] excluded by the restriction to the letter of prolongation (Sn): (a) where the ْوَ or یٰ occurs as second of two soft letters having the ٌ of مَفَاعِلٍ [18, 256] between them, whether the two soft letters be (a) two یٰs, as in ْنَبَّاتُ (Aud, A), which is the excess over the decimal number, from ْنَفَأٔ, aor. ْيَنِئِفَّ; whereas the saying of Sht that its o.f. is ْنَبَّرُ [251, 716] (Tsr),] is based upon [the theory] that it is from ْنَفَأٔ, aor. ْيَنِئِفَّ (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (b) two ْوَs, as in ْأَرَأْلُ [715], pl. of ْأَوْلُ [357]: or (e) different, [one being یٰ, and the other ْوَ (Tsr), which includes two cases, precedence of the یٰ before the ْوَ, and the converse thereof, both exemplified by A (and Kh) (Sn),] as in ْسَيْبَةٌ pl. of ْسَيْبَةٌ [251], [since it is (Aud)] orig. ْسَيْبَةٌ صَوَّارِدٌ [685, 716] (Aud, A); and ْصَوَّارِدٌ pl. of ْصَوَّارِدٌ hunter (A, Tsr), where the ْصَٰلِدً is a subst. for the ٌ of ْصَٰلِدَٰنُ [247, 686] (Sn): orig. ْسَيْبَةٌ and ْسَوَّأَدٍ [715] (A): (a) what follows the ٌ of the pl. is changed into Hamza in the four exs., because the succession of three soft letters contiguous to the final is deemed heavy (Tsr): (b) this substitution is not peculiar to what follows the ٌ of the pl. [715]; so that, if you formed from ْتُرُلَ a [sing. (Sn)]
like مُعَسَّر، you would say ٔمُرََٰثُل with the Hamza: this is the opinion of S and the majority (A, Tsr), and IM proceeds upon it in the Tashīl (A); but Akh and Zj dissent [in that (Tsr)], holding substitution to be disallowed in the sing., because it is light (A, Tsr), contrary to the pl. (Tsr): (c) the predicament of this Hamza in respect of its being written as a ی, and of dotting's being disallowed, is [the same] as was mentioned in the case of ٔجُتُّل and ٔبَّحُت above (A). And here is a [fifth (A)] case peculiar to the ی, (Aud, A):—when two یs are combined, and the first is initial, [at the beginning of the word (Tsr),] while the second is either mobile [unrestrictedly (Tsr)], or quiescent, [but] original as a ی, then the first ی is [necessarily (Tsr)] changed into Hamza (Aud), because of two matters, (1) that reduplication at the beginning of a word is rare, the only instances of it being some well-known words, like ٔمُن [357, 672, 674]; and, since reduplication at the beginning of a word is rare with sound letters, it is impossible with the ی, from the heaviness of the latter: (2) that, since they allow [the initial ی of] ٔمُتُّجُر [below] and the like, which is a single ی, to be changed [into Hamza], on account of [the fact] that, by reason of the Damma, it is like two یs, they are naturally disposed to make the change obligatory when two یs are [actually] present, because two یs are heavier than a ی, and a
Damma: these two reasons are given by S. Two cases are included under that [rule], (1), where the second is mobile; (2) where it is quiescent, [but] original as a (Tsr): the first [case (Tsr)] as in the pl. of joining and preserver, where you say اَرَاسْلُ [357, 661] and (Aud), like pl. ضَوْارِبٌ, ضَارِبَةٌ, اَرَاسْلُ [247, 383, 686] (Tsr), orig. اَرَاسْلُ and اَرْسَلْ (Aud), with two s [below], the first of which is changed into Hamza, as ضَرْبَتْ صَدَرَهَا [48] (Tsr): and the second [case (Tsr)] as in اَرْسَلْ [357], fem. of اَرْسَلْ [357], orig. اَرْسَلْ [below] with two s, the first being a ف pronounced with Damm, and the second a quiescent (Aud), original as a, while its pl. is اَرْسَلْ [357], orig. اَرْسَلْ [below], which is treated as above mentioned [under the first case] (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) [the passives (Tsr)] and اَرْسَلْ, [below], where [it is not necessary that the first, should be changed into Hamza, because (Tsr)] the second is quiescent, [and] converted from the of سَلَّمَ [490, 671] (Aud), with Fath of the، vid. اَرْسَلْ reached and اَرْسَلْ hid; so that it is not original as a, because it is a subst. for an aug. ! (Tsr): (b) اَرَوُلَ with two s, alleviated [658] from اَرَوُلَ [below] with a, pronounced with Damm, and then a Hamza, fem. of اَرْوَلْ the اَرْوَلْ [of superiority (Tsr)] from اَرْوَلْ [357], i. q. اَرْوَلْ fled for refuge (Aud),
where it is not necessary that the first should be changed into Hamza, because the second, being converted from a Hamza, is not original as a (α) allowability is to be understood from the negation of necessity (Tsr). As for [this] substitution of the Hamza for the, it is [said by Z to be] (ΙΥ) for every occurring as an initial, coupled with another [that is] inseparable [from the formation], as in أَرْيَصُ (1) and أَرزَئُ [above], pls. of زَرْيَصُ and زَرْئِقُ [above]: (2) أَرْيَصُ [661], dim. of وَرْيِصُ joining [below] (M); and أَرْيَصُ [below], dim. of زَرْيَصُ [above]: orig. زَرْيِصُ and زَرْيقُ, in which there are two causes for conversion into Hamza, (α) the combination of two s [above]; and (β) the [initial] 's being [permanently] pronounced with Damm [below], on account of the dim. formation [274]: (3) أَرْعَصُ [below] and أَرْوَزْنَ, which you would say if you formed a n. like جُرْبُ [253] and لُوكُس promissed, threatened and weighed: (α) if used as names, they would be triptote, because they are كَرْتُ, like كُثْرُ Kauthar [671] and جُوْهُرُ Jauhar [369]: not أَذْرَعُ [18], like أَذْرَعُ Adrat and أَذْرُجُ Aulaj (ΙΥ). The rule for it is [here said by R to be] this:—Whenever two s are [combined] at the beginning of a word, and their second is not an aug. [letter of prolongation] converted from another letter [699], their first is converted
into Hamza, as (1) 
[above], from the measure of (3) 
[below], upon the measure of طَمْأَر [377] (R). [But A states the rule thus: — ] Whenever two, s. are combined at the beginning of a word, their first must be changed into Hamza, provided that their second be not an unoriginal letter of prolongation (A), being either not a letter of prolongation, or an original letter of prolongation (Sn). Four cases, therefore, are excluded, vid. where the second [و ] is a letter of prolongation (1) substituted for (a) the ١ of قَامِل [with Fath of the ع (Sn)], as in وُهَّرَ أَلْيَسْهَنَّ The age of maturity was reached VII. 19. [686]; (b) a Hamza, as in أَلْيَسْهُمَا alleviated from أَلْيَسْهُمَا [above]: (2) adventitious, [but not caused by substitution, in order that this case may be distinguishable from what precedes it (Sn),] as when you form the paradigm of قَعَ العَدَ [482] from عَدَ and then reduce it to the pass., [in which case you say عَدَ, the second (و ) being an adventitious letter of prolongation caused by the supervision of دَامَم (436) before it (Sn)]: (3) aug., as when you form the paradigm of طَمْأَر [above] from عَدَ, in which case you say عَدَ: (a) in these four cases the change [of, into Hamza] is not necessary, but allowable: (b) some differ
about the fourth, where they hold the change to be necessary, [as above,] because two \( s \) are combined [at the beginning of the word]; while the second, [though an *aug.* letter of prolongation (Sn),] is not substituted for an *aug.*, [contrary to the (second), of such as \( \text{وَفْتُ} \) (Sn),] since the Damma before it is unadventitious, [contrary to the Damma before the letter of prolongation in such as \( \text{وَفْتُ} \) (Sn)]: and this opinion is adopted by IU [and R]: (c) IM prefers the saying that both modes are allowable, because the second [\( s \)], though its prolongation is not an innovation, [since the word is formed, and constituted, therewith (Sn),] is still an *aug.* letter of prolongation; so that it is not devoid of resemblance to the \( s \) (Sn)] converted [from the (Sn)] ! (A) in such as \( \text{وَفْتُ} \) (Sn). And two cases are included, in which the change is necessary, vid. where the second \( s \) is (1) not a letter of prolongation, as in (a) \( \text{لُفْتُ} \) *pl.* of \( \text{أَلْفُ} \) *fem.* of \( \text{أَلْفُ} \), *orig.* \( \text{وَرْعُ} \) [above]; (b) \( \text{رْاِلْصُّ} \) and \( \text{إِلْصُّ} \), *orig.* \( \text{رْاِلْصُّ} \) and \( \text{إِلْصُّ} \), *pl.* of \( \text{إِلْصُّ} \) and \( \text{إِلْصُّ} \), with two \( s \) [above], the first the \( f \) of the word, and the second a *subst.* for the \( f \) of \( \\text{كَعِلَة} [686] \), as it is substituted in the *dim.* like \( \text{أَرِيْسُ} \) and \( \text{أَرِيْسُ} \) (A), *dims.* of \( \text{إِلْصُّ} \) [above] and \( \\text{إِلْصُّ} \) *preserver*; though \( \text{أَرِيْسُ} \) and \( \text{أَرِيْسُ} \) [above] would be more conformable to what
(1222)

precedes (Sn): (c) لم [above], which you would say if you formed the paradigm of كَوْنُ [873] from، orig. لُرِدَ [above]. (2) an original letter of prolongation, as in لُرِدَ [above] (A). The condition is that the second ج should not be an adventitious letter of prolongation, being (1) an original letter of prolongation, i.e., [a letter of prolongation] not substituted for anything, as in لُرِدَ [above] (fem. of لُرِدَ، orig. لُرِدَ [above]): (2) not a letter of prolongation at all, because not after دامم, whether it be (a) mobile, as in لُرِدَ [and لُرِدَ] mentioned [above]; and in لُرِدَ pl. of لُرِدَ، orig. لُرِدَ [above]: or (b) quiescent, after a vowel other than دامم, as in لُرِدَ، orig. لُرِدَ with three جs [357]. In all of that the change [of the first ج into خمزة] is necessary: whereas, with the adventitious letter of prolongation, it is not necessary, but allowable, whether such letter be a subst. for the ج of خمزة، as in لُرِدَ and لُرِدَ [above], where لُرِدَ and لُرِدَ [below] with خمزة are allowable; or for a خمزة, as in لُرِدَ alleviated from لُرِدَ [above]; or for any other [letter], as detailed by A (MKh). The restriction of initiality [in the first ج] excludes such [forms] as هُورُي [661] and هُورُي (Aud, A), rel. ns. of خمزة love and خمزة date-stones [300] (Aud, Sn), where the first ج is not changed into خمزة,
because it is not initial (Ts'r, Sh). IM in the Tashil adds another condition for the necessity of change [into Hamza], vid. that the conjunction of the two s should not be accidental, caused by elision of a separating Hamza, as when you form [a word commensurable with (Sn)] [482] from ُؤُنَعَّلَ [i. q. ُرَعُدَذَ promising, threatening (Sn)], in which case you say َؤُنَعَّلَ, orig. ُؤُنَعَّلَ, the first being converted into ى because of its quiescence after a Kasra [685, 699], and the last ى into ى because of its mobility and the Fath of what precedes it [684, 719]: and, when the vowel of the first [disj.] Hamza is transferred to the quiescent ى before it, the conj. Hamza is elided, because it can be dispensed with, [since the initial is no longer quiescent]; while the ى reverts to its o. f., vid. the ى, because of the cessation of the motive for its conversion; so that the word is reduced to ٠ؤُنَعَّلَ [with a, pronounced with Fath, and then a quiescent ى (Sn)], where two s are combined at the beginning of the word, and change is not necessary, but both modes are allowable: and similarly, if the vowel of the second Hamza were transferred to the ى, the word then becoming ٢ؤُنَعَّلَ [with two s pronounced with Fath, and then an ى (Sn)], both modes, [retention of the (first) ى, and its change into Hamza (Sn)], would be allowable, agreeably with the opinion of F. But others are said to hold change to be necessary in that [accidental
conjunction of two, and, whether [the vowel of (Sn)] the second [Hamza (Sn)] be transferred, or not (A). The allowable [substitution of the Hamza for a letter of softness] is its substitution for every, [permanently (IY)] pronounced with Damm [675], occurring (1) single, when (a) a ف, as in [٠١٢٧٨٠٨٠٨٠ and (IY)] [٠١٢٧٨٠٨٠٨٠, ٠١٢٧٨٠٨٠ (M), الوقت. and الوقت [٠١٢٧٨٠٨٠, ٠١٢٧٨٠ (IY)]; (b) an ع not [doubled by having another, and] incorporated into [it], as ٠٨٠٨٠٨٠ دار, and دار ٠٨٠٨٠ ٠٨٠٨٠ pl. of ٠٨٠٨٠ ٠٨٠٨٠ ٠٨٠٨٠ ٠٨٠٨٠ (M), pl. of ٠٨٠٨٠ ٠٨٠٨٠ ٠٨٠٨٠ ٠٨٠٨٠: 'Umar Ibn Abi Rab'ia says

And, when I lost the sound of them; and lamps that burned brightly at nightfall, and fires, were extinguished; and another says

[٠١٢٧٨٠ (IY): (2) coupled [with another, and, when [the permanently pronounced with Damm is] an ع, as in ٠١٢٧٨٠ غور [below] and ٠١٢٧٨٠ تور [278] (M). The formula for it is “Every, pronounced with a permanent [below] Damma, whether such, be initial, [as in ٠١٢٧٨٠ أجرة;] or medial, [as in ٠١٢٧٨٠ وور and ٠١٢٧٨٠ تور:] and whether that which is initial be followed by an aug. ٠١٢٧٨٠, converted from another letter, as in ٠١٢٧٨٠ أوري [above]; or not, as in ٠١٢٧٨٠ أجرة [above]” (R). As for
the substitution of the Hamza for thepronounced with Ḍamm, mentioned [in the last two paragraphs], it is
good, regular, as in (1) ḍā'īrə, orig. ḍā'irə [above]; (2)
ānōr [above] and anōr pl. of kār fire, orig. anōr and
[242]; (3) suwarq [237], pl. of sāqī shank, and inf. n.
of gārā lāmə. The water sank, aor. yūghur, inf. ns. yūghur
and yūghur, where the conversion is not on account of the
combination of two s, because the second is an aug.
letter of prolongation (A). Our saying [that the
Ḍamm should be (A)] "permanent" [above] is to guard
against the [accidental (IY)] Ḍamm [arising because
(IY)] of (1) inflection (IY, R, A), as in ḍūhə ḍulə This is
a bucket (IY, A); (2) the [concurrence of (IY, A)] two
quiescents (IY, R, A), as in II. 15. [403, 664, 684] and
II. 238. [547, 664, 684] (IY, A). And "not doubled
[by having another, incorp:orated into it]" is to guard
against such as ṭū ṭuhrə taking refuge and ṭāhrə shifting.
As for the substitution of the Hamza for the ḍ pronounced with Kasr between an t and a double ʃ , it
[also] is [an allowable substitution for a letter of soft-
ness; and occurs] in such as ṣā'ī and ṣā'ī [305], rel. ns.
of ṣā'ī and ṣā'ī, orig. ṣā'ī ṣā'ī and ṣā'ī with three s,
then lightened by conversion of the first into Hamza
(A). The irregular (M), anomalous (A), [substitution
of the Hamza for a letter of softness] is its substitution
for (1) the \( l \) in [a good number of positions (IV), such
as (M)] (a) \( دَابَّة \) and \( شَابَة \) [665] (M, A), for
\( دَابَّة \) and \( شَابَة \), where the \( l \), being mobilized on account of the
concurrence of two quiescents, is converted into Hamza, because the \( l \) is a weak letter, wide in outlet [732], not
susceptible of a vowel; so that, when constrained to
mobilize it, they convert it into the letter nearest to it,
vid. the Hamza (IV): and [hence (IV)] إِبْيَاضٌ (M, A),
إِدْهَامٌ (M), and [hence [إِبْيَاضٌ, إِدْهَامٌ, إِشْعَالٌ], for
إِشْعَالٌ (M), and [ثَلَاثٌ] (M, A), (a)

Dukain says

وَحَلَّبَهُ حَتَّى إِبْيَاضٍ مَّلَٰثٍ

And his milking was until his milk-pail became white;
and Kuthayyir says

وَلَأَرْضَى أَمَّا سُودُهَا فَتَجَسَّلَتْ يِبَاضًا وَأَمَّا بِضَعُّهَا فَأَدَهَّامَتْ

And at the land when such that, as for its blacks they
have clothed themselves in whiteness, and, as for its
whites, they have become black, meaning فَأَدَهَّامَتْ; and
they recite

وَبَعْدُ يِبَاضٍ أَلْتِيبٍ مِنْ كُلِّ جَانِبٍ

And after the whiteness of hoariness from every side,
which has so overgrown my head of hair that its black
has become glistening, meaning إِشْعَالٍ: while AZ is
reported to have said "I heard 'Amr Ibn 'Ubaid read
and I thought that he had committed a solecism, until I heard the Arabs say "above." (IY) (b) [665] and [247, 373], reported to have been pronounced with Hamza by Al'Ajjaj (M, A), who says

(M) O abode of Salma, O hail, again hail! Then Khindif [309, 679] is the head of this world (Jsh), because the I would be a foundation in the world, to rhyme with which only a word ending like would be allowable; so that, since he says [at the end of the first hemistich], he pronounces with Hamza, in order that the rhyme may run in one course as respects lack of foundation (IY): while [665] is transmitted (M) from them by Lh with Hamza, orig. without Hamza, as is proved by their saying, in the pl., and (IY): the poet says

As though he were a tame falcon above a watch-tower, that had discovered the sand-grouse in a level smooth plain (Jh, IY): and [hence (IY)] The hen clucked [674]; and the poet says [665] (M), cited by Fr, where the poet, being
constrained to mobilize the ل before the ق of مَشْتَاقٌ، because it corresponds to the ل of [the foot] لَمُشْتَقُّ، converts it into Hamza, as we said above [under (a)], except that he mobilizes it with Kasra, because he means [to express] the Kasra that was on the ، wherefrom the ل was converted, since مَشْتَقٌ is مَشْتَقٌ، being orig. مَشْتَقٌ (IY); and Fr transmits, in a case of no constraint، رَجُلٌ مَثِلٌ a wealthy man (R)، for لَبَيْنِ الرَّجُلَ مَثِلٍ [278، 682، 703، 711] (MAR)؛ and they say لَبَيْنِ الرَّجُلَ مَثِلٍ بَلْ لَصَحِّحْ The man discharged the obligation of performing the pilgrimage (R)، for لَبَيْنِ (MAR): (a) that [conversion of the ل into Hamza in the exs. given under (b)] is not for escape from the [concurrence of] two quiescents؛ but is because of the proximity of the outlets of the ل and Hamza [732] (R): (2) the ، not pronounced with ظام (M)، (a) when ف pronounced with كسر or فاث (IY): (a) as for the substitution of the Hamza for the initial [below]، pronounced with كسر، it is (A) in such as وَشَاحٌ [699، إِسْتَحْ، إِسْتَدَا، وَسَاحُ، وَسَاحُةٍ، وَسَاحُةٍ بالدركي، كنسية، and وَسَاحُةٍ، كنسية embassies]، and [بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ， بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، بِعَادٍ، B. 76. The sack of his brother [Benjamin (K، B)] in the reading of [Ubayy (A)،] Sa‘id Ibn Jubair (M، A)، and IIU (A): S cites [the verse by Ibn Mukbil (S)]]
As for the embassy, its cavalcades got hold sometimes of misfortune, and sometimes of favors, in the presence of the tyrants: (α) that is because they assimilate the pronunciation with Kasr to the pronunciation with Ḍām, since they deem Kasra, as they deem Ḍamma, to be heavy [on the] (IY): (β) Mz holds this substitution to be regular [322] (M, R, A) in the [initial (R)] pronounced with Kasr (M, R): but others restrict it to hearsay (IY, A): while I'm reports that IUK says "I have seen in some book that it is the dial. of Hudhail" (Sn): (γ) "initial" [above] is to guard against such as the, of طَرِيْل long [684], which is not converted, because the [ ] pronounced with Kasr, being lighter than the one pronounced with Ḍām, is not converted in every position; while the middle is more remote from alteration [than the beginning] (A): (b) [as for the (initial) , pronounced with Fath, it is not converted, because of the lightness of Fathā, except (A)] in [their anomalous sayings (A)] أَنَأُ languard [699] (M, A), on the measure of قَنَّا spear-shaft (Sn), said of a woman, orig. قَنِّا (IY, A), قَنِّة from قَنُّي i. q. قُنُّر languor (IY), [or] from قُنُّة [with Fath of the , and quiescence of the و, as is understood from the KF (Sn)], i. q. بَطَأ slowness (A); أَسْمَآء Asmā (M, A), a
woman's name (IY, A), to guard against  إلا اسماءه pl. of اسم [667] (Sn), because, says IS, it is orig. اسماء [699] (A), its measure being تِمَّةٌ فِي أَحْدَثٍ beauty (IY, A); and أَحْدَثٍ [322] (M, A), when used as a num. (IY, A) in أَحْدَثٍ وَعَشْرُونَ and أَحْدَثٍ عَشْرَ [313] (IY), orig. أَحْدَثٍ, from عَشْرَةٌ unity; contrary to أَحْدَثٍ (IY, A) in ما جَاءَكَ أَحْدَثٍ [322] (A), [and] in أَحْدَثٍ There is not any one in the house (IY), where the هَمْزَة is [said to be (A)] original (IY, A), because أَحْدَثٍ is not in the sense of unity (A), since it denotes generality, not singleness (IY); though [here also the هَمْزَة is said [by some] to be a subst. for the هَمْزَة (Sn); and أَحْدَثٍ in the tradition (M) that Muḥammad said to a man, who made the sign with his two forefingers in reciting the creed, أَحْدَثٍ أَحْدَثٍ: Make the sign with one, one, i.e., أَحْدَثٍ أَحْدَثٍ (IY): (b) [when a letter of prolongation: for:] F recites

أَحْبُ الْمُودَّدِينَ إِلَيْ مُوسَى وَجَعْدَةٍ إذ أَضَاءَهُمَا الْوَتُودُ (R), by Jarīr, praising Hishām Ibn 'Abd AlMalik, The dearest of the kindlers (of fire) to me are, also related لْحُبُ الْمُودَّدِانَ Assuredly very dear to me are [476] the two kindlers (of fire), Mūsā and his sister Jaʿda, when the blaze has lighted them up (Jsh), with the of مُوسَى الْمُودَّدِانَ [or or مُوسَى ] and pronounced as
a Hamza; while [reported to have been (B)] read [by Ibn Kathir with the (B)] pronounced as Hamza (R), because of the Damma before it, like [for (686)] (B): (a) the reason of that is said to be that the (B), being in the vicinity of Damma, becomes, as it were, vocalized with Damm; while the (B), vocalized with Damm is [regularly] pronounced as Hamza, as in (R): (3) the (M, A), (a) when [initial, and] pronounced with Fath, in which case they substitute Hamza for the (M, R, A), with Fath of the Hamza, and quiescence of the (Sn), meaning [i.e., (A),] by restoring the (260, 719), and (IY, R, A) substituting a Hamza for the (IY), [i.e.,] changing the [first (R),] (IY) into Hamza (R, A): so says IJ (R): (a) F says that (Sn), [i.e., [663] (IY, R, A), which is shortness of the [upper (IY)] teeth, or, as is said, their curvature towards the inside of the mouth, whence [663, 703] said of a
man, and ﷽ of a woman (IY, A): (b) [when a letter of
prolongation: for] they (M, R), [or] some of them (A),
say ﷺ nature (M, R, A) with Hamza (A), orig. with
ي (IY, R), the Hamza being a subst. for the ﷺ (IY);
and similarly ﷼, which is the lion (A). The substi-
tution of the Hamza for the ﷺ [and ﷺ (A)] is rare (IY,
A), i. e., anomalous (Sn), irregular (IY). Its substitu-
tion for the ﷺ is in (1) [such as (Jrb)] ﷺ [304, 326, 682,
684] (M, Jrb, A), and [sometimes also in its pl. (Jrb)]
أ مر [below] (M, Jrb): (a) the o. f. of ﷺ (IY, R, Jrb,
BS, A) is ﷺ [below] (Jrb, A), the o. f. of which (A)
is ﷺ (IY, R, BS, A), as is proved by. [the dim. (IY)]
أ مر [275, 278] (IY, Jrb, A) and [the broken pl. (IY)أ مر [378] (IY, A), its ﷺ being converted into ﷺ (IY, R, BS,
A), according to rule [684, 703] (BS), because mobile,
and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (IY, R,
A); so that أ مر becomes ﷺ [above] (IY): while its ﷺ,
[being then assimilated to the unsound letters (IY, R),
on account of its faintness, and being therefore like ﷺ,
or ﷺ occurring as a final after an aug. ﷺ (R),] is convert-
ed [into ﷺ, and afterwards (R)] into Hamza, [as in case
١ (k, b) above] (IY, R, BS), contrary to rule, two
consecutive transformations being thereby produced
(BS), whereas transformation of two adjoining letters is
anomalous (A): (b) its pl. of paucity is أ مر [above]
with the s, which they sometimes change [into Hamza] (BS); [so that] in the pl. (IY, MAR) they also say أَمْرُكُ (IY, R) for أَمَرْتُ, for a similar reason, [vid. the assimilation of its s to the unsound letters, as explained above under َمَلَحَ (R): the poet says

And (many) a land, whose waters were exhausted, and whose shades were passing away in the part of the forenoon when the sun was high. (M, R, BS), cited by IJ, who says that F cited it to him (IY): (c) its pl. of multitude is مِئَةٌ [278], according to the o.f., with the s, not otherwise (BS): (d) the substitution in (Jrb) َمَلَحَ is anomalous (SH, Sn), in two respects, [the substitution of Hamza for the s, and the transformation of two consecutive letters] (Sn); but is (R) obligatory (SH), whereas in أَمْرُكُ it is not so (Jrb): (e) hence َمَلَحَ [275, 278, 304, 326, 684], a [lexicological] pl. of شَـئٌ, orig. شَـئَـهَا [260, 304] with quiescence of the ُ for they elide the s by assimilation to the unsound letters, because of its faintness, weakness, and finality; and, when the s is elided, the ُ remains as ُرَـخَ; and then the ُ is pronounced with Fath, because of its vicinity to the s of femininization, the letter before which, [when not an ] is pronounced with Fath [646]; so that the ُ, being mobile, and preceded by a otter pronounced with Fath
is converted into ٌ [684], the n. becoming ُشَاءٌ; and, when it is pluralized, the َs of feminization is rejected, on the principle of ُقُدِّرٍ and ُقُدِّرٌ [254]; so that the n. remains with two letters, the last of them an ِ, which, when Tanwin is affixed to it, is exposed to elision, as the ِ of َعَصَا and َرَحَى is elided [643, 684, 719], in which case the explicit n. would remain with one letter; and, that being impossible, they restore the َs elided from the sing., so that the word becomes constructively ُشَاءٌ, restoration of the elided being more appropriate than importation of a strange, extraneous letter; and then the َs is changed into Hamza, so that ُشَا is said (IY): (f) ُلَآ family is said to be orig. ُلَُهَ; then ُلَلَّ, the َs being converted into Hamza; then ُلَآ, the Hamza being converted into ِ [658]: that is because conversion of the َs into ِ [684] is not established, while its conversion into Hamza [above] is established; and it is better to rely upon that conversion of which similar instances are established: but Ks says that its o. f. is ُلَآُلَ آ [684], because they, [i.e., the members of the family,] يَبْرِئُونَ إلَى أَصِلٍ go back to a [common] stuck, or origin (R): (2) آَلُ نُعَلَتَ [599] and نُعَلَتَ [682] (M, A), i. q. نَعَلَتَ (A): (a) AÜ relates that the Arabs say آَلُ نُعَلَتَ [above], meaning هُلَ نُعَلَتَ (IY, R); while the Hamza here is
decided to be a subst. for the $s$ , because in interrogation 
$\text{هـل}$ is prevalently, and [ $\text{لـ}$ with ] Hamza rarely, used, 
for which reason the $s$ is [considered to be] original : (b) 
as for their saying $\text{هـلَ مَعَهُ} \ (\text{IY})$, it is 
said [that the Hamza here is a subst. for the $s$ , and 
(\text{IY})] that the o. f. [of $\text{لا} \ \text{يَعْلُدُهُ}$ in excitation (R)] is $\text{هـلَ} \ [573]$ 
(\text{IY}, R); but the truth is that they are two dial. vars., 
because their use in this sense is uniform, without 
predomiance of either over the other, for which reason 
the $s$ as original is not more appropriate than the reverse 
(\text{IY}). And its substitution for the $\text{ع}$ is in the saying 

\[\text{مَأَيَّر} \ \text{جَمَّرُت} \ \text{مَالِك} \ \text{الْرَّدِّيِّقِ} \ \text{عُبَـبُ} \ \text{بِخَرِ} \ \text{مِسَاحَك} \ \text{يَهْرُقُ} \ (M, A)\]

And the deserts of intense heats were agitated
at times, like a billow of a laughing, far-extending sea
(\text{Sn}), cited by As, where $\text{عُبَـبُ}$ is meant (\text{IY}),(أباب ، \text{عُبَـبُ}) 
being orig. $\text{عُبَـبُ}$ (A); but the poet substitutes the
Hamza for the $\text{ع}$ because of the proximity of their
outlets [732], as the $\text{ع}$ is substituted for the Hamza in
such as $\text{أَيْمَّن} \ \text{فَرَسَت} \ \text{أَلْحُج} \ [580, 682]$ and the like (\text{IY}).
Some, however, say that the Hamza [here (A)] is
[original (IY)], not a subst. [for the $\text{ع}$ (A)]; and that 
$\text{أَبَاب} \ (A)$ from $\text{أَبَاب} \ (A)$ meaning prepared
himself [for going away (\text{IY})], because the sea prepares
itself (\text{IY}, A) to swell (\text{IY}), and] to be in commotion ;
and, according to this, the Hamza is original. The reason why these five [substitutions of the Hamza, vid. for the undoubled, permanently pronounced with Damm, the ی pronounced with Kasr between an ی and a double ی, the initial ی pronounced with Kasr, the ع, and the ع, as also the irregular substitutions for the ی, ی, and ی] are not mentioned here by IM is only that the substitution of the Hamza for them is allowable [or anomalous], not necessary; whereas here he notices only the necessary; and, if he notices any thing else, it is [merely] by way of digression. As for its substitution for the ی and غ, it is [found in] their sayings صرخ for screaming, and رَأَى for [hearkened, and agreed, to it (Su)], transmitted by Akh and Nr, respectively, on the authority of Khl. But its substitution for these two letters is very strange (A).

§. 684. The ی is substituted for (M, SH, A) four letters (IY, A), (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), the ی (IY, A, MASH); (3) the Hamza (M, SH, A); (4) the [single (A)] ن (M, A). [And IH mentions a fifth, vid. the ی below.] Its substitution for its two sisters is (1) [regular (M), obligatory (SH),] in (a) such as باب, [719] رَقَى and [703] مَا, and بَاب [703, 711], vid. where the ی and ی are mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (M, R),
subject to the [other] conditions mentioned [by A below] (R): (b) مل, according to one opinion (SH), since its o. f., according to Ks, is م [683], because its ديم., according to some, is مل; but the م is converted into ل: while, according to the BB [below], the ل is substituted for the م (Jrb): (2) irregular, [rare (IY),] in such as تطانتي [below], حارئ, and ماجل (M), where they substitute an ل, from desire of lightness [below], for the quiescent م and م, when preceded by a letter pronounced with فتح (IY). IM indicates the [regular] substitution of the ل for its two sisters by his saying "Substitute an ل for م, or م orig. mobile, after a conjoined فتح", i. e., Change of the م and م into ل is necessary upon eleven conditions, (1) that they be mobile; for which reason they are sounded true in مول and مبع [703], because of their quiescence: (2) that their vowel be original; for which reason they are sounded true in جيل [300, 658] and توم, alleviated from جيال the she-hyæna and توم twin; and in II. 15. [403, 664, 683], III. 183. [406], II. 238. [547, 664, 683]: (3) that the letter before them be pronounced with فتح; for which reason they are sounded true in موض compensation [711], جيل [685], and سور chapters [238]: (4) that the فتح be conjoined [with them], i. e., [be] in their words [without a sepa-rate (Sn)]; for which reason they are sounded true in
Verily 'Umar and the grandfather of Yazid: [(a) these four conditions IM indicates by his saying cited above:] (5) that their conjunction oe original; so that, if such [a word] as [392] عَلْبِطٍ would be formed from raiding and رَمَى shooting, and رَمِي would be said, defective (A), like [16, 671], orig. [392] عَلْبِطٍ with two s, and رَمِي with two ى s (Sn); and the [first], and ى would not be converted into ٰ, because the conjunction of the Fatha with them would be adventitious, caused by elision of an ٰ, since the o. f. would be عَلْبِطٍ [727] and رَمَيِ [401], because عَلْبِطٍ is orig. عَلْبِطٍ (A): (a) this [condition] is not taken from the text [of the IM, nor is it mentioned in the IA or Aud] (Sn): (6) that the letter after them be mobile, if they be ى s; and that they be not immediately followed by an ٰ or a double ى, if they be ج s: (a) this [condition] IM indicates by his saying [in continuation of the passage above cited] "if the following [letter (MKh)] be mobilized" (A), i.e., if there be any following [letter] here, otherwise this condition is not applicable (Sn); "whereas, if it be made quiescent, it restrains the transformation of any [ى or ى occurring as the ى of the word MKh], not [as (MKh)] the ج, the transformation of which is not restrained by any quiescent other than an ٰ, or [than] a ى wherein doubling is customary": (b) for that reason
the غ is sounded true in such as بیان perspicuity, [348, 683], خورنک Khawarnaک; and the ل in such as قطیب, 719, غزرا 663 [229] and [299] فتوی [300] (A), these [last] two exs. being combined by A because the غ in the first is converted from the second ی of علی Ali, which is converted from ی of یسایة [703], 711, because the letter after it is mobile; and the ل in یسایة [719], since there is no ل or double غ after it: (c) similarly [the ل is transformed in] یک خورنک They dread and یک خورنک They obliterate [with Fath of the ح, according to the dial. of those who say مکا یک خورنک, inf. n. مکا یک خورنک (Sn), orig. یک خورنک and یک خورنک [with two غ (Sn)], the [second] غ and [first] غ, respectively, being converted into غ, because mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; but being afterwards elided, because of the two quiescents: (d) and so, in the pl. of غ مناسا, یک خورنک, when used as a name [for a rational male (Sn)], you say قام یک خورنک [properly الی یک خورنک The] یک خورنک's [13] stood, orig. یک خورنک, [the first یک خورنک of] which is treated as mentioned [under (c)]: (e) according to this, if you formed from یک خورنک and غ a word
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like [399], you would say [with Fath of their first and third, and quiescence of their second (Sn), orig. ] and [second] \( \text{غَزَّوُتْ} \) and [second] \( \text{غَزَّوُتْ} \), the [second] \( \text{غَزَّوُتْ} \) and \( \text{غَزَّوُتْ} \), being converted [into 1]; and [afterwards] elided, because of meeting the quiescent [؟], and that [formation] would be facilitated by the freedom from confusion [of the transformed with the o.f. (Sn)], since there is no [?] in the language (A); so that [in \( \text{غَزَّوُتْ} \) and \( \text{غَزَّوُتْ} \)] one would understand it to be transformed, orig. [399] (Sn): (f) some hold that this [unsound letter in the word formed on the measure of \( \text{عَنْكَبُورَتُ} \) and \( \text{غَزَّوُتْ} \) (Sn)] should be sounded true, because that [expression (Sn)] which contains it is a sing. (A); while, the sing. being less heavy than the pl., i.e., the indicator of an aggregate [234], like [above], \( \text{يَخْصَشُونَ} \), and \( \text{يَبْتَكَوْنَ} \), alleviation by means of the transformation mentioned is [not so] suitable [in it as] in the pl. (Sn): (g) the reason why they sound [the, or ى] true before the 1 and the double ى is that, (a) if they transformed [it] before the 1, two quiescent ىs would be combined, so that one of them would be elided [663]; and therefore ambiguity would result in such as [\( \text{رَمِيَّا} \text{غَزَّوُرَ} \) or [above], because it would become [\( \text{رَمِيَّا} \text{غَزَّرَا} \) or [above], \( \text{رَمِيَّا} \), and no one would know whether it belonged to the du. or to the sing.;
while what would not involve ambiguity, [such as ُعَسَرُ (Sn),] is made to accord with what would involve ambiguity, because it belongs to the same cat. [in that the، and ي are followed by a quiescentِ (Sn)]: (b) the، of such as ُعَلَّدِ is in a position where لا is changed into، (A), because the، of relation necessitates conversion of the ٰ [third] into، [300]; so that, if the، were converted into ٰ, because of its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, the ٰ would be converted into، on account of the، of relation; and an endless concatenation of conversions [from،] into ٰ, and [from ٰ] into،، would be entailed (Sn): (7, 8) that neither of them be an ٰ of the ُجَلِّ، فَعَلَّ (Sn), whose qual. is َأَفْعَلَٰ [348]; or of the inf. n. of this v. [331]: (a) these two conditions IM indicates by his saying “But the، of ُجَلِّ، فَعَلَّ”, as ُجَلِّ، حَوَلَّ، َغَيْدُ tenderness and squinting, “and ُجَلِّ، فَعَلَّ”, as ُجَلِّ، حَوَلَّ، َغَيْدُ was tender and squinted, “when possessed of” a qual. “َأَفْعَلَٰ [below], like َأَعْيَدُ [tender in body (Sn)] and َأَحْوَلَ، ُغَيْدُ squinted, cross-eyed, wry, is sounded true” [708]: (b) the reason why the v. in this cat. must be sounded true [in the ُجَلِّ، فَعَلَّ] is only that it is made to accord with َأَفْعَلَٰ [707], as ُجَلِّ، حَوَلَّ squinted and ُغَيْدُ was blind of one eye, because it is in the sense there-
is made to accord with it as respects the sounding true:
(c) by his saying "when possessed of ًأَعْلَ " [above] IM guards against such as ُخَافْ ٌ[403]: for it is ُنَعْلَ with Kasr of the ع [704], on the evidence of ُأَمَّنَ, felt saٌe (A), being the opp. of َخَافَ, and [the o. f. of] the thing being recognizable by [the form of] its opp. (Sn); but it is transformed [in the ع ], because its qual. is ُنَعْلَ, like ُخَافَ fearing, not ُنَعْلَ: (9) which is peculiar to the , that it be not an ع of the ُنَعْلَ denoting the sense of reciprocity, i. e., participation in agency and objectivity:
(a) this condition IM indicates by his saying "And if [the sense of (IA)] reciprocity be plain" [below], i. e., appear, "from ُنَعْلَ, the ع, when a ٌ [below], is preserved, and is not transformed ", i. e., When the ُنَعْلَ whose ع is a , is i. q. ُتَفَا عَلَ [487], it is sounded true [in the ع ], because made to accord with ُتَفَا عَلَ 703], on account of its being in the sense thereof, as ُجِرُّوا [492, 707] and ُرِجُّوا They intermarried [693, 707], i q. لَجَرُوا and ُرِجُّوا ُتَجَرُّوا: (b) by his saying "And, if reciprocity be plain" [above], he guards against ُنَعْلَ 's not being i. q. ُتَفَا عَلَ, in which case its transformation is necessary, unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether its ع be a ٌ, as in لَرَبَاب doubted; or a ٌ (Sn),] as in ُخَطَأَ was unfaithful, i. q.
passed through, i. q. جَازَ (c) by his saying “when a و” [above], he guards against its غ’s being a ى, in which case its transformation is necessary, even though it be indicative of reciprocity, as إِسْتَائَرُوا إِبِنَاؤُوا They were distinct, one from another, إِسْتَائَرُوا meaning They trafficked, one with another, and إِسْتَائَرُوا their meaning They smote one another with swords, i. q. تَبَأَبَأُوا تَبَأَبَأُوا, and تَبَأَبَأُوا because the ى is more like, [i. e., nearer in lightness to (Sn),] the ى than the و [686] is; and has, therefore, a better title to transformation [into ى] than it has:

(10) that neither of them be immediately followed by a letter entitled to transformation : (a) this [condition] IM indicates by his saying “And, if two letters be entitled to this transformation, the first is sounded true”, i. e., When two unsound letters, two و or two ى و or a و and a ى, are combined in the word, and each of them is entitled to be converted into ى, because of its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, one of them is unavoidably sounded true, lest two transformations be combined [without a separative (Sn)] in one word; while the last is more entitled to transformation [than the first], because the final is the seat of alteration : (α) the combination (α) of two و و is [in] such as أَلْحَرَى blackness, inf. n. of إِسْوَرَى أَحْرَى i. q. was black, [the fact] that the ى of أَلْحَرَى is converted from a و being proved
by their saying حَوْارَائِي for its du. [229], and حَوْرٌ and أَحْوَرٌ [672] for the pl. [249] and fem. [273] of black; (β) of two ی s is [in] such as ٱلْحَيَاةٍ for rain, its o. f. being حَيَّىٰ, because its du. [229] is حَيْيَانٍ، but its second ی being transformed [into ل] because of what has been mentioned above [under (a)]; (γ) of the، and ی is [in] such as ٱلْهَٰرُوْى love [326], its o. f. being حُوَرى، but its ی being transformed: (b) for that reason one sounds [both the ی and،] true in such as ٱلْحَيَوَانُ animal [698], because the [letter] entitled to transformation is the، transformation of which is impossible [under the sixth condition], because it is a ل followed immediately by an ل (أ): (b) IM indicates by his saying "But the reverse is sometimes true", [i.e., holds good anomalously (Sn),] that sometimes, in the preceding [combination of two unsound letters in the word (Sn)], the first is transformed, and the second sounded true, as in ٌعَائِمَةٌ utmost extent [723], orig. غَيْبَةٌ [with Fath of the two ی s (Sn)], the first ی being transformed [into ل], and the second sounded true, which is facilitated by the second's not occurring as a final: (α) like غَلِایْصُ in that [respect] are (α) كَیْتَةٌ [305]: (β) طَلَایَةٌ [305], ۳۰۲, ۳۰۵, ۶۸۳, ۷۲۳, according to Khl, its o. f. being غَیَّةٌ; but the ی being anomalously transformed, since the rule is to transform the second; and this, as IM says in the Tashil, is the easiest mode
[of accounting for $\text{شیث}$ (b): the saying that its o. f. is $\text{یثآ}$ (α) $\text{یثآ}$ [commonly written $\text{یثآ}$, as in B on II. 37.], with quiescence of the first $\text{ی}$ [298], entails transformation of the quiescent $\text{ی}$, [contrary to the first condition]:

(β) $\text{یثآ}$, on the measure of $\text{یعیلة}$, entails elision of the $\text{ع}$ without any necessitating cause (A) for its elision, because the customary [procedure] in the like [formation] is conversion of the first $\text{ی}$ into Hamza, as [the $\text{ی}$ and $\text{،}$ are converted] in $\text{یعیلة}$ and $\text{یعیلة}$ [683], [respectively] (Sn): (γ) $\text{ییثبت}$, like $\text{یثبت}$ [254], entails giving precedence, [by which is meant preference (Sn),] to transformation over incorporation, [which is open to the objection that this is entailed by the first mode also (Sn),] whereas the recognized [procedure] is the converse, as is proved by the change of the [second (Sn)] Hamza of $\text{یثآ}$ into $\text{ی}$, not into $\text{ى}$ [661] (A), in order to give precedence to incorporation [in $\text{یثآ}$] over transformation [in $\text{یثآ}$]: but Ḥrb holds that precedence should be given to transformation; while some hold that precedence should be given to incorporation in the $\text{ع}$, and to transformation in the $\text{ل}$, as explained at length by the author of the Tsr: (c) according to what is [stated] in the Tsr, and laid down by our Master and YH and others, the modes [of accounting for $\text{یثآ}$] are
six, the four mentioned by A [above in \( \gamma \) and \( \beta \)] : the fifth that its o. f. is \( \text{اَيَّةَ} \), with \( \text{ذَامَمَ} \) of the first \( \text{يَ} \), like \( \text{سَرَ} \) [254], the \( \text{عَ} \) being converted into \( \text{l} \), which, says Kh, is refuted by [the fact] that conversion of the \( \text{ذَامَمَ} \) into Kasra would be necessary, [so that this mode would be identical with the fourth]; but this requires consideration, and the language of Frd is “and, it is said, \( \text{أَيَّةَ} \) with \( \text{ذَامَمَ} \) of the first \( \text{يَ} \), the transformation of which [into \( \text{l} \) ] is according to rule”: [and] the sixth that its o. f. is \( \text{أَيَّةَ} \) with Fath of the first [\( \text{يَ} \)], as in the first saying, except that the second [\( \text{يَ} \)] is transformed, according to rule; so that \( \text{حَيَّةَ} \) becomes \( \text{أَيَّةَ} \) like \( \text{حَيَّةَ} \) life; and then the \( \text{ل} \) is moved up to the position of the \( \text{عَ} \), in which case its measure is \( \text{مُكْتَبَ} \) with three Fathas: (d) the commentary of B [on II. 37.] contains two other modes, \( \text{أَرْيَ} \) [like \( \text{تَمُّرُ} \) a date (B)], with quiescence, and \( \text{أَرْيَ} \) [like \( \text{مُكَّأَة} \) a mare (B)], with Fath, of the \( \text{و} \); so that the modes are eight: (e) if [only] one of the two [consecutive unsound letters] be entitled to transformation, but its transformation entail transformation of the other, that is not an instance of the forbidden occurrence of two consecutive transformations; so that there is no difficulty in such as \( \text{عِصَّا} \) pl. of \( \text{مَعْدِي} \) [685, 722], \( \text{عِصِّي} \) [243, 685, 722], and \( \text{عِتَيِّ} \) inf. n. of \( \text{عَتَا} \) [685, 722]: so says YH: (d) the combination of two transformations is
allowable with a separative, as in يَفْرُون They fulfil, since its o. f. is يَفْرُون. IM, in the CK, rejects [the assertion] that the occurrence of [even] two consecutive transformations is a catachresis that ought to be avoided unrestrictedly, disallowing it when they agree [in kind]; and pardoning it when they differ, as in زَا and محمد [683] and ظَا [658], or يَمْرَة and مَرْة and نَرُأَى: but it is sometimes replied that these expressions are anomalous: so says YS (Sn): (11) that neither of them be an ُء of what ends in an augment peculiar to ns. (A.), like the ُل and ُن, and the ُل of feminization (Su): (a) this [condition] IM indicates by his saying "And the ُء of that [word (IA)], at whose end that [augment (IA)] which is peculiar to the ُء. has been added, must be preserved", i.e., The conversion of the ُء and ُى into ُل, on account of their being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is prevented by their being an ُء of what ends in an augment peculiar to ns., because by that augment its resemblance to what is the principal subject of transformation, vid. the v. [667], becomes remote; and that is [exemplified in] such as ُجَرَّال [331, 698, 703] and ُسَيْكَان flowing: (b) whatever instances of this sort, [whose ُء is a ُء or ُى, and at whose end are an ُل and ن (Sn.),] occur transformed are reckoned anomalous, as ُدَارُان Dūrān and ُمَهْسَان Mūhān (A), [each of which is] a 133a
[proper] name (KF), by rule دَارُانَ and مَوَاحَانٌ (A, MKh), because orig. the du. of دَارٌ and مَامَ (MKh); but [SBd says that (Sn)] they are said to be foreign, in which case it is not good to reckon them in what is anomalous (Sn, MKh): (c) Mb [dissents, and (A)] asserts that the rule [in what ends in an l and n (Tsr, Sn)] is transformation (A, Tsr); and that there is no anomaly in دَارُانُ and مَوَاحَانُ, but the sounding true in كَمِبَانُ and جَلَانُ being distracted by love is anomalous (Tsr); because the l and n do not exclude the n. from resemblance to the v., since they are constructively separate, which, says F, is confirmed by their saying زَعْفَانَ from زَعْفَانٌ [274, 282, 283], the l and n remaining in the dim., and not being elided (Tsr, Su): but the correct opinion is the first, which is that of S: (d) there is a dispute about the abbreviated l of feminization [263, 272] in such as صَرْرَى Sawārā, [on the measure of نُعْلَى, mentioned by S (Bk).] which is a name of a water, Mz holding that this l is a preventive of transformation, because of its peculiarity to the n.; while Akh holds that it does not prevent transformation, because it does not exclude the n. from resemblance to the v., since صَرْرَى, in pronunciation, is equivalent to نَعْلَى. They two [masc.] did: so that the sounding of [the l in] صَرْرَى true is, according to Mz, regular; but, according to Akh, anomalous, not to be
copied: and therefore, if the like thereof were formed from قَالَ saying, then, according to the opinion of Mz, قَالَ would be said; but, according to the opinion of Akh, قَالَ: and, in this question, IM's choice wavers; for in the Tashil he adopts the opinion of Akh, and in some of his books the opinion of Mz: while [his sou] BD decides in favor of the latter; and what Mz holds is the opinion of S: (e) the addition of the [mobile (Sn)] s of femininization [263] is disregarded [as a factor] in sounding true, because it does not exclude the n. from the semblance of a v., since the [quiescent (Sn)] مَثَل is affixed to the pret. [607]; so that no incongruity [with the v., such as قَالَ that She said and بَعُثَ that She sold] is established by affixion of the s in such as سَتَّ رَقَالَة and بِعَائِشَةَ [247] (A), pls. of قَالَ saying and بَعُثَ selling, orig. بِعَائِشَةَ تُوَّلَى and كَبِيلَةَ تُوَّلَى, like كَبِيلَةَ [247], pl. of كَامِلَ perfect (Sn); and, as for the sounding true in such as حَرَكَةَ and حَرَكَةَ حَرَكَةَ [247, 711], [pls. of weaving and حَآَثِكَ and حَآَثِكَ unfaithful (Sn),] it is anomalous by common consent. There remain two other conditions [not mentioned in the IM]. One, which IM mentions in the Tashil and the CK, is that the be not a subst. for a letter not transformable, by which he guards against [with Fath of the , though Kasr is more excellent, as SBD transcribes from the CK (Sn),] for شَجَرَةَ tree [685]; for they do not
transform [this ی (MN)], because the ی is a subst. for the ی: the poet says

إِذَا لَمْ يُكْنِ فِي نَّفْسِهِ شَجَرَةً رَوْنَ جَنِّى # فَأَبْعَدَ كَنَّ آللَّهُ مِنْ شَجَرَةٍ

[685] (A) If there be not in you any shade, nor any fruit, then God curse you for trees!, where شَجَرَةٍ, with Fath of the ش, is orig. شَجَرَاتُ (MN). And the other is that the ی be not in the place of a letter not transformable, even if it be not a subst. [for such a letter], by which he guards against such as يَخَسَّسَ i. q. يَخَسَّس despaired,
since its ی, though mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is not transformed [into ی], because it is in the position of the Hamza; while the Hamza, if in its position, would not be [so] changed [658]; so that the ی is treated in the same way, because of its occurrence in the place of the Hamza. So he says in the CK: “and”, says he, “it may be that the ی in يَخَسَّس is sounded true because, [even if it were transformable (Sn),] its transformation would be negativized: for it was [orig.] before, but has since been put after, the Hamza; so that, if it were changed [into ی], two alterations, the alteration of transfer, [i. e., transposition (Sn),] and the alteration of change, [i. e., transformation,] would be combined in it”. This is his language: but some mention that the reason why يَخَسَّس is not transformed is that the conjunction of the [preceding]
Fatha with it is adventitious, because the ی is the ف of the word; so that it is meant to be understood as prior, and the Hamza before it as posterior: and, according to this, the previous stipulation [in the fifth condition] that the conjunction of the Fatha with the ی should be original makes this condition unnecessary. And IBdh mentions another condition for this transformation, viz. that the sounding true should not be intended for a notification of the obsolete o. f.: and by that he guards against retaliation [685, 703, 711], a certain disease in a camel’s head [703], and ِجَبَدُ, i.e., length, and beauty, of neck; ِحَيْدَى, ِحَيْدَى, ِحَيْدَى [272]; and ِحَوَّية and ِحُوَّية [above]. But this is not needed because these [ns.] are anomalous [in that their ِو or ی is not converted into ِ] notwithstanding their fulfilment of the conditions (A); though ِحَيْدَى’s being anomalous proceeds only upon the opinion of Akh [above] that the ِل of feminization does not prevent, not upon the opinion of Mz that it does prevent, t. transformation (Sn): and like those [ns.] in anomalousness are ِرَجَحَ, غَيْبَ, [lexicological (Sn)] pls. of ِرَأجَحَ, غَأيَبَ, absent [257]; ِعَفُو, ِعَفُو ا. q. جَحَعُى a young ass; ِهِيَةُ Huyawa, [a stronghold belonging to the Banu Zubaid in AlYaman (MI)]; ِأَزَوُّ, ِأَزَوُّ, which is the very cunning man; and ِلَرَةٌ ِلَرَةٌ, which is the dog’s
platter (A). [above] is anomalous (SH), because of what we have mentioned [298, 311]; but is (R) obligatory [below] (SH), necessary (R). They say, for the rel. n. (1) of أَلْحِيْرَة Al-Hi‘ra, [a city near AlKūfa, and (Jh, KF) also (Jh)] حُارِى, [irregularly (Jh).] as though, deeming the combination of the two Kasras with the [three] یَs to be heavy, they substituted a Fatha for the Kasra of the ح, and an ی for the [first] یَ, converting the quiescent first ی into ی [311]. And [the Prophet's saying (KF)] إِرْجَعُنَّ مَازِرَتُكَ خَيْرُ مَازِرَتِكَ Repent ye when laden [with sin], unrewarded occurs in tradition, orig. مَؤْرِزُ، the [quiescent] ی being converted into ی for lightness [above], as we have mentioned (IY): [or] for conformity (KF), because of the influence of مِازِرَتُ (Jh); whereas, if it stood alone, مَؤْرِزُ would be said (Jh, KF): so says IAл (Jh). And hence their saying يَبَّأَجُلْ for يَبَّأَجُلْ [333, 674, 701, 703], and يَبَّأَجُلْ for يُبَّأَجُلْ سُ [701], converting the [quiescent] ی and ی into ی, because they consider the combination of ی with ی to be easier for them than the combination of two ی s, and than ی together with ی (IY). But such as یَبَّأَجُلْ ؛ یَبَّأَجُلْ [though regular in some dials. (R),] is weak (SH), because of the conversion of the quiescent ی and ی, preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath,
into ی (R). And the most likely [opinion] is that the saying تَزَوَّدْ مَنًا ۡمَهَّ ۡلَحَٰلَ (16) and its counterparts are instances of that [conversion of the quiescent ی into ی] (IY). Substitution of the ی for the Hamza is (M, SH) (1) obligatory [below] in such as أَدُم [661, 682] (M, R), because of the combination of two Hamzas: (a) the meaning of “obligatory” [above] is that the use of the original [letter] is not allowable (IY): (2) regular, but (R) not obligatory (M, R), in such as ۚرَأَس [642, 658, 682] (M, SH), where the use of the original, or of the deriv., [letter] is allowable, for which reason the substitution is not obligatory (IY), except according to the people of AlHijaz [658] (R). Its substitution for the [single (A)] ن [and the Tanwin (R)] is (M, R, A) in pause (M, R), exclusively, upon three things, (1) the acc. pronounced with Tanwin (M), as in رَأَبَت [زِيدًا I saw (M)] Zaid [640] (M, R): (2) that [v.] to which the single [corrob. (IY)] ن preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath is affixed (M), as in قَسَفًا XCVI. 15. [153, 497, 608, 610, 649] (M, R, A); and similarly ۚلا تَقْعُدَ الْمَيْسِمَاتَ العَمَّ [614, 649]: AlA’shâ says مَتَى تَأَجَّجَكُن تأَجَّجَكُن [497, 649], meaning تَأَجَّجَكُن; and the other says تأَجَّجَكُن [154, 424], meaning that shall assuredly blaze up brightly, [orig. تَأَجَّجَكُن, as explained below]; while Imra alKais, in his saying ۚفِنَا دَكَََّكَ أَلَحَٰلَ
[115, 640], is said to mean جَفْسُ [649]; and the counterparts of that are numerous (IY: (a) تَأَجَّجَحَا in the [second] verse is [considered by AKB to be] a pret., [as rendered in §. 424, on the authority of the Jsh,] the l being (a) for unbinding [649]; while its ag. is the pron. of (α) a fire: AHD says in the Kitāb anNabāt "[264, 282] is made masc., which is rare”; and then cites this verse: while some say that نَارٍ is only fem.; but that the poet makes the pron. masc., because by شَهَابًا he means a flame, which is masc., or because the feminization of نَارٍ is improper [263], نَارَ تَأَجَّجِ [21, 263]: (b) حَطَّبًا firewood, because it is more important, since the fire exists only by its means: (b) not for unbinding, but only the pron. of the two, حَطَّبًا and نَارَ; while the pron. is made masc. because of the predominance of [the masc.] حَطَّبًا over [the fem.] نَارًا [320]: F says “Akh says that he means the fire and the firewood”: (b) some say that تَأَجَّجَا is an aor. v., from whose beginning the [aoristic] t is elided; but that the l is substituted for the single corrob. ن, the o. f. being تَأَجَّجَحَكَٰنّ [above]: and in that case the latent pron. [165] belongs to the fem. نَارًا, for which reason the v. is made fem. (AKB): (3) إذنَ [594, 640], as فَعَلْنَهَا إذا XXVI. 19. [201] (M). The l is
substituted for the \( \text{ین} \) in these positions because of the \( \text{ین} \)’s resemblance to the letters of prolongation and softness, on account of the nasality in them [270, 450, 663, 671] (IY). Its substitution for the \( \text{س} \) is [authorized by IH] in \( \text{جی} \) [above], according to one opinion (SH), i. e., that its o. f. is \( \text{یم} \), which is the saying of the BB [above]. This is valid, as respects [both] sense, because \( \text{جی} \) is i. q. \( \text{یم} \); and [letter,] because its dim. is \( \text{هیم} \); although the saying of KS [above] is nearer to analogy in changing \( \text{س} \) into \( \text{ل} \). And for this reason the author of the KF adopts the opinion of the BB, saying “Its o. f. is \( \text{یم} \)”: [though he does not follow IH and Jrb in holding its \( \text{س} \) to be converted directly into \( \text{ل} \); but prefers the indirect conversion described by R in §. 683, adding] “the \( \text{s} \) is changed into Hamza, [so that \( \text{یم} \) becomes \( \text{یم} \) (KF);] and then [two Hamzas occur consecutively, so that (KF)] the [second (KF)] Hamza [is changed (KF)] into \( \text{l} \)” (MASH).

§. 685. The \( \text{ی} \) is the letter most extensively substituted (A). It is substituted for (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), the \( \text{l} \) and \( \text{م} \) (MASH); (3) the Hamza; (4) one of the duplicate [or triplicate] letters; (5) the \( \text{n} \); (6) the \( \text{ع} \); (7) the \( \text{ب} \); (8) the \( \text{س} \); (9) the \( \text{ث} \) (M, SH). Its substitution is frequent because it is a vocal [734] letter, whose outlet is from the middle of the 131a
tongue [732]; so that, since its outlet occupies the middle of the mouth, and there is in it a lightness not [found] in any other [letter], it is substituted with a frequency not belonging to any other. Its substitution is of two kinds, regular and anomalous. The regular is its substitution for three letters, the š, the 舅 , and the Hamza (IY). Its substitution for the š is [regular] in two cases, vid. where the letter before the š is (1) pronounced with Kasr, as in مصباح [18, 253, 256], and مقاتع pl. of مفتوح [253, 386]; and similarly in their dims. (Aud), مفتوح pl. of مفتوح [274, 233] and ضيراب [274] (Tsr): (a) hence ضائراب inf. n. of ضائر , and ضائراب inf. n. of ضائر [332]: (b) the reason why the š, when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, must be converted into ى is that, being weak, on account of the width of its outlet, it acts as a [mere] letter of prolongation, impleting the vowel of the preceding letter (IY): (2) a ى of the dim. [379], as in غلام inf. n. of غلام [369, 374] (Aud), because the letter after the ى of the dim. is only mobile [274], whereas the š does not receive a vowel; while the letter before the š is only mobile, whereas the ى of the dim. is only quiescent: so that, after the ى of the dim., the š must be converted into a letter that will be mobile, and will not prevent quiescence of the letter before it; and is therefore converted into ى , because of
its affinity to the preceding letter; and because, if the ḫ were converted into ʿ, it would afterwards have to be converted into ẓ, as in سَيَّد [below] (Tsr). Its substitution for the ʿ is [regular] in ten cases, (1) where the ʿ occurs after a Kasra, when the ʿ is (a) final, [whether it be in an act. or pass. v., or in a n. (Tsr),] as in رَضَى was pleased [686, 719] and قَوَى was strong, عَفِى was effaced, the raider [301] and the caller (Aud): (a) the ʿ in these five cxs. is converted into ẓ because of its occurrence as a final after a Kasra, their o. f. being وَضَرَّ and ٌضْرَان from ِضْرٌ [728] pleasure and قَرْة strength [729], from عَفِى effacement, and أَذَاعُ from أَذِّرٌ raiding and دَعِى a call (Tsr): (b) before the ʿ of femininization, as in شِكِيَةَ sad (Aud), said of a woman (Jh), an act. part. [on the measure of فُعَلَة (Jh)] from ُشَكَیْةَ sadness (Tsr); َآكْسِیَةَ [246] (Aud), pl. of ُشَجَو [683] (Tsr); خَارِیَةَ raider [724] (Aud), a [fem.] act. part. from ُشَرْوَ (Tsr); and عَرِیقِیَةَ عَرِیقِیَةَ (Aud) and تَرِیقِیَةَ [238] (Tsr), dim. of عَرْقَوَة [248, 301, 675] (Aud) and تَرْقَوْة [385, 675]: (a) the ʿ, in the whole [of these cxs.] is converted into ẓ because of its occurrence as a final after a Kasra, since the ʿ of femininization is virtually separate [266]: (b) the ʿ, in عَرِیقِیَةَ [or تَرِیقِیَةَ] ought not to be converted into
because the word is [orig.] formed with the ؤ, as is proved by [the fact] that we have no infl. n. ending in a ؤ preceded by Damma, which shows that ؤ is on a par with ؤ [721]; but they make no distinction here between the word's being [orig.] formed with the ؤ and its not being so (Tsr): (c) سؤوام pl. of سؤااسة [with Fath of the س, i. q. مثأو equal, as سؤااسة آلناس سؤااسة فَتُينُ اَلأَمِّرُ The people are equal in this matter (Tsr),] and meaning servants [below] are anomalous (Aud): (α) سؤااسة is, as it were, pl. of مثأو [above] by elision of the augs., except that another س is added in it (Tsr): (β) its measure is فعاللة: and it is anomalous in several [other (Su)] respects, firstly the repetition of the ف in the pl., notwithstanding its not being repeated in the sing., which is the counterpart of the repetition of the ع in the dim. (Tsr) in عُشْيَشْيَة [286] (Tsr, Sn), dim. of عُشْيَة, notwithstanding its not being repeated in the non-dim. (Sn): secondly the pluralization of فعالً upon this measure, the pl. required by analogy being ؤَسْرِئْل, like ؤْقِبَأ pl. of ؤْقِبَأ tunic [246]: thirdly [the repetition of the ف as an aug., notwithstanding that the ع is not repeated with it, since (Sn)] the rule is that, when the ف is repeated as an aug., the ع [also (Tsr)] should be repeated with it, as in مَرْمَمْپِس [370, 671]; and
that, when it is repeated alone, it should be *rad.*, as in

\[671^r\] (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (γ) مَّقَتِّرٍ [above] is [said by Dm to be (Sn)] pl. of مَّقَتِّرٍ act. part. (Tsr, Sn) of مَّقَتِّرٍ i. q. حَدِمٌ served (Sn), from مَّقَتِّرٍ i. q. حَدِمٌ service (Tsr), being orig., [as in the Tsr (Sn),] مَّقَتِّرٌ; but having the [second (Sn)] and converted into ی, because final after a Kasra; and being then subjected to the same transformation as قَافِصٌ [16] (Tsr, Sn); [so that its sound pl. is مَّقَتِّرُون, like قَافِصُون (234),] as

متَى كَنَا لَأَهْلِكَ مَّقَتِّرُونَا

When were we servants to thy family? [below] (Tsr):

[but the author of the KF says that] مَّقَتِّرٍ is i. q. خَدِمٌ took him as a servant, anomalous, because خَدِمٌ is intrans. [494A, 496]; and [that] the sing. of خَدِمٌ [below] is مَّقَتِّرٌ, مَّقَتِّرٌ sing. of مَّقَتِّرٌ (253, 265) (KF): (δ) the servant is called مَّقَتِّرٌ with Fath of the م, and doubling of the ی, as though it were a rel. n. [300] from مَّقَتِّرٍ service, which is an inf. n.; but the ی of relation may be made single, [as in مَّقَتِّرٍ (311), in which case مَّقَتِّرٌ becomes مَّقَتِّرٌ, the sound pl. of which is مَّقَتِّرُون, like قَافِصُون (234),] as in the saying of 'Amr Ibn Kulthum
Thou browbeatest us, and threatenest us. Gently! When were we servants to thy mother, (that thou shouldst browbeat us, and threaten us)? [while some say that] the [sound] pl. is formed by rejecting the of relation; so that you say مَقْتُورُونَ in the nom., and مَقْتُورُ in the acc. and gen. (EM): S says "They asked Khl about مَقْتُورُ pl. مَقْتُورُ; and he said that it was on a par with اَشْعَرُونَ اَشْعَرُ pl. 253]" (Jh): (e) these two [anomalous formations] have no third: ISd says in the مُعَلَّكَمَ that F said "IAmb told me, on the authority of Th, that the latter had not heard any [formation] like مَقْتَرَةٌ, except one word that A U d had told him, vid. مَستَرْنِ سُوَّاً meaning سُوَّاً I. q. مَسْتَرْن. is predicable of one or more, as كَيْسُ سُوَّاً III. 109. They are not equal, because it is orig. an inf. n. [148], i. q. إِسْتُوَّة equality (ML): (η) they say سَوَّاسِةٌ سَوَّاسِةٌ also, according to the general rule in transformation (Tsr, Sn); and the pl. of مَقْتُورُ ought to be مَقْتَرَةٌ [above]: (θ) I Br says in the Glosses on the Jh that سَوَّاسِةٌ is a heteromorphous pl. of سُوَّا, like بَاطِلٌ pl. of بَاطِلٌ 255]; as though it were pl. of سُوَّاسِةٌ: and that the measure of سَوَّاسِةٌ is نَعُلَةٌ like [that of] شِرْفَةٌ agile; not نَعُلَةٌ, because
the cat. of سَلِسُ [674] is extraordinary; nor قَوَّعَةُ، because the cat. of كَرْبُ [373, 671, 672] is extraordinary; nor فَعَّلَةُ، because the ف is not repeated alone: so that [the notion of] سَوَاسْيَةُ or قَوَّعَةٌ or فَعَّالَةٌ is vain; and it must be فَعَّالَةٌ: and this is a fine discourse, which the author of the أَعْدِ السُّلَيْبُانُ transcribes in the Glosses [on the IM]: (c) before the ل of feminization, (α) abbreviated, as when you form from غَزْوُ هِبَتْبَى فَعَّلَى [397, 399], in which case you say غَزْوِيَا; (β) prolonged, as when you form from عُزْوُ أَربَعَاءُ [273, 390], in which case you say عُزُيَا (Tsr): (d) before the أَعْجَيْبُ أَعْجَيْبَاءُ [686] which resembles the two لs of feminization (Tsr),] as in your saying غَزْيَا [385] from غَزْوُ (Aung), because the two لs of feminization [263] and what resembles them are virtually separate [from the ن ending therein] (Tsr): (2) where the و occurs as ع of an inf. n. of a v. transformed in the ع, and is preceded by a Kasra, and followed by an ل, as in فَطْسَانُ fasting and قِيَامُ standing [713] (Aung), inf. ns. of the [unaugmented] tril. (Tsr); and إِفْتِيَانُ submissiveness [713] and اعتِيَانُ accustoming oneself (Aung), inf. ns. of the augmented [tril.]: orig.
and, and, and, in which is converted into ی, because it is transformed in their vs. by conversion into ١ [684, 703]; while its remaining sound in the inf. n. after a Kasra, and before a letter resembling the ی in prolongation, would be deemed heavy; so that it is transformed in the inf. n. by conversion into ی, for the purpose of making the inf. n. accord with its v. in [the fact, if not the mode, of] transformation, in order that the action on the crude-form may become uniform [as a euphonic change of the ا] (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) سوار bracelet [below] and سوار tooth-pick (Aud), generic ns. [3], where the ١ is not converted into ی (Tsr), because the quality of inf. n. is non-existent; (b) لیوان inf. n. of لیوان sought refuge, one with another, and جاور inf. n. of جاور was neighbour to, [where, though they are inf. ns., the ی is not converted into ی (Tsr),] because the ی of the v. [جوُرَ جاور (Tsr)] is sounded true; (c) رواج inf. n. of رواج went in the evening, for lack of the Kasra (Aud) before it (Tsr); (d) جول [below] inf. n. of حال shifted and عَيْد inf. n. of عَيْد أَلْبِيَف visited the sick, [where, though they are inf. ns. whose vs. حال and عَيْد are transformed by conversion of their ی into ١, the ی is not converted into ی (Tsr)] for lack of the ١ (Aud) after them (Tsr): (a) in this case, [i. e., where the ١ is lacking (Tsr),] transformation
is rare, as جَعَلَ اللَّهُ كُلُّمُ قَيِّمًا وَأَرْزُعُهُم IV. 4. [And give not unto lunatics your goods, which] God hath made to be a support for you; but maintain them, in the reading of نَسِي and Ibn 'Āmir, [i. q. قَيِّمًا, like i. q. عَرْوُجُ Qَيِّمًا, seeking protection (K, B),] and جَعَلَ اللَّهُ الْكَعْبَةَ أَلْبِيَتِي V. 98. [156] to be a station for men, [where the fearful shall take refuge, and the weak be safe, and the merchant shall gain, and where to the pilgrims and settlers shall repair (B),] in the reading of Ibn 'Āmir (Aud), their o. f. being قَيِّمًا, but the كُلُّمُ being converted into كَلُّمُ because the preceding letter is pronounced with كَسَرُ (Tsr): (α) Qَيِّمُ is an inf. n. on [the measure of] كَلُّمُ, like شَيْعُ [348], its كَلُّمُ being transformed [into كَلُّمُ], as it is transformed [into كَلُّمُ] in its v. (B on V. 98.): (b) sounding [the كَلُّمُ] true, notwithstanding the fulfilment of the conditions, in كَرُتُ الْطَّغِيّةِ inf. n. of نَوارَ The doe-gazelle shied away, i. q. نَفْرَتُ, is anomalous (Aud): (α) by rule it should be نَفْرَتُ نيَّار; but it occurs with the كَلُّمُ sounded true, as in the saying of Al‘Ajjāj

يِخْلِطُونَ بِالْتَّأْنِيسِ أَلْتَوَارَا

They mingle shyness with familiarity, cited by IJ (Tsr): (β) no counterpart of it has been heard (Aud), says IM in the `CK (Tsr): (γ) 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar reads قَرَوْمًا
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with the ء [in IV. 4. above]; but [this is not an inf. n., since] تَوَمُّ is what a thing is supported by, like مَلَلُ for what a matter is governed by (K): (3) where the ء occurs as ع of a pl. sound in the ج, and is preceded by a Kasra; while, in the sing., it is (а) transformed, [i. e., converted (Tsr),] as in دَارُ pl. of جَيْبٌ pl. of جِيْلَةٌ artifice [634], دَمِّ pl. of دِمَةٌ [below], قِيْمَةٌ pl. of قِيْمَةٌ pl. of قِيْمَةٌ pl. of قِيْمَةٌ قَامَةٌ pl. of قَامَةٌ pl. of قَامَةٌ pl. of قَامَةٌ stature [238] (Aud): (а) the o. f. is دَمَّ, جِلَّ, دَوَآرُ, and تَوَمُّ; but, since the ء is preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr in the whole [of these exs.], and in the sing. is transformed by conversion into ج in the first and last, and into ي in the intermediate [exs.], it becomes weak, so that the Kasra overpowers it: (b) we deduce from the multiplication of the exs. that, when the ء is transformed in the sing., the occurrence of the ج after it [in the pl.], as in دَيْرٌ [above], is not prescribed as a condition, contrary to the opinion of IUK (Tsr): (c) جَوْجَ pl. of حَاجَةٌ need is anomalous (Aud), the regular form being حَجَّ, because the ء is preceded by Kasra, and is transformed in the sing. [by conversion into ج] (Tsr): (b) quasi-transformed, i. e., quiescent, in which the condition of conversion is that it be followed in the pl. by an ج, as in سِيَاطٌ pl. of سِيطٌ whip [242, 713], حَوْضٌ pl. of حَوْضَ cistern, and
( 1265 )

pl. of رَضٍّ [238, 254, 713] (Aud): (a) their o. f. is سِوَاط, جَوْض, and رَمَش: but, since the ا, is preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr in the whole [of them], and is quiescent in the sing., it becomes weak, so that the Kasra overpowers it; while the overpowering effect of the Kasra is strengthened by the presence of the ل (Tsr), because of what is mentioned [in case 2] above, that the ل resembles the ی [in prolongation] (Sn): (b) it results that conversion of the ا, into ی in this case has five conditions, (α) that the expression be a pl.; (β) that the ا, in its sing. be dead by reason of quiescence; (γ, δ) that the ا, in the pl. be preceded by a Kasra, and followed by an ل; (ε) that it be sound in the ل (A): (ε) if the ل be missing, the ا, is sounded true, as in كُوْرُ pl. of كْر ن, and عَرْدَة pl. of عُرْدُن with Fath of its initial, meaning an old camel (Aud), because, when the ل is lacking, the work of the tongue is less; so that the articulation of the ا, after the Kasra is lightened: for which reason the ا, is sounded true; and may not be transformed, because to the lack of transformation [in the sing.] is joined the protection of the ا, by its distance from the end [of the word], in consequence of the ا of feminization, [which is regarded as an outwork protecting the ا, on its weak side, i.e., towards the end, where alteration is prevalent] (Tsr): (α) نُحَرْ تَر [pl. of نُحُر bull, by
change of the ج into ي (Tsr),] is anomalous (Aud), the regular form being نج with the ج sounded true: (β) it is said that the o. j. is نج with quiescence of the ج, which is transformed [into نج (257)] by conversion of the ج into ي [case 5 below]; and that the ج is afterwards pronounced with Fath: (γ) Mb asserts that it is contracted from نعالة [237], being orig. نثب، for which reason it is transformed, [because of the presence of the ل]; and that it is afterwards contracted [into نثب]: so IM transmits from him: (δ) the [explanation generally] recognized as his, however, is that they say نثب in order that the conversion [of the ج into ي] may be an indication that it is pl. of نجر bull, meaning the animal, not of نجر slab, meaning of dried curd, the distinctive peculiarity [of نجر in the former sense] being that, since they say نثران [256], by conversion of the ج into ي, because quiescent, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [case 5 below], as pl. of نجر bull, meaning the animal, they make its pl. نثب accord therewith; whereas the pl. نجر slabs, meaning of dried curd, has no [such alternative] form, wherewith it might be made to accord in conversion: so says Jrb (Tsr): (δ) the ج is also sounded true, (α) if it be mobile in the sing., as in نجر pl. of
The horses standing upon three legs and the point of the toe of the fourth leg, the coursers (Aud), pl. of جُرى (Tsr): though جُرَىُّ (Tsr) is said to be [not anomalous, but only (Tsr)] pl. of جُرَى (pl. courser or (B)] جُرَىُّ [251], not of جُرَى (Aud); and, says IM in the CK, as for جُرَى جُرَى of طِبَّان, possibly it may be regarded as [a heteromorphous pl. of the cat. of جُرَىُّ pl. of جُرَى, as though it were pl. of طَلَّان from meaning surpassed him in tallness (Tsr): (β) if the ل be unsound, [a ی or ٰ, the first (Tsr)] as in 343, 348 (Aud), جُرَىُّ from ی [348], orig. رَبَّانُ; the, being converted into ی, which is incorporated into the ی [case 7 below] (Tsr); and [the second as in (Tsr)] جُرَى with [Fath of the ج, and (Tsr)] doubling of the ج (Aud), the air (KF), i.e., what is between the sky and the earth, and [Jaww.] the name of a district in AlYamāma (Tsr): in which case one says [in their pl. (Tsr)] ۲۷۸, 713 and جُرَى [below] (Aud), like جُرَى جُرَى (235, 237) (Tsr), with the ع, [vid. the جّ (Tsr),] sounded true (Aud),
and being changed into Hamza, because final after an aug. 

transformation of their ʿ is not allowable with that [transformation of their ʿ] (Tsr), lest two transformations occur consecutively (Aud); so that one is restricted to transformation of the ʿ , because it is the seat of alteration (Tsr): and similarly in what resembles them (Aud), i.e., where the ʿ is transformed by being changed into Hamza, and the ʿ is [therefore] sounded true (Tsr): (4) where the ʿ occurs as a final, fourth or upwards [727] (Aud), [and] after a Fatha (IA, A), because, in that case, the expression containing it does not lack a transformable counterpart, with which it is made to accord—so says BD—whether the ʿ be in a n. or v. (Tsr):—you say ʿعَطَوْتُ [I took (Tsr)] and ʿزَكَّيْتُ [I threw, by retaining the ʿ, in its own form, because it is third (Tsr)]; but, when you put the Hamza or ι Duplication [433], you say ʿعَطَيْتُ I gave and ʿزَكَّيْتُ I purified, [by changing the ʿ into ʿ, because it becomes fourth (Tsr)]: and you say, in the pass. part. [of ʿعَطَيْتُ and ʿزَكَّيْتُ, when the sign of dualization is attached to it (Tsr)], ʿمُعَطَيْانِ and ʿمُزَكَّرَانِ (Aud), by changing the ʿ into ʿ [229]: (a) the reason why it is changed into ʿ in the pret. and pass. part. of the augmented v., although it is not after a Kasra, is that (Tsr) they make the pret. [ʿعَطَيْتُ and ʿزَكَّيْتُ (Tsr)]
accord with the aor. [يرَكِّبُ (Tsr)] and the pass. part. [Mexَّكُيِّان (Tsr)] with the act. part. [لا مَعْطِيَان (Tsr)] and مَعْطِيَان with Kasr of the ط and ل (Tsr)], since each of them, [i. e., of the aor. and act. part. (Tsr).] has a Kasra before its final [case 1] (Aud): (a) they make the deriv., [i. e., the pass. part.,] accord with its original, [the act. part.] as they make the original, [i. e., the pret.,] accord with its deriv., [the aor.] (Tsr): (b) S asked [his master (Tsr)] Khl about the reason for the transformation of [the , in] such [prets.] as تَغَارَزَنَا and تَدَعَّينَا We raided one another [727] and We called one another, [orig. تَغَارَزَنَا and تَدَعَّينَا , the , being changed into (Tsr).] notwithstanding that the aor. [تَغَارَزَنَا and تَدَعَّينَا (Tsr)] has no Kasra before its final: and he answered that the transformation existed [in the pret.] before the coming of the initial ت, vid. in غازَنَا and دَعَيْنَا , for conformity with [the aor.] and نُفَازَيْنَا and دَعَيْنَا [with Kasr of their penultimate (Tsr)]; and that it was afterwards retained in company with the ت [of تَفَاءَلِل] (Aud), as with the s of femininization in such as مَعْطَة given (Tsr), the t of which is converted from a ی, because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684]; while this ی is converted from a ض , because occurring fourth [and] after a Fatha (Sn): and this is a
good explanation of the reason (Tsr): (c) their saying [727] in the aor. of [the unaugmented tril.] شَأْنَ [with Fath of the Hamza, as likewise is the aor., (Sn)], meaning preceded, outwent, is anomalous, the regular form being يَشَأْنَ, because it is from شَأْنَ; while [in the aor.] there is no Kasra before the , on account of which it might be converted into ی; nor is the , converted in the pret., with which the aor. might be made to accord: if, indeed, the Hamza of transport be prefixed to it, you say يَشَأْنَ [in the pass. (Sn)], for conformity with the act. (A), the , of which is converted into ی on account of the Kasra before it (Sn): (5) where the , when quiescent, [and] single, follows immediately after a Kasra, as in مِيْرَانَ a balance, [orig. مِيْرَانَ, because from وزن weighing (Tsr),] and time appointed for performance of an action [278] (Aud), orig. مِرَاقَتَ time, where the , is converted into ی, because quiescent [and single] and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) صَوْانَ receptacle of a thing (Tsr) and سَوْار [above] (Aud), because the , in them is mobile, not quiescent (Tsr); (b) إِجْلِيْزَات (Aud) continuance, together with swiftness, of journeying [332, 482, 494] (Tsr), and إِعْلَوْطَ (Aud) clinging to the neck, as إِعْلَوْطَ.
meaning He clung to the neck of his camel, and mounted him [482, 494, 675], because the in them is double, not single: (a) is anomalous, not to be copied: so says IM in the Tashil (Tsr): (6) where the is a ل of فعَلَى with Damm, when an ep. [272], as in إنَّا زِيَّنَا السَّبَأَةَا أَلْدُنْيَا XXXVII. 6. Verily We have adorned the heaven nearest [to you (K, B)] and your saying لِلْمَتَقِينِ الدَّرَجَةُ أَلْعَلْيَا For the pious is the highest rank [725] (Aud), orig. أَعْلَمُ دَنْرَى nearness and العَلْوَى elevation, the in them being converted into ى, because the, with the Damma [of the initial] and the sign of feminization, is deemed heavy in the ep., [which is considered heavier than the substantive;] so that its ل is lightened by conversion into ى: (a) the proof that نُعَلَى [here] is an ep. is its being preceded by its qualified, as exemplified: (b) this is the original use [of the الدَّنْيَا]; while their use of it [as a substantive, which is] not preceded by a qualified [359], is a divergence from the original, but is subject to the same treatment [of the ل] (Tsr): (c) as for the saying of the Hijāzīs أَلْسَانُهَا [الْقُصْرَى (Tsr)] The farthest [distance, with the, sounded true (Tsr)], it is anomalous by rule, [but] chaste by usage, serving to notify the o. f., as [it is notified (Tsr)] in [the v., like (Tsr)] إِسْتَعْلِكَّةَ mastered, and [the substantive, like (Tsr)] قَانَ إِسْتَعْلِكَّةَ [684, 711] (Aud), by rule إِسْتَحْكَانَةَ
with transformation, which is omitted for notification of the o. f. [725]: (d) the Banū Tamīm say ʿ ал ْقِصِيَ َا with transformation, according to rule (Tsr): (e) if ُعَلَّيَ be a substantive, [not an ép., the Ј in (Tsr)] it is not altered [by being changed into ى] but the Ј is retained in its o. f., to distinguish the substantive from the ép. (Tsr), as in the saying [of Dhu-r-Rumā (MN, Tsr)]

أِدَّارًا بِكَرُؤُوهُ هَتْجَبِلُ لِلْعَبْسِ إِيَّهَـاَّ نُمَّاءُ الْهَرَاءِ ِحُرْرَيْنِ أَوْ يُحَرْرَيْنِ

[725] (Aud) O abode in Huzwā [272], thou hast excited for the eye a flow of tears, so that the water of emotion gushes part after part, or remains fluctuating in the eye, coming and going (MN, Tsr), with the Ј in ُحْرُؤُهُ retained in its [original] state: and they do not reverse [the rule], because the substantive is lighter than the ép.: (f) in what the author of the Aud mentions, vid. that the Ј of ُعَلَّيَ, when a Ј, is changed in the ép., and preserved in the substantive, he follows IM; while IUK says that this [rule laid down by IM] is contrary to the saying of the Etymologists, who reverse [it], changing the Ј in the substantive, not in the ép., so that they make ُحْرُؤُهُ anomalous [725] (Tsr): but IM says, in one of his books, [“The GG say that this is peculiar to the substantive, though they exemplify only by a pure ép., or by َالْعَدْنِيَّا, where the substantivity is adventitious; and they assert that the sounding (of the Ј) true in
is anomalous, like that in حَرَّمُ (below): but this is a doctrine of whose correctness there is no evidence; whereas" (A)] "what I say is confirmed by evidence, and is agreeable with [the doctrine of (Tsr)] the Masters of lexicology: [for] Az quotes Fr and JSk as saying that whatever ep. is like الْعُلَّيَا, and is with the ی, since they deem the ی heavy with the دالَّمَم of its initial," [and with the heaviness of the ep. (Sn)]: "nor is there any dispute about it, except that the people of AlHijāz display the ی in اللُّصْقِيَّة above], while the Banū Tamūf say: اللُّصْقِيَّة" (A, Tsr): and, as for the saying of IH "contrary to the ep., as عَلَّیِّ ی (725), meaning the fem. of الْاَخْرَی the greatest raider, BD says "It is an exemplification of his own, and is not accompanied by any report [of its having been heard from the Arabs]; while analogy requires that الْعُلَّيَا should be said, as الْعُلَّيَا is said" (A) : (7) where the ی and ی meet, [and are combined (Tsr),] in a [single (Tsr)] word (Aud), or what is virtually a [single] word, like مُسْلِیِّ مَيْ my Muslims (A), in the nom., because the pre. and post. are like one thing, especially when the post. is the ی of the 1st pers. [129] (Sn); while the first of the two [unsound letters] is quiescent, original in nature and quiescence [716] (Aud): for, when these conditions are combined, the , must be converted into ی, whether the ی precede or
follow, because it is heavier than the ی, in order that lightness may, so far as possible, be attained (Tsr); and then the [first] ی must be incorporated into the [second] ی [747] (Aud), because of the combination of two likes [731] (Tsr): (a) exs. of that, (a) where the ی precedes [the ی (Tsr)], are میت سید and سید میت [251, 703], orig. سید and میت [683, 16] (Aud), because from سان was lord, aor. یمومت یسون by conv. of consent, and مات died, aor. according to one of the two diacs. [482]: (α) their measure, according to critical judges, vid. the BB, is قیعل with Kasr of the ی: (β) the Bdd hold it to be قیعل with Fath of the ی, like قیعل and صیرف سید [373], transferred to قیعل with Kasr of the ی, because, say they, we do not see, in the sound, any n. on [the measure of] قیعل with Kasr: but this [argument] is weak, because what does not occur in the sound sometimes occurs in the unsound, which is a separate sort; so that this may be a formation peculiar to the unsound [251], like فعلهٔ pl. of فعل, as فعله تنصة [247]; and, if قیعل were with Fath, they would say سید with Fath (Tsr): (b) where the ی precedes [the ی (Tsr)], are ی لئی and ی لئی [278, 302], inf. ns. of تَبَ؛* I folded and ی Lَبَ؛* I twisted, orig. ی طوی and ی طوی (Aud), with Fath of their first, and quiescence of their second [letter], their ی being converted into ی, and incorporated into
the ى (Tsr): (b) sounding [the ṭ (Tsr)] true is necessary, ى (Tsr): (b) if the ى and ى be in two words, as یُسیر Yūsūr calls [with the ى preceding the ى (Tsr)], and یُسیر واقع ى A threatener will shoot (Aud) with the ى preceding the ى (Tsr): (b) if the first of them be (a) mobile, as یُسیر [with the ى mobilized with Kasr (Tsr)], and یُسیر [348, 714] (Aud) with the ى mobilized with Damm (Tsr): (b) adventitious in nature (Aud), [not, however, as Kh distinguishes, when necessarily so, but only when] allowably, which is [explained by him as] of three sorts, substituted for an ى [686], as سیر [716]; substituted for ى [686], as when you form from بیع a [v.] commensurable with بیع [482], saying بیع and then put it into the pass., saying بیع; and substituted for a Hamza [658] (Tsr), as ریه alleviated form of ریه sight (Aud): for in the whole of that there is no change [of ى into ى], nor any incorporation, because the first [unsound] letter is [allowably] adventitious; contrary to ایمة alleviated form of ایمة, which is on the model of ایم from being without husband, or without wife: since the second Hamza is changed into ى, [as in ایمة ى,] because the one before it is pronounced with Damm [661], so that ى becomes ى; and this change is necessary [661]: and then the ى is converted into ى, which is incorporated
into the [second] ی, so that ِرَبُّ یَأ becomes ِرَبُّ یَم; and this [process also of] change and incorporation is necessary, because the ی is necessarily adventitious in nature, since it is orig. [a second] Hamza, [the alleviation of which is necessary;] the adventitiousness that defends from change being only the allowable, not the necessary, adventitiousness (Tsr): (γ) adventitious in quiescence, as َقَرَى [with quiescence of the ی (Tsr)], orig. [ِقَرَى] with Kasr [above] (Aud), because it is a pret. v. (Tsr); but made quiescent [in the medial] for lightness, as َعَلِمُ [with quiescence of the ی (Tsr)] is said for َعَلِمُ [482] (Aud) with Kasr of it: though some allow ِقَرَى with incorporation after conversion (Tsr): (c) three sorts deviate anomalously from what we have mentioned, (α) a sort [in] which [the ی ] is transformed, though it does not fulfil the conditions, like the reading [ِلِدْرِیَّا] in XII. 43. [498] with change [of the Hamza into ی, and of the ، into ی ،] and incorporation [of the first ی into the second] (Aud), although the ، is [allowably] adventitious in nature, because it is alleviated from the [single] Hamza [658]: (α) Ks, who heard this reading, transmits that [doctrine of its anomalousness]; but some, says IM in the CK, transmit that it is regular, according to one dial. (Tsr): (b) a sort [in] which [the ی ] is sounded true, notwithstanding [its] fulfilment of them, [i. e., of the
conditions (Tsr.), as male cat (Tsr), below, aīm, below, inf. n. of the dog howled, and jā'ā, ḍūn, the dog howled. Rajá Ibn Haiwa (Aud): (α) you do not incorporate in below, because it is a [prim. (Jh)] substantive, which is not conformable to the v. (Jh, Tsr); and similarly in below, a man's name; both being different [in this respect] from 251 (Jh): so says Jh: (β) aīm is on the measure of a most hard day, i.e., kābīr al-ṣiddā, howled Haiwa, [says Jh in the Sahāh (Tsr),] is not subjected to incorporation, [as mīt, gīh, and mīt are (Jh),] because it is a [coined, prim. (Jh),] name [4] (Jh, Tsr) of a man (Tsr), not conformable to the v. (Jh); [and it is] diptote because of the quality of proper name and feminization [18] (Tsr): (c) a so.t in which the is changed into, into which the [preceding], is incorporated, [according to the converse of the rule (Tsr),] as [inf. n. of (above), by rule (Tsr),] and [686] (Aud), by rule [722], because orig. , being from forbidding (Tsr): (d) [both] transformation and sounding true are regular in the dim. of that n. [mobile in the, (Tsr)] whose broken pl. is on
[the measure of] ٌمَقَالِعُ [18, 253, 256], as جَذَّرُ [369] (Aud), pl. جَدَاوُلٌ [253]; and أَسْوَدُ, when [a substantive (Tsr)] denoting serpents (Aud), pl. أَسْوَدُ (Jh, Tsr), because it is a substantive; whereas, if it were an ep. [below], its pl. would be سُودٌ [249] (Jh): so that, in the dim. of جَذَّرُ and أَسْوَدُ, you say جَدِّيَوُلٌ and أَسِبِئَدُ جَدِّيَوُلٌ [279], by sounding [the] true; and جَدِّيَوُلٌ and أَسِبِئَدُ جَدِّيَوُلٌ [279], by transforming [it into] ی, and incorporating the ی of the dim. into it]: (a) as for the transformation, which is the preferable [method], it is the same process as in مَيْتُ سَيْدُ and مَيْتُ [above], according to the rule; and, as for the sounding true; it is because you treat this ی [of the dim.] like the ی of أَسْوَدُ جَدَاوُلٌ [279], since the ی of the dim. and the ی of the broken pl. are each put to denote a meaning; (b) if أَسْوَدُ were an ep. [348], transformation would be necessary in [the dim. of] it, because it does not take the pl. أَسْوَدُ: so says BD (Tsr); [but Jh says that] the dim of أَسْوَدُ black is أَسِبَيدُ, and, if you will, أَسِبَيدُ, [meaning blackish,] i.e., approximating to blackness [287] (Jh): (c) by our saying “mobile in the ی” [above] we guard against such as عُمْرُ عَكْبَرٌ، because, though their broken pl. [246] is on [the measure of] مَقَالِعُ [above], transformation [of the ی] is necessary in their dim., as
[279] and سم١٥٨٣; and sounding true is not allow-
able: the difference being that the mobile is strong
[279], and the quiescent weak; while the vowel of
[the ١٠ in] the dim. [ت٣٤٧ and أسب٣٩] is not taken into
account, because it is adventitious: so says IAz (Tsr):
(d) the pl. of سم١٥٨٣ [above] is ض١٥٨٩٠ [715], the , being
sounded true in its pl., because sounded true in the
sing.: but, for its dim., S says سم١٥٨٣ , transforming it,
and making it like سم١٥٨٣ , [which is allowable as dim. of
أَسْبَٰن serpent,] although its pl. is أَسْبَٰن; while there is
nothing to prevent those who say أَسْبَٰن for the dim.
[of أَسْبَٰن ] from saying سم١٥٨٣ (Jh): (8) where the ١٠ is
the ١٠ of the مَفْعُولٰٰ [of the v. (Tsr)] whose pret. is on [the
measure of ] مَعْلُوٰل with Kasr of the ع , [the trans. and
intrans. being alike in that respect, the first (Tsr)] as
مض١٥٨٣ approved it, pass. part. مَرْض١٥٨٣ approved [722]; and
the second as (Tsr) مَنَو١٥٨٤٠ عَلَى زُبي٣٩ overpowering Zaid, 
pass. part. مَضْرُس١٥٨٣ overpowering (Aud); orig. مَضْرُس١٥٨٣ [722] and
مض١٥٨٣ , with two , s after the ع , the first being
the ١٠ of مَفْعُولٰٰ [347], and the second their ١٠ : (a) their ١٠ is
converted into ١٠٠ , in order that the n. may be made
to accord with the v., where transformation is necessary
in that case, since the letter before the final is pronounced with Kasr [case 1]; so that they become مَعْجُورٌ and مَغْفُورٌ, in which the, and ی are combined, while the first of them is quiescent [case 7], for which reason the, is converted into ی, and the [first] ی incorporated into the [second] ی; while the Damma is changed into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved from conversion into, (Tsř): (a) the reading رَأْضِيَة مَرْضَة

LXXXIX. 28. Approving [what thou hast been vouchsafed (K, B)], approved [before God (K, B), with the, sounded true (Tsř)], is anomalous (Aud); but 1M in the Tashil pronounces it to be [merely] inferior (Tsř): (b) if the ی of the r. be pronounced with Fath, sounding true is necessary, as مَدْعُورٌ raided [722] and مَدْعُورٌ called (Aud), orig. مَدْعُورٌ and مَدْعُورٌ, with two, ی, the, of مَدْعُورٌ [347], and the ی of the word; so that the first is incorporated into the second, because of the combination of the two likes [731] (Tsř): (a) transformation [here] is anomalous, as in

وَقَدْ عَلَمَتْ عَرْبِيَّة مُلْيَةَ أَنْ یَهَا الْأَلْلَهُ مَعْدُوْیًا عَلَیْهِ وَعَادٍ [722] (Aud), by ʻAbd Yaghūth [Ibn Wakkās (MN)] alHarithi, And my wife Mulaika has known that I am the lion, when assailed, and when assailing, where he transforms [the ی of] مَدْعُورٌ [684], orig. مَدْعُورٌ (MN,
(1281)

Tsēr), upon the measure of مَفْعُولَ (MN): (α) Mz recites this verse with مَعْدُوَّا, by sounding [the ] true: but others recite it with transformation (A, Tsēr); and IM indicates the allowability of this by his saying "And sound the [ ] of مَفْعُولَ from such as عَدَّا true; or transform, if you do not aim at the more excellent [method]": (β) sounding true is for conformity with the act. v., and transformation for conformity with the pass. v. [722]; but sounding true is more proper, because conformity with the act. v. is so (Tsēr): مَعْدُوَّا عَلَيْهِ وَغَارِيًا (γ) occurs thus, with the undotted غ and د, in the MSS of [the commentary by] IUK: but مَغْفِرَّا عَلَيْهِ وَغَارِيًا when raided, and when raiding, with the dotted غ and د, occurs in Z’s book, [the M,] where he says "They say غَرَّى and غَرَّى; but they do say غَرَّى and غَرَّى, as

وَقَدْ عَلَّمَتْ عَرْسِي مَلِيْكَة أَنْتِي * أَنَا أَلْدَيْت مَغْفِرَّا عَلَيْهِ وَغَارِيًا [722]”; and the more correct [version] is what is mentioned by Z, [because he is as trustworthy as Hadhām in the adage] “When Hadhām says [anything], then believe her; for verily the [true] saying is what Hadhām has said” [194] (MN): [so says Al’Aīnī, who perhaps saw this version in some MS of the M; but Brōch and Jahn print مَعْدُوَّا آلَحَ in the text of the M; and this is the version given by IY, as also by R, IHS, and A;
while either version suits the argument in the Aud:]
(9) where the, is the ج of قُـْـلُ [with Damm of the (Tsr)]; when a pl., as غَـصٌّ pl. of حَـصٌّ [243, 299, 684, 722], قُـْـلٌ pl. of قَـفٌّ [328], and دَـلٌّ pl. of دَـلٌّ [237, 243] (Aud):
(a) the o. f. is دُـلُّ, عَـصِّرُ, قُـْـلُ, and قُـْـلُ: but, deeming the combination of two ج is heavy in the pl., they convert the last ج into ي; and then the first is transformed by conversion into ي, and incorporation [case 7]; while the letter before the [first] ي is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the ي may sound true (Tsr): (a) sounding [the ج] true [in the pl.] is anomalous, as أَـبُّ أَبْ, أَـخُ أَخْ, [pl. of أَـبُّ أَبْ father and أَـخُ أَخْ brother, both transmitted by IAr (Tsr)]; نُـكْـرٌ [with an undotted ح (Tsr)], pl. of نُـكْـرٌ i. q. جِـهَةٌ direction; نُـجْـرُ with a ج, pl. of نُـجْـرٌ, which is the cloud that pours down its water; and نُـجْـرُ pl. of نُـجْـرٌ, which is [the cavity of (KF)] the chest (Aud), transmitted by AHm on the authority of AZ: (α) the pls. mentioned are pronounced with Damm of the first and second [letters], orig. بُـهْرُ, نُـكْـرٌ, أَـخُ أَخْ, أَـبُّ أَبْ, نُـجْـرُ, and بُـهْرُ, نُـكْـرٌ, أَـخُ أَخْ, أَـبُّ أَبْ, with two ج, the first of which is incorporated into the second (Tsr): (b) if قُـْـلُ be a sing., sounding [the ج] true is necessary, as َبُـهْرُا ُبُـهْرُا كَبِيرًا XXV. 23. And have exceeded [the limit in wrong-doing (K, B)] with great excess, لَأَ يُـجْـلِّدُونَ ُعَمْـلُوا فِي آ لْآ رُؤْ XXVIII. 83. Seek not
elevation in the earth, \( \text{نَبُو} \) inf. n. of \( 
abla \text{كَبَّا أَلْبَال} \) The wealth increased, and \( \text{سُمُو} \) inf. n. of \( 
abla \text{سُمَّا زَبِّة} \) Zaid was exalted (Aud), all of these exs. being sing. inf. ns., pronounced with Ćamm of the first and second [letters], orig. \( \text{غَنَّرُو} \), \( \text{سُمُو} \), \( \text{نَمُو} \), \( \text{عَلْوُو} \), and \( \text{سُمُو} \), with two \( \text{s} \), the first of which is incorporated into the second (Tsr): (a) sometimes, however, the sing. is tranformed (Aud), by conversion of the last, into \( \text{س} \), and transformation of the first, like the transformation of [the \( \text{و} \), \( \text{ي} \)] case 7] (Tsr), as \( \text{عُنْتَي} \) [684, 722], inf. n. of \( 
abla \text{حَتَا أَلْشَيَع} \) The old man became decrepit; and \( \text{نَعْسُي} \), inf. n. of \( 
abla \text{قَسَا كَلْبَي} \) His heart was hard (Aud): (c) what is [said by IM] in the Alfiya necessarily implies that the pl. [\( 
abla \text{فُؤُوْل} \) and the sing. [\( 
abla \text{فُؤُوْل} \)] are equal [in this respect, that sounding true is preferable to transformation]; for [immediately after "And sound the ( ل of مَفْعُول from such as | \( \text{عَكَّا} \) true; or transform, etc."], cited above under case 8,] he says "Similarly the فُؤُوْل from the [crude-form] containing the \( 
abla \text{و} \), when this letter appears as a ل of a pl. or sing., occurs biform": whereas transformation is more suitable in the pl., because of its heaviness; and sounding true in the sing., because of its lightness (Tsr): (10) where the \( 
abla \text{و} \) is an \( \text{غُنُول} \) [with Ćamm of the \( 
abla \text{ف} \), and doubling of the \( 
abla \text{ع} \) (Tsr)], when a pl. sound in the ل, like \( \text{صَيّم} \) [pl. of صَيّم (Tsr)] and \( \text{نَيم} \) (Aud) pl. of نَٰئم, the \( 
abla \text{ع} \) [in
both] of which is a ૖ [247, 715, 716, 722]: (a) their o. f. is ૑ and ૜ [below]; but, two ૦ and a Damma being combined in the pl., it is as though three ૦ were combined, in addition to the heaviness of the pl., which therefore deviates to alleviation by conversion of the two ૦ into ی and ૦ are lighter than two ૦ (Tsr): (a) the more frequent [method] is to sound [the ی] true, [according to the o. f. (Tsr),] as ૜ and ૜ [above] (Aud); but a frequent, common, [method] is transformation, which is indicated by IM’s saying "And such as ૜ for ૜ is common" (Tsr): (b) sounding true is necessary if the ૦ be (a) unsound, lest two transformations [of the ૦ and ૦ (Tsr)] occur consecutively, as ی and ی pl. of ی roasting and ی erring (Aud), orig. ی and ی, the ૦ being transformed by conversion into ૤ [684], because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; and then elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents, [the ૦ and Tanwin]: so that, if the ૦ were transformed by conversion into ی, two transformations would occur consecutively in the [same] word; and that is considered disagreeable by them (Tsr): (b) separated from the ૦ [by an ૦ (Tsr)], as ی and ی [384, 715], because the ૦ is then far from the end, [which is the seat of alteration (M.Kh)]; while the saying
الآلهة طرقتنا منوبة أبو الداعر في أرخ آثابان الأَذَابِيَّات
[715, 716, 722] (Aud), by Dhu-r-Rumma (IY on §. 715),
or by Abu-l-Ghamr al-Kilabi, Now Mayya, the daughter of Mundhir, came to us at night; and not aught kept
the sleepers, [i.e., those whose habit was to sleep at
the time wherein she came (J),] awake; save her talking
(MN, Jsh, J), or, in an alternative version, سلامها
her greeting (Jsh), recited with the الْيَم, by IAr (IY),
is anomalous (Aud), by rule, the النوام, with the , sounded
true, which IM indicates by his saying “But the
anomaly of such as الْيَم is attributed” (Tsr) to the
learned (Sn, MKh) in Arabic (Sn), i.e., is transmitted
[by them] (A, Tsr) in ١٦١٢٢٨ [above] (A). And
the ⱀ is [regularly] substituted in place of the ⱀ and ⱀ, in
[the gen. and acc. of] such as مُسْلِمٌ [16, 228] and
مُسْلِمٌ [16, 234] (R). Its substitution, (1) for the ⱀ, is
(M, SH) (a) regular in such as (M, R) (α) ⱀ مَفْتَيْحٌ and
[above] (M), قَرِّثَتِيسٍ [274, 283] and قَرِّثَتِيسٍ [253]
(IY, R); (b) ⱀ حُسْبِهِ [281, 282, 293, 298] (R): (b) anom-
alous in such as حُبِّلَّ [643, 686] (SH): (α) حُبِّلَّ with
the ⱀ is regular, according to Fazara; so that IH should
rather say “weak” [643], not “anomalous” (R); (2)
for the , is (a) [regular (M), obligatory (SH),] in such as (α) ميَرَان
(M, SH) and ميَرَان [above], whence
wind and still rain [278], because from being windy, breezy, cool and The cloud rained continually (IY); (b) عَاصِمٌ [above] (M); (c) غَازٌ (M, SH) and غَارِبَةٌ [above]; (d) [243, 721] (M); (e) تَيَابُمٍ (M, SH) and إِنْقِيَاذٌ [above] (M); (f) جَيَافُ [above] (M, SH); (g) دَيْمٌ [above] (SH); (h) سَيْدٌ [above] (M, SH) and لِيَةٌ (M).–orig. فَعْلَةُ لَّوَى خَرَبَةُ لَوَى يَدُهُ twisted his hand and put off his creditor (IY); (i) أَغَزَّيتُ I equipped for raiding [629, 674, 719, 727] (M, R) and I urged to raid (M), for conformity with the aor. يَغُزُّي and يَسَتَغَزُّي (IY): (b) irregular (M), anomalous (SH), in such as (a) صَبْيَةٌ [246, 257, 724] (M, SH) and [246], orig. صَبَوُّص ʿ I was a boy, or boyish, aor. أَصِبُوُ ʿ where the is converted into ى because of the Kasra of the ـ before it, the between them not being [regarded as] a separative, because of its weakness by reason of quiescence (IY); (b) ُثَبَرْةٌ [above]; (c) عَلَوْتُ ُعْلِيَانُ (M), fem. ُعْلِيَانَةٌ, tall, corpulent, from ُعَلَوْتُ I was high, where they convert the ى into ى because of the Kasra before it, not taking the quiescent [l] between them into account [as a separative], because of its weakness (IY); (d) ُضِيَمٌ [above] (SH); (e) ُبَيْنُضِيَلُ ُ
without Kasr of the aoristic letter [404], by treating
the mobile ى here like the quiescent, for which reason
they convert the ى into ى, on the principle of ى سين and
ميت [above], as they treat the quiescent [ى and و] like
the mobile in ى جل and ى داري and ى جل [684] (IY on
§. 684): (α) [according to R, however,] such as ى يم is
regular, though weak: (β) so is such as ى يمل: F says
"It is regular, according to some folk, although it is
weak"; but Z decides that ى يم and ى يمل are ano-
malous (R). Its substitution for the Hamza is (1) [re-
gular, but not obligatory (R),] in such as ذيب [278, 642]
(M, SH), for ذيب (IY on §. 658), orig. with Hamza
(Jh, Jrb); and ى مير [by alleviation of ى مت, pl. of ى مت,
which is exciting dissension among the people (IY on
§. 658)] according to what has been stated in [the chapter
on] Alleviation of the Hamza (M), vid. that the Hamza,
whether quiescent or pronounced with Fath, is con-
verted into ى when the letter before it is pronounced
with Kasr [658] (IY): (2) necessary in [such as] ىPLIT
[659, 661] (R). The [necessary] substitution of the ى
[686] and ى for the Hamza occurs in two cats., (1) the
pl. upon [the measure of (Tsr)] ى ماقع [726]: (2) the
two Hamzas concurring in a [single (Tsr)] word [661]
(Aud). The ی is substituted, by way of anomaly, not to be copied, for a good many letters, which we proceed to discuss, according to what Z [or IH] mentions (IY). The substitution of the ی for the [six] remaining [letters mentioned (MASH)] is confined to hearsay. It is frequent in such as قَصَصَتْ أَمْلَتْ (1) and أَمْلَتْ قَصَصَتْ [below] (SH): (a) by "such as" IH means an augmented tril., wherein two similar letters are combined, but incorporation is not possible, because the second is quiescent [731], as in أَمْلَتْ [below]; or three similar letters, the first of which is incorporated into the second, so that incorporation into the third is not possible as in قَصَصَتْ and قَصَصَتْ أَلْبَازٍ [below]: for the combination of similar letters is disliked, while they have no way to incorporation; so that they seek relief in conversion of the second [or third (MAR)] into ی, because of the heaviness: (b) if the expression be an unaugmented tril., the second [similar letter] is not converted; so that مَدْدُ مَدَّتَ for I extended is not said: and, as for their saying قَالَ رَبِّي بِكَ [below], it is anomalous: (c) they also substitute the ی for the first of the duplicate letters in [the n. on] the measure of فَعَلُ, when a simple substantive, not an inf. n., as in دِيْمَاسٍ, دِيْمَارُ, دِيْمَارُ [below], according to him
that says [in the pl.] دناییبـ [MAZ], دیامیسـ [278], and شوارورـ; but this substitution is regular, since فعال, when non-inf., does not occur except with the first of its duplicate letters changed into ی, to distinguish the simple substantive from the inf. n., in which it is not changed, as كذاب inf. n. of كذب [332]:

(a) when the simple substantive is with the ی, as in صرة [head of the spindle (MAR)] and دنایب [short (MAR)], it is not changed, because of the freedom from ambiguity: (b) as for him that says دیامیس and دیامیسـ, it may be (α) that, since the ی is inseparable from their sings., he does not restore them [in the pl.] to their o. f., although the Kasra is [there] removed; or (β) that their sings. are orig. on the measure of فعال [377] (R), the ی not being a subst. (IY, R) for [the first of] the duplicate letters (R), but an aug. for co-ordination with سدح [396] (IY): (c) as for their saying شوارورـ, with the ی, in the pl. of زشرارز [below], it is based upon [the supposition] that زشرارز is orig. زشرارز, although there is no فعال in their language [377]; or زواریدر may be orig. زشرارز, the ی being changed into ی, by assimilation to the ی in pl. [247, 686], in which case its o. f. [in the sing.] is زشرارز [713, 716] and زواریدر occurs in
the inf. n. of ٌإِجْنُرَّةٌ [332, 482, 494] and إِخْرُطَةٌ [482, 494, 667, 675] (R): (e) the substitution of the ی for one of the duplicate [or triplicate] letters is [exemplified] in (a) أَمْلُيْتُ أَلْكُنَابَ I dictated the writing (M, Jrb), aor. أَمْلَىٰ, inf. n. أَمْلَىٰ [for أَمْلَىٰ (Jrb), orig. أَمْلُتُ [above] (IY); the Kur has فَهِي نُسِّي عَلَيهِ بُقْرَةٌ وَأَصِيَّلَا XXV. 6. And they are dictated to him morning and evening (IY, Jrb) and وَلِيْبِلَ أَلْدَى عَلَيْهِ الْحَقُّ II. 282. And let him on whom lies the debt dictate [below] (IY); and the poet says

فَاَيْتَ لَا أَمُلُةَ حَتَّى يُفَارِقًا

Then I swore I would not weary of him until he should depart, i. e., لَا أَمُلُةَ: (α) they say that the o. f. of أَمُلُةٌ is أَمِلُّ, inf. n. أَمِلُّ, as in II. 282. [above] (Jrb): but [some hold that (Jrb) properly (IY)] they are two [excellent (Jh)] dial. vars., [both occurring in the Kur (Jh),] because their employment is uniform (IY, Jrb), as أَمَلُى أَلْكُنَابَ, aor. يُبِلُّ, inf. n. أَمَلَىٰ أَلْكُنَابَ, aor. يُبِلُّ, inf. n. أَمَلَّ (IY); so that to make one of them original, and the other deriv., is not more appropriate than the converse (IY, Jrb): (b) قُصِّيَتُ أَطْفاَرِي I clipped my nails [below] (M, Jrb), transmitted by ISk (IY), for قُصَّيَتُ (IY, Jrb), where they substitute ی for the third ص, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): (c) لَا ۖ وَرَبِّي لَا أَنْعَلَ No, by thy Lord, I will
not do! (M), meaning زَرَّیَکَ [above], where they substitute a ی for the second ب, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): (d) تسَرْتُ (M), orig. I took a concubine, تَفْعَلْتُ from i. q. بِ‌کَاح [331], which is named سَر concubine is سُرَیْة, because he that intends it hides, and seeks to conceal himself (IY): (α) سُرَین, [a rel. n. (Jh)] from سَر (Jh, IY), i. e., copulation, [for the reason just given,] or concealment, because the man often secrete her, and hides her from his free-born [wife]; while its س is pronounced with Damm, because formations are sometimes altered, especially in the rel. n., as اَرْض سَهْلَةٌ دَهْرٌ and سُهْلَیْه دُهْرْی [311], rel. ns. of دَهْرَ and سُهْلَیْ smooth ground (Jh): but Akh says that it is سُرَین (IY), derived (Jh)] from سُرَرَر gladness, because her master is gladdened by her (Jh, IY): (e) تَتْنَّیتُ (M), orig. تَتْنَنتُ being the exercise of thought, orig. أَلْتِنْتُ, one of whose ن s they change into ی, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): and [read by Hamza and Ks in (B)] II. 261. [644, 647] (M), orig. یَتْنَنَنْ It hath not been altered from خَبْا مَسْنُوی XV. 26, 28, 33. (IY), meaning of [black (K)] clay wrought into shape (K, B), i. e., altered, a ی being substituted for the third ن, and then converted into
because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684], so that يَتْسَنَّي becomes يَتْسَنَّنِ it being afterwards elided for apocopeation [404, 720], so that لَمْ يَتْسَنَّنِ becomes لَمْ يَتْسَنَّنِ: this is the saying of IAl [below] (IY): تَقْضَى أَلْبَارِي The falcon stooped, or swooped (M), i.e. إنْقَضَّ الْطَائِرُ [344], from تَقْضَى meaning The bird dropped in its flight (IY): (α) they do not use its تَقْضَى except changed (Jh, IY), as where, deeming three ضِنِّهِ s heavy, they substitute أَي for one of them (Jh): AlʿAjjāj says تَقْضَى أَلْبَارِي إِذَا أَلْبَارِي كَسْرُ [below] (Jh, IY): (γ) the saying نَزَّرْ أَمَّا أَمَّا أَلَّهُ فِي نَتِيَّةٍ رَأَمَا بِفَعْلِ الصَّالِحِينَ فِي أَتَيَّةٍ We will visit a man such that, whate'er betide, God he fears, and, whate'er betide, by the deed of the righteous he takes example (M), recited by ISk on the authority of IAr, where the poet means يَأَتِمُّ (IY): تَقْضِيَةٍ (M), [as] in وَمَا كَانَ صُلْوَتُهُ عِنْدَ الْبَيْتِ إِلاَّ مَكَأَرٍ وَتَقْضِيَةٍ VIII. 35. [21, 682], where the أَي is a subst. for the [second] د (IY), according to those who pronounce it to be from صَدَّ, aor. يَصَدُّ (M); i.e., clapping of hands and making a noise, whence إِذَا قَرَمَكَ مِنْهُ يَصِدُونَ XLIII. 57. [below].
i.e., *Lo, thy people* [Kuraish (K, B)] clamour, and cry out, at it; one of the two َs being transmuted into ِ: this is the saying of A.U.: (α) تَطُعُّبٌ للَّهُ [being orig. تَصِيدَةٌ, then by incorporation تَصِيدَةٌ,] like تَحْسُبُّهُ, تَصِيدَةٌ expiation and تَعَلْلُهُ diversion; but, when the second َ is converted into ِ, incorporation is impossible, from the difference of the two letters (IY): (2) تَلْعِبُتْ [I ate endive (IY)], from لَعْمُهُ endive (M), which is a delicate herb, according to what ISk transmits, on the authority of IAr; whence, says As, the world is called لَعْمُهُ: (α) its o. f. is تَلْعِبُتْ; but they substitute a ِ for one of the َs, from dislike to the combination of [three] َs (IY): (j) صَلْصُبُّ (α) دُهْدُهَتْ [below] (M): they say دُهْدُهَتْ I rolled the stone down, aor. دُهْدُهَتْ, inf. n. دُهْدُهَتْ and دُهْدُهَتْ, quasi-pass. دُهْدُهَتْ It rolled down, i.e., دُهْدُهَتْ, quasi-pass. دُهْدُهَتْ (IY), a ِ being substituted for the [second] َ (Jh): Dhu-r-Rumma says

"كمما تُدْهَدِي من الْعَرْضُ الْعَكْلاَمِيَّ"  
As rocks roll down from the mountain (Jh, IY); and Abu-nNajm says

"كَانَ صُرْتُ جُرُقْهَا النَّسْتَعْجَلَِ # جَنْدِهَا دُهْدُهَتْهَا مِنْ جَنْدِهَا"  
As though the sound of her hurried swallowing were a stone that thou hadst rolled down from stones: while their
saying ḍhūḏrā al-ṣabālī for what the black-beetle rolls together indicates that the o. f. is ʿṣ̣aḥṣaṭ (b) [below], for meaning I said “Hush! hush!” [187], i.e., “Be silent”, the ʿa being a subst. for the ʿa, from dislike to the reduplication (IY): (k) mākājī (IY) pl. of mukūl (below) (M), according to what AZ transmits, the [second] ʿa being followed by two ʿa s, the first a subst. for the ʿa of mukūl [683], which becomes a ʿa in the pl., because the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr; and the second a subst. for the [third] ʿa, because of [the heaviness of] the reduplication (IY): (l) dīnājī [below] (M) dark, as ḍīnājī meaning intensely dark night, orig. ḍīnājī, where, disliking the reduplication, they substitute a ʿa for the last ʿa; and, this ʿa being then combined with the one before it, they lighten [the word] by elision of one of the two ʿa s; so that it becomes ḍīnājī, of the class of the defective [16] (IY): (m) dīwān register [332, 716], dībāj, dīwān, brocade [above], and ṣīrāṭ carat [278, 332] (M), orig. ḍīwān, the paradigm of which is ṣīrāṭ, the ʿa in it being a ʿa, because they say ṣīrāṭ, and, in the dim., ḍīwān: if, then, it be said “Then wherefore do you not convert the ḍīwān into ʿa, because of the
s occurring quiescent before it, on the principle of its conversion in سَيْن and مَيْت [above]?", the reply is "Because that would lead to destruction of the object: for, disliking the reduplication in دَرْان, they change [the first ] into ی], in order that the two letters may be different; so that, if they were afterwards to change the [second] ی [into ی], saying دِیْان, they would revert to [a reduplication] such as what they have fled from: and besides the ی is not inseparable, being only substituted for lightness, since they say دَنْارِین, restoring the ی, when the Ka'ara is removed from before it; so that it is plain to you that this ی is not inseparable; because, in some circumstances, it return to its o. f.; though some say دَنْارِین, making the subst. inseparable": (ب) دِبْاچُ [above], that being indicated by their saying دُبْاییچُ [above], with the ب in the pl., as though they disliked reduplication [in the sing.], and therefore changed [the first ب into ی] : (٧) تَرَاطُ, where, because of the heaviness of the reduplication, they substitute a ی for the first ی, that being indicated by the pl. تَرَاطُ [278], where the appearance of the ی is an indication of what we have said (IY) : (٩) شِیرَ ُ عرد (M), coagulated milk, the water of which is extracted (KF), orig. شِیرَ, like تَرَاطُ (IY); and دِیْان [377] (M) a dungeon [belonging to AlHaţţaj 139a
(Jh, KF) Ibn Yusuf (Jh), and a burrow, den, [orig. دماس], the ی being substituted for the [first] م (IY): according to him that says دميس and شريرز [above] (M) in the pl. (IY); (o) the saying of the poet, [describing a wild cow in search of her calf (Jsh),]

قامت بها تسند كل المنشد * قايتصت يبيثل ضوم الفرقد

[below] (M) She stood in it (the بقعة patch of ground), seeking with all inquiry, البند in the shape of the pass. part. being a mīnī inf. n. [333], and joined a calf like the light of the asterism called AlFarkad (Jsh), by which one guides oneself (KF), where he means اتصلت اناسٍ (2) [689], but dislikes the reduplication (IY): اناسٍ [248, 253] (SH), orig. اناسٍ [248, 274], because it is pl. of انسان (Jrb); (a) اناسٍ may be pl. of (a) انسان, in which case the ی is not a subst. for the ن: so says Mb: (b) انسان, [by conversion of the ن into ی (K, B on XXV. 51.),] its o. f. being اناسبٍ [above], which also is used; so that it is like طرقبان [248, 274], pl. of طرابي [287, 385] (R), the o. f. being طرابي [250] (K). As for the ع, the ب, the س, and the ث, they are [sometimes replaced by the ی.], as in (1) the saying

ز منهل ليس له حوارتي * ولسفادي جبيه نفاقتي
And many a watering-place, which has no sides preventing any one from coming down to it, but to which every one is able to come down from all of its sides, and the frogs of whose main part have croakings! (Jsh), where the poet means ضفادع, but substitutes the ی for the ع by poetic license (IY): (2) the saying

[682] (R), by Abû Kāhil AnNamir Ibn Taulab alYashkuri, describing a female eaglet, named غحبة Ghubba, belonging to the Banû Yashkur, She has bits of flesh that she dries, of foxes, and a little of her hares (MN), where the poet means الثعالب and أرایبها; but, being constrained to make [the ب] quiescent, which is not possible for him, he substitutes for the ب a ی, [which is] quiescent in the position of the gen. [16, 720] (IY): (3) the saying

[below] (R) Whenever four mean unmanly fellows are reckoned, thy husband is fiftieth, and thy father sixth (Jsh), where the poet means ساس, but substitutes a ی for the ی by poetic license (IY): (4) the saying

وأنت بالهجّة لا تبالي
My father and my maternal uncle shall be a ransom for thee, O Zur'a! Two days have passed, and this is the third; and thou carest not for the desertion (Jsh), where the poet substitutes a ی for the second ی [of the ی (Jsh)], as though he disliked the cat. of the ی (Jsh), 674 (IY). But the ی and ی [and the ی], ی and ی are weak (SH), because unheard from trustworthy Arabs (MASH). And sometimes the ی is substituted for the ی, as in ی for ی [684] and ی for ی (R). It is therefore said by A to be] substituted for eighteen letters, (1) the ی, as in ی and ی [above]; (2) the ی, as in ی [above] and the variations [of the inf. n. (Sn)] thereof, [as ی and ی (Sn)]: (3) the Hamza, as in ی for ی [642, 658]: (4) the ی in ی and ی [above]: (5) the ی in ی [above]: (6) the ی in ی and ی [above]: (7) the ی and ی [above]: (8) the ی in (a) ی and ی [above]; (b) ی [above]; (c) as IAAl holds, ی 261. [above]; (d) ی, ی because of their saying [18] ی, ی and ی [above], orig. ی, ی, because of their saying ی, ی, with the ی, for ی [278] ی, ی; (e) ینان: (9) the ی in ی [above]: (10) the ی in ی.
If a generous hasten to the noble deed, he hastens with the swoop of the falcon, when the falcon contracts his wings (Sn), i.e., "contracted" (Sn), from "taking," [this being pronounced a taking, not a derivation; so that the objection that an augmented inf. n. is not derived from a more augmented is averted (Sn)]: (11) the ل in [above]: (12) the م in [above], where, says IAr, the poet means نُبّر أَمْرًا أَلَّم [above]; (13) the ع in [above]: (b) [above]: (14) the د in [above], orig. تَصْدَٰيتُكَ لِلْأَلْمَر [A]; and so in [above]: Fm says in the Msb I applied, and devoted, myself exclusively to the matter, orig. تَصْدَٰيتُكَ, then changed for lightness” (Sn): (15) the ب in [above]; (16) the ت in [above], i.e., [a] ثُلُّث [684], i.e., "from the pl. of َنَابِعَتَنَّ آلِهَتُنا اللَّهُ [above], orig. دِنْجُوج (A): YH says "so that the َي of the pl. is elided, and the [last] َج then converted into َي"; and analogy requires that the like of this should be said on A’s saying “orig. مَكَابِيلُ” [below]: but this is correct only when the َي of ْدِلاَجِي.
and [with Tanwin دیچ و مکاکی is single; not when it is double, as the ی of مکاکی is marked in such correct Mss of the KF as I have seen: nay, [in مکاکی and دیچ] the quiescent ی is the ی of the pl., [being a subst. for the ی of مکرک دیچ and مکرک دیچجع, which becomes a ی in the pl., because the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr.;] while that which follows it is a subst. for the ج [or ك] (Sn): (18) the ل in مکاکی ل pl. of مکرک [above], orig. مکاکیلک [above] (A).

§. 686. The ی is substituted for (M, SH, A) three letters (A), (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), by which are meant (IY) the ی and ی (IY, Jrb, A), because all [three] are letters of prolongation and softness (IY); (3) the Hamza (M, SH, A). As for its substitution for the ی, it is in one case, vid. where the letter before it is pronounced with دامم [below] (Aud), whether it be in (1) a v. (Tsr), as in ضریب و دیچ [below] (Aud): (a) their o. f., before they are put into the pass., is trafficked with [683], swore allegiance to, and ضارب; but, when you put them into the pass., you pronounce their initial with دامم [436]; while it is impossible for the ی to remain after a دامم, because the letter before the ی is pronounced only with Fath; so that the ی is converted into ی, for homogeneity.
with the vowel of the letter before it (Tsr); (b) the Revelation has ما وْرِي َعَنْهُما VII. 19. What was hidden from them [683] (Aud): or (2) a n., as in ضُوْرِبُ dim. of ضَوْرِبُ [below]; if the ٰ be not second, converted from a ی, as in ۡنَاب meaning [canine] tooth, [fang,] in which case it returns to its o. f., vid. the ی, as نُيبِن [278] (Tsr). And, as for its substitution for the ی, it is in four cases, (1) where the ی is quiescent, single, and [in a sing. (IA).] not in a pl. (Aud), [and is] after a دَامَم (IA), whether it be in (a) a n. (Tsr), as in مُوْرَس [278] and مُوْرَس [278, 682, 699] (Aud), orig. مُيِسِن and مُيِسِن, act. parts. [of ۡأَيَقُنَ ۡأَيَقُنَ was certain and ۡأَيَقُنَ ۡأَيَقُنَ was well off (A)] from ۡيَقِينَ certain and ِيِسِّيرَ easy, the ی in both being changed into ٰ, because occurring after a دَامَم; or (b) a v., as in ۡيَوْسِرُ ۡيَوْسِرُ is certain and ِيِسِّيرَ is well off (Tsr): (α) the ی must be preserved [from change (Tsr)] if it be (α) mobile, [because by means of the vowel it resists change (Tsr),] as in ۡقَيْمَ (Aud), i. e., says Jh, most violent thirst, and delirium from love, and a distemper that seizes camels, so that they wander about the land, and do not graze (Tsr): (β) incorporated [into its like (Tsr)], as in ۡحِيْفَن (Aud), pl. of ۡحِيْفَن [247], where the ی is not changed, because the incorporated and [what it is] incorporated into are equivalent to one letter, the
tongue removing them with one movement, for which reason two quiescents may be combined when the first is a soft letter, and the second is incorporated [663], as in قاب [665], because the softness and prolongation of the first [quiescent] letter are like a vowel in it, while the incorporated [letter] is like the mobile [663, 731]; and, since that is so, the [preceding] vowel [Damma] does not succeed in converting the incorporated ی into ۱: but this ex. [حیث] is also excluded by IHsh's saying "not in a pl." [above]; and the [best way to obtain an excellent ex. is for you to form a [sing.] like حاضر [384] from بیع, saying بیاع, [the ی in which, for the [first] reason that we mentioned [in the case of حیث], is not transformed (Tsr): (γ) in a pl.: but in this [case (Tsr)] the Damma [occurring before the single ی in the pl. (Tsr)] must be converted into Kasra, [because of the heaviness of Damma, ی, and the pl. (Tsr).] as in the [فعل] pl. of فعال, and فعال [248, 249, 710], like wandering about, [pl. of هیم and آقیم (Tsr),] and white (Aud), pl. of پیش and آقیم; or of another [measure], like pl. of عفت, on the principle of برل pl. of برل [247], عفت being the she-camel that does not conceive [718], pl. and عفت [247] (Tsr): (2) where the ی occurs after a Damma, and is the ل of (a) [468, 476],
like How intelligent the man is! and What a good judge he is! [with Fath of their first, and Damm of their second (Tsr),] i. q. مَا أَنْهَى، i. e., أَعْقَلَة، and مَا أَنْهَى (Aud), i. e. أَحْكَمَة، نَهْيَى and نَهْيَى from قَصْيَة I forbade and قَصَيْتُ I judged, the ي́ in them being changed into й, because occurring after a دامма (Tsr): (b) a n. ending in a [fundamental, inseparable] ِّ [266] (Aud) of feminization (Tsr), with which the word is formed [from the very first, and which has not been previously elided (Tsr)], as when you form from رَمَى a [n. ending in ِّ (Tsr),] like مَقُدُرَةٍ [333], [with دامم of the ُّ (Tsr),] in which case you say مُّمرَأٍ [with the َّ, orig. مَرَأِيَّةٍ, the ي́ being changed into й, because occurring after a دامما (Tsr)], contrary to [what happens when the ِّ is affixed after the formation of the word, in which case the دامما must be converted into كاسرة, in order that the ي́ may be preserved, as in (Tsr)] such [formations] as ترَاتَي ِّ inf. n. un. of ترَاتَي flagged [336]: for its o. f., before affixion of the ِّ, is ترَاتَي with دامم [of the ُّ, because it is of the cat. of تَفَعْلُ, since تَوَابِ [inf. n. of تَوَابِ is (Tsr)] like تَكَسُّلٍ [with دامم of the (Tsr);] inf. n. of تَكَسُّلٍ كَكَسُّل was sluggish; but its دامما is changed into كاسرة, in order that the ي́ may be preserved from conversion [into ِّ (Tsr)]; and afterwards ١٤٠٩.
the i supervenes, to import unity [336]; while the transformation [of the Դamma into Kasra (Tsr) remains in its state (Aud), the predicament [of the ی] not being altered by restoration of the Դamma to its original place, and change of the ی into ی, because that would lead to the occurrence of an inf. n. ending in ی, preceded by an inseparable Դamma [721], since the adventitious ی, being virtually separate [266], is not taken into account (Tsr): (c) a n. ending in the [aug. (Tsr)] ی and ی, as when you form from یِمِی [a name (Tsr)] on the measure of  سابعان [with Դamm of the ب (Tsr)], the name of the place about which Ibn Aḥmar [or rather Tamīm Abn Abl Muĥbil, according to the correct opinion (Tsr),] says ٢٣٥٢ [236]; in which case you say  رموان  رامووان. (Aud) with Դamm of the م, orig. یمِی, the ی being changed into ی, because occurring after a Դamma: (a) you may, however, say that, when a [n.] like  ضیبان [237, 250] is formed from یِزِر [685, 723] is said, the letter before the ی and ی being given the predicament of what occurs as a genuine final, like [the ی of] یِسِی [685]: while this necessarily requires that, in the like of  سابعان from یِمِی [above], یِمِی, should not be said, because, in the paradigm of  عضد [368] from یِمِی, it is not allowable to say یِمِی, since we have no decl. n. ending in an inseparable ی.
after a Žamma [721]; but the Žamma must be converted into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved, so that you say ریمان [724]; and similarly ریمان must be said, by transforming the vowel, not the consonant: so says the author of the Aud in the Glosses [on the IM] (Tsr): (3) where the ی is the ل of فعلی with Fath of the ر, when a substantive, not an ep., as تقریث piety, reverence [689, 725], [i. q. مثال, مثال Thou hast its like, or match, i. e., مثل, transmitted by IJ (Tsr).]
and [248] (Aud), orig. شریبا, تفیت, because from تفیت I feared, reverenced, شریبا I sold, and تفیت I was youthful, the ی in them being changed into ، to distinguish the substantive from the ep.; while they appropriate transformation to the substantive in particular, because, being lighter than the ep., it is more tolerant of heaviness (Tsr); (a) IM [in the CK (Tsr)] and his son [in the C (Tsr)] say that سعیا Sa'ya, [a name (Tsr)] for a [certain (Tsr)] place, [a district in AlYaman or its immediate neighbourhood, by rule, says IJ, سعور (Bk),] and ریا for the [nice (EM)] odour, and تفیت [with Fath, says Th (Jh),] for the young of the wild cow, or bovine antelope, are anomalous: but [this requires consideration, since (Tsr)] the first, [vid. سعیا from سعیا striving (Tsr),] may be
transferred from an *ep*. [4], like صُدَايا خَرْيَة [725], *fems.* of خَرْيَة [250] and صُدَايَان خَرْيَان thirsty (Aud), the sounding [of its ي] true being retained as an accompani-
ment after its being made a name, as F explains (Tsr); while the second, [vid. لِّي رُيْيْا] (348) (Tsr),] is said by the GG, [S and others (Tsr),] to be an *ep.* wherein the quality of substantive predominates [149], the o. f. being رَآيْحَة رُيْيَا a fragrant odour, i. e., filled with per-
fume; and the third, [vid. طَغْيَان طَغْيَا from طَغْيَان inordinate wickedness (Tsr),] is more often pronounced with Դamm of the ط [below], so that perhaps they retain the sound-
ing [of the ي] true as an accompaniment when they pronounce [the ط] with فَاث for lightness (Aud): (b) thus they criticize IM; and the author of the Aud follows them: but afterwards he says in the Glosses "It has since appeared to me that IM’s meaning [by ‘anomalous’] is anomalousness in usage; for I have read, in his [own] handwriting, a marginal annotation here ‘The substitution of the ِن for the ي, when a ل of ثَعَلى, is not to be taken as a precedent, because there is no cause [for it], while it necessarily involves increase of heaviness’": (c) various spellings of طَغْيَان [272] are trans-
mitted: As says “with Դamm of the ط [above], like حَبْلَى”; while Th says “with فَاث of the ط [above], on the paradigm of سَكْرَى”; and AU says “with Fath
of the ط, and Tanwin": so says ISd (Tsr): (4) where the \( \mathfrak{r} \) is the \( \mathfrak{v} \) of نَعْلَى [718], with Damm [of the الف (Tsr), when (a) a substantive, like طَرَبْنِي happiness, [i. q. طِيب (Tsr),] an inf. n. of طَابَ was happy (Aud), aor. طِيب (Tsr), like بُشْرَى [272, 331] and رَقْى [272] (K, B on XIII. 28.); or تَعْبَد, a name for Paradise (Aud), whence شَكْرِّهُ طَرْبَى the tree of Paradise (Tsr): (a) the meaning of طَرْبَى للَّك Mayst thou be happy! or Happiness be thine! is أَصْبَتْ خَيْرًا طِيبًا Mayst thou find good fortune and happiness!; while the [syntactical] place of طَرْبَى is the acc. or nom., as in طِيب or طَيِبَانَ اللَّك, and سَكَّمًا للَّك [41] or سَكَّم [25, 28], its two places being indicated to you by the reading of طَرْبَى لَهُمّ وَحَسْنُ مَآيِ XIII. 28. Happiness be theirs, or May they find happiness, and beauty of abiding-place! [718], with the nom. and acc.; and [in the construction with the acc.] the ج denotes explanation, as in سَقِيَا للَّك [41, 62, 504] (K): (b) an ep. acting as a substantive [in not being preceded by a qualified, and in being put immediately after the اطْيَب (Tsr)], which is the فَعْلُ of أَنْعَلَ أَنْعَلَى [272, 355], like أَلْطَرْنِي the happy state, or life, أَلْكُرْسَى the shrewd woman, and أَلْخُيْرَى the good woman, fems. of أَطْيَبٌ [718], and أَخْيِر [351] (Aud), ns. of superiority acting as prim. substantives (Tsr): (α) what indicates that
they are acting as [prim. (Tsr)] substantives is that the 

*الْأَفْنَعُلْ* [249], as the learned and the great, [pls. of *الْأَفْنَصُلْ* and *الْأَكَبِرُ* (Tsr),] like *أَفْنَكْل* [249] (Aud), which is a prim. substantive: (b) the o. f. is *أَلْكُيْسِيَّ*, *أَلطْبَبِيَّ*, and *أَلْطَيْرِيَّ* with Damm of their initial; but the *ي* is changed into , because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm (Tsr), as in *مونتَ* and *مسر* [above] (K on XIII. 28.): (c) if *فُعَلَى* be a pure ep., [i. e., preceded by a qualified (Tsr).] its Damma must be converted into Kasra, [in order that the *ي* may be preserved from conversion into , to distinguish the ep. from the substantive (Tsr)]; but no instance of that has been heard except [two words (Tsr).] an iniquitous division, i. e., *كَعْطَةَ حَقْةَ* wrong/ul, [from *كَعْطَة* wronged, or defrauded, him of his right, aor. *كَعْطَة* diminished to him his right and *كَعْطَة* wronged him (Tsr).] and *مِشْيَة* حُكَيْكَي an elegant, or affected, gait, i. e., wherein the shoulders move [272, 718] (Aud), from *كَعْطَةَ* meaning moved his shoulders in his walk, orig. *حُكَيْكَي* and *حُكَيْكَي* with Damm of their initial, the Damma being changed into Kasra in order that the *ي* may be sounded true, as in *نِيْضُن* pl. of
(1309)

[above] (Tsr): (d) this is the language of the GG: but IM [in the Alfrya (Tsr)] and his son [in the C (Tsr)] say that before the ینعّلی, when an ep., the دامم may [either] be preserved, the ین being converted into ی; or be changed into Kasra, the ین being preserved: so that you say the happiest or الظَّبِيبَی [below], الظلَّوبَی, and the shrewdest or الکَیَمَی, and the narrow-est or الکَیَمَی (Aud), from vacillating between conformity with its masc. [by retention of the ین] at one time, and observance of the measure [by retention of the دامم] at another: (e) this differs from the language of the GG, S and his followers, in two respects, (α) that IM and his son allow two forms in ینعّلی when an ep.: whereas the GG decide upon one of them, saying that the ین [occurring as the ع] of ینعّلی, when a substantive, is converted into ین, as ینعّلی and ینعّلی; while, in the ep., it is not converted, but the letter before it is pro- nounced with Kasr, so that the ین is preserved, as ینعّلی and ینعّلی: (β) that the GG mention the ینعّلی in the cat. of the substantives [718, 725]: and assign to it the predicament of the substantives in retention of the دامم and conversion of the ین into ین, whereas IM mentions it in the cat. of the eps.; but allows the two forms in it, unequivocally declaring that both are heard from the Arabs: (f) Shl says "No instance
of this [formation] occurs [with its ا] converted, except the فُلُّيُّ of فُلُّيُّ (Tsr): (g) Makwaza al-A'rabī reads طَيِّبِيِّ لَهُم in XIII. 28. [above], pronouncing the ّ with Kaar [in the substantive], in order that the ی may be preserved, as يِضّ [above] and مُعيَّشة [333, 710] are said (K). Its substitution, (1) for the ّ, is (a) [obligatory (SH)] in such as (α) ضُرَّبُ [18] (M, SH), pl. of ضَرَّةٍ [247, 278, 383] (Jrb); and ضُرِّبَ (M, SH), dim. of ضَرَّبٍ [278, 682] (Jrb): i.e., in [the ultimate pl., and the dim., of (R) such as (IY)] فَاعَلُ [above] (IY, R), like ضَرَّبٌ and ضَرَّبُ [373]; and فَاعَلْتُ and فَاعَلْتُ, like ضَرَّبْتُ and ضَرَّبْتُ [377]: for, whenever you mean to form the dim., or [ultimate] broken pl., from any of those [ns.], you convert its ّ into ّ, as ضُرَّبُ and ضُرِّبَ [above], and خَوَتُمَّ, خَوَتِيُّ [247], عِرْقُيَّةٌ, and عَوْقُيَّةٌ, جَوْنِيُّ, and ضَرَّبْتُ, سَرَبْيِّ [α] the cause of its conversion in the dim. [278] is obvious, vid. the fact that the letter before it is pronounced with دَانم [above]: (β) as for its conversion in the broken pl. [247], it is by conformity with the dim.: for, when you say ضَرَّبُ and ضُرَّبُ [above], there is no دَانم on the ص and necessitating conversion of the ّ into ّ; but, since you say خَوَتُمَّ.
in the *dim.*, you say مائم in the broken *pl.*, which is made to accord with the *dim.* in this [conversion], because they follow one course [247, 274, 279], this broken *pl.* being treated like the *dim.* in many of its predicaments, in that the sign of the *dim.* is a quiescent ی third preceded by a Fathā [274], and the sign of the [ultimate] broken *pl.* is a quiescent ی third [256], preceded by a Fathā, while the ی is the sister of the ی, as above shown; and that the letter after the ی of the *dim.* is pronounced with Kasr [274], as is the letter after the ی of the [ultimate] broken *pl.* [256] (IY) : (b) ضمیم [below], *dim.* of ضرب [278], *inf.* n. of ضارب [332, 685] : (c) and أَوَلَدُ [247, 278, 661] (M), which they treat like خوارم and خوارم [above], since the substitution is obligatory, because of the combination of two Hamzas (IY) : (d) ضرب [above] (IY, R) and تصارب (R), where you convert the ی of the [act.] v. and تصارب into ی, according to the rule mentioned [above], because the letter before it is pronounced with Damm (IY) : (e) وخوی and خوی [294, 300] (M, SH), and the like [rel. ns.] from the abbreviated (IY), where the ی third or fourth [300] has the ی of relation affixed to it, in which case you convert the ی into ی (R), whether the ی be [converted] from a ی or ی (IY, R), because of the occurrence of the 141a
double ی after it: (α) the reason of its being converted into ی, and the reason of this ی's not being converted into ی, notwithstanding its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, have been explained [300, 684] (R): یلَّوَأٰنِي (f) [229, 639], du. of یلَّوَأٰنِي [500], when [used as (IY)] a name (M); and similarly یلَّوَأٰنِي [229], یلَّوَأٰنِي, یلَّوَأٰنِي, یلَّوَأٰنِي, یلَّوَأٰنِي [204], whether [an adv. of] time or place, یلَّوَأٰنِي [559], and یلَّوَأٰنِي [543, 544], when you name a man by one of these things: and so, if you made one of them a name of a woman, and then pluralized it with the ی and ی, you would say یلَّوَأٰنِي [234], and the like: (α) the cause of the conversion of such س as those into ی, is that they are original, neither aug., nor substituted; so that, since they have no o.f. to which they might be restored when mobile, nor has Imāla been heard in them [639], the predicament of the ی is assigned to them, and therefore they are converted into ی, when they need a vowel: (β) if it be said “Since they are original, not substituted, why is their conversion into ی not disallowed, because they have no o.f. as ی, or ی?” the answer is that the matter is so, except that, when these words are used as names, they are translated to the predicament of ns.: so that what is predicated of the یs in those ns. which it is not good to pronounce with Imāla,
such as عصا [626, 629] and قطعا sand-grouse, is predicated of their ٰ; and, as you say حضران [229] and قطروان, so you say ٰلدران and ٰلذان: and somewhat similarly, if you named a man ضرب [482], you would inflect it, saying ٰرآى ضربًا This is Darab, I saw Darab, and ٰمرر ضرب I passed by Darab, although, before use as a name, it is not invaded by inflection [402, 403]; so that, as ضرب, when used as a name, is transferred to the predicament of ns., and is therefore infl. [194, 206], so ٰلی, ٰلدا, and ٰبما, when used as names, are transferred to the predicament of ns., and their ٰs are decided to be [converted] from the ٰ, since they are original, and Imāla has not been heard in them (IY): (b) weak in [such as] ٰفِنَعُ for ٰفِنَع Anfūs [in pause] (R), [where] some of Tāyyi say ٰحَلَلُ with the [for ٰحَلَّل ] (M on §. 643); (a) Fazāra and some of Kāis convert every final ٰ, whether for feminization, as in ٰحَلَّل [248, 272], or not, as in ٰكَفَّرُ [401, 671, 673], into ٰى [in pause]; so say the GG; but IH makes that peculiar to the ٰ of "such as ٰحَلَّل" [643, 685], which is not proper: (b) the reason why they convert it into ٰى is that the ٰ is faint; and becomes plain only when you put another letter after it, vid. in the state of continuity, where your beginning to sound another letter makes the sound of the ٰ plain, even though it be faint: whereas, when
paused upon, it becomes so extremely faint that you think it to be non-existent, for which reason [648] and [54] are said, with the I of silence [615] after it; so that in pause they substitute [for it] a letter homogeneous with, but plainer than, it, vid. the ی; (c) it is only, for the object mentioned, vid. plainness, that, in the state of pause, which ought to be lighter than the state of continuity, they tolerate the heaviness of the ی, which is heavier than the I; and also because the letter before it is pronounced with Fath, which somewhat lightens the heaviness of the ی: (d) this is also an excuse for the conversion of the I into Hamza [643], although it is heavier than the I: (e) Tayyi leave it, in continuity, in the same state as in pause, saying یم with the ی in both states: (f) some of Tayyi convert the I into ی [in pause], because ی is plainer than ی, and plainness is intended: for the I is [sounded] farther in the mouth than the ی, because it is [emitted] from the throat [732]; and after it the ی, because it is from the middle of the tongue; and after it the ی, because it is from the lips: (g) the ی is more frequent than the ی, in the dial. of Tayyi, in such a position, because the lightness suitable to pause ought to be observed together with the observance of plainness: (h) those who convert the I into ی [in pause] leave the ی, in continuity, in the same state as in pause, all of that being
because continuity is treated like pause [647]: (i) the reason why the \( \text{ل} \) is converted into \( \text{ي} \) or \( \text{ز} \) is that the three resemble one another in prolongation and width of outlet (\( \text{R} \) on \( \text{Pause} \)) ; (2) for the \( \text{ي} \), is (a) [obligatory (\( \text{SH} \))] in such as (\( \alpha \)) \( \text{مؤن} \) (\( \text{M} \), \( \text{SH} \)) and \( \text{مسر} \) [above] (\( \text{IY} \)), \( \text{نبطر} \) [above], and \( \text{بطر} \) (\( \text{M} \), \( \text{SH} \)), \( \text{orig.} \) \( \text{نبطر} \) (\( \text{Jrb} \)), pass. qf of \( \text{مطار} \) [432] (\( \text{IY} \)), from \( \text{مطرة} \) [332], whence \( \text{مطار} \) [377] (\( \text{Jrb} \)); vid. where the \( \text{ي} \) is quiescent and unincorporated, and is preceded by a letter pronounced with \( \text{Damm} \) (\( \text{M} \), \( \text{R} \)), and followed by two or more letters [below], except in such as \( \text{يمضان} \) [249], and \( \text{حيكى} \) and \( \text{ديبى} \) [above] (\( \text{R} \)): (\( \alpha \)) if the \( \text{ي} \) in \( \text{مسر} \) and \( \text{مؤن} \) become mobile, or the \( \text{Damma} \) before it be removed, the word reverts to its original \( \text{ي} \), as in the \( \text{dim.} \) \( \text{ميسيس} \) and \( \text{ميسيتن} \) [273], and the broken \( \text{pl.} \) \( \text{ميسيس} \) and \( \text{ميسيتن} \) [252] (\( \text{IY} \)): (\( \beta \)) our saying "[and followed by] two or more letters" [above] is to guard against such as \( \text{يمض} \) [above] (\( \text{R} \)): (\( \gamma \)) as for \( \text{ميسيس} \) [above], the \( \text{ي} \) in it is a \( \text{subst.} \) for the \( \text{ي} \) substituted for the \( \text{ل} \) of \( \text{كامل} \); while the last \( \text{ي} \) is a \( \text{subst.} \) for the \( \text{ل} \) of \( \text{ميقال} \) [332] (\( \text{IY} \)): (b) \( \text{sparing, taking compassion on} \) [725] (\( \text{M} \), \( \text{SH} \)), \( \text{orig.} \) \( \text{بقيا} \), \( \text{بقيا} \) [a quasi-inf. n. (\( \text{KF} \))] from \( \text{ابقى علیه} \) \( \text{spared} \) him, i. q. \( \text{اضنق علیه} \) \( \text{took compassion on him} \), from \( \text{بلى} \) \( \text{remained} \).
as though he desired him to remain (Jrb); and [above], from ٌمَّتَقََّرَ [689] (ΙΥ) (c) ٌمَّتَقََّرَ [294, 301] (R):
(b) [anomalous, weak (SH),] in such as (a) ُهُدَا أَمْرُ مَنَضْرٍ ُعَلِّيِّعٍ This is a matter accomplished (Μ, SH), orig. ُمَنَضْرَ (R, Jrb), from ٌمَّضَى [below] (Jrb), the last, in it being a subst. for the ٍى , which is a ٍل in ُمَضَى (ΙΥ), because it is from ٌمَضَى, aor. ُمَضَى (R) ُمَضَى [685] (M, SH), which is from ُمَضَى Φοράθεθ (ΙΥ), [being] orig. ُمَضَى (R, Jrb), from ُمَضَى (Jrb), as though the ٍى were converted into , in order that ُمَضَى might correspond to ُأَمْرُ; whereas, if they converted the , [of ُعُرِّبَ] into ٍى , the ِذَامَّة would be turned into ُكَسَرٍ, and ُمَضَى would become ُمَضَى [722], which would not correspond to ُأَمْرُ (R); and ُمَضَى I drank a purgative (ΙΥ, R), which is the medicine that moves the stomach (R), from ُمَضَى I moved, because the laxative necessitates motion: (α) they change the ٍى into , because they mean the formation ُعُوَّلَ; and therefore dislike it to be confounded with the formation ُفِعَّلُ , [as would happen] if ُمَضَى and ُمَضَى [722] were said (ΙΥ):
(c) ُجَبَارَ (M, SH), for ُجَبَارٍ inf. n. of ُجَبَارَ
I collected the tax (IY, R, Jrb): (α) [the assertion] that the [last], of مَضْرَعُ is a subst. for the ی is said to require consideration, because one says مَضْرَعُ عَلَیْ الْآمَرُ I accomplished the matter, inf. n. مَضْرَعُ [above], and مَضْرَعُ عَلَیْ الْآمَرُ, inf. n. مَضْرَعُ; and similarly [the assertion] that the چَبْارَةُ is a subst. for the ی, because چَبْارَةُ and چَبْارَةَ are two dial. vars., since Jh says in the Sahâh: “[Ks says (Jh)] چَبِیتُ اَلْبَاءُ فِی ّالْکُوْرَی ّI collected the water in the trough or cistern and چَبْیتُ”, the inf. n. of the first being, it is said, چَبَیّ, چَبِی, and of the second چَبَیّ; and Jh also says چَبِیتُ ّالْحَرَّاجُ, inf. n. چَبَیّاَّ, چَبِیّاَّ, and چَبَیّةَ: so they mention; but it is [a] feeble [argument], because, from the [mere] use of the two [forms], it does not necessarily follow that both are o. fs., since substitution may be recognizable [in one of the two forms] here by the paucity of [its] usage [682] (Jrb); and [R says that] the whole are anomalous [substitutions of for ی] (R). They say ٌعَرَّیتْهَا and ٌعَرَّیتْهَا as dims. of thing and eye, respectively, converting the ی in them into ی: but the chastest [practice] is to say ٌشَیّهَا and ٌعَینّیتُهَا with retention of the ی, and Damm of their initial; though Kasr of their initial is allowed in the dim. [274, 721], on account of the ی, in order that the consonant and vowel may be conformable, one to
another. And of this class is their saying ضَرِيعَةٌ and بَيْتٌ as dims. of ضَرِيعَةٌ rea land property, or estate, and بَيْتٌ house, respectively: whereas the form adopted in them is ضَرِيعَةٌ and بَيْتٌ, as in a verse by AlKhalil Ibn Ahmad that I have had recited to me

إِنَّمَا يَكُونُ لَكَ جَدَّى ﺔَ أَغْنِاكَ خَلَلُ وَزِيتُ
أَوْ لَمْ يَكُنَّ دَا زَا دَا ﺔَ فَكَسَرَةُ رَبِيعٌ

If there be not a kid for thee, vinegar and olive-oil will suffice thee; or, if there be not this, nor this, then a frag- ment of bread, and a little tent (D); or [ضَرِيعَةٌ and] بَيْتٌ [274, 721] (Jh, KF), with Kasr of the initial, as also in the dims. of شَيْخُ عَيْرٌ, [274] شَيْخُ [above], and their likes (Jh). This [retention of the ى, however,] is not obligatory, which is proclaimed by H’s saying “the chastest”; and therefore his reckoning that [conversion of the ى into ٰ] among the “mistakes” [which the D, by its title “The Pearl of the Diver on the Mistakes of the Distinguished”, professes to expose,] is an excess of language. And IM distinctly declares in the Tashil that the ع before the letter [ى characteristic] of the dim. is made into a ٰ, (1) necessarily, if it be an ى converted from a ى; so that you say بَيْتٌ as dim. of بَيْتٌ [278]: (2) allowably, though less approvably, if it be a ى or an ى converted from a ى: so that ضَرِيعَةٌ and
are allowable as *dim.* of شَيْحَةُ and نَابِ [278]. And similarly ضَوْنَتْ and ضَوْنَتْ [above]. And what H disallows is allowed by some, who transmit it from the K.K., saying "They say شُرَى as *dim.* of شُرَيْعَ"; so that what H mentions is of no account (CD). Or شُرَى is a weak *dial. var.* on the authority of Idrīs Ibn Mūsā, the Grammarian (K.F). The substitution of the for the Hamza [685] is (1) [allowable (R)] in such as جُونَة (M, SH); orig. جُونَة and جُونَة with Hamza: (a) the *ex.* is said to be a blunder, because the composition جُونَ is neglected in the language, and thus the ع in جُونَ is not known to be orig. Hamza: the author of the ِسَحَاح says "And جُونَ with ُبَمَم is the *inf. n.* [331] of the جُونَ intensely black, [pl. جُونُ (Jh);] of horses, [like غَيْبَة dingy whiteness and رَجَمُ bright bay color (Jh)]; and جُونَ is also the جُونَ of the perfumer [below]: and they are seldom pronounced with Hamza", where his saying "they are seldom pronounced with Hamza" obviously means the reverse of what is mentioned by [Z and] IH, because Jh makes it orig. unsound [in the ع], and the Hamza in it a *subst.* for the جُونَ: (b) "the جُونَ of the perfumer" [above] is his حَقَّ small round box (Jrb): (2) necessary in (a) [such as (MASH)] I believe [661]: (b) such as حَمْسِرْوايِ
[230, 726], according to the most recognised usage; and ٌ[248]; and حَمْرَوِي [304] (R). [On the substitution of the ُ for the ُ see §. 687.]

§. 687. The م is substituted for [four letters (IY, A),] (1) the ُ, [necessarily (SH, Aud),] in فَم [16, 667] (M, SH, Aud, A), according to most (A), alone (M, SH), the م not being substituted for the ُ except in مَُ, but this substitution being obligatory (R), lest [the ُ be elided, so that (R)] the infl. [n. (Jrb)] remain until [below] (R, Jrb), according to what has been mentioned [278] (Jrb): (a) its o. f. is ٌأَنْخُرٌ [16, 306] (IY, R, Aud, A), like ُفَرِّج crowd (A), its أ being a ُ, and its ج a ُ (IY), as is proved by [its broken pl. (IY, Tsr)] أَنْخُرٌ (IY, R, Aud, A) and its dim. َفَرَيْنَا [275] (IY), because the broken pl. [or the dim.] restores things to their o. f. [260, 278] (Tsr), and by ُفَرَيْنَا wide-mouthed and ُفَرَيْنَا I opened my mouth (R); and its measure being فَعَل with فَث أ of the first [letter], and quiescence of the second (IY): but the ُ [that occurs in it, being assimilated to the unsound letters (IY),] is elided (IY, R, Aud, A), as the unsound letters are elided from such as ُدَنٌ and ُدَنٌ [231, 260, 275, 719] (IY), on account of its faintness (R, Tsr), for the sake of alleviation (Aud, A), because this word is sometimes pre. to the pron., in which case ُداً would be said, which would be deemed heavy (A);
and, when the ١ is elided, the ٢ remains of two letters, the second ٞ, and the first pronounced with Fath [below]: while its retention in this state would lead to conversion of the ٢ into ٣ [684], on the principle of [the conversion in] ٤ and ٥ [719], because of its being mobile with the vowels of inflection, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; and, this ٣ being elided, as in ٥ [643, 683], because of the concurrence of two quiescents, upon affixion of Tanwin to it, the decl. ٢ would remain unil. [below], which is not found (IY): and [since, according to what has just been mentioned, the ٢ requires the ٥ to be retained (IY),] they substitute the ٦ for the ٧ (IY, ر, اذ, ا), because the ٧ [is a sound letter, on which the vowels are not heavy; and (IY)] is from the same outlet as the ٤ [732] (IY, تلا), both being from the mouth; and has in it a nasality akin to the softness of the ٥ : (a) if it be said “What is the proof that the ٧ is pronounced with Fath [above] to the exclusion of Damm or Kasr?” the answer is “The [common] pronunciation testifies to that”: and then, if it be said “AZ transmits ٨ and ٨, with Damm and Kasr, for ٩”, the answer is “That is not common in it; and the decision is [based] only upon the most frequent [pronunciation], which is Fath, Damm and Kasr being rare, of the cat. of blunder, the explanation of which is that, seeing [the vowel of] the ٧ in this ٢ vary, when
the n. is *pre. [otherwise than to the ي of the 1st pers.];
as *حَدَّا فَرَّا This is thy mouth,
and *مُرَرَتْ يَفْيِكَ I passed by thy mouth [16], they treat it
in the same way when the n. is aprothetic: (b) as for
the saying of the poet [Al'Ajjāj (AKB)]

ُيَا لَيْتَهَا تَقُولُ خَرَجْتُ مِن فُرُّكَ * حَتَّى يَعَودَ الْمُلُكُ فِى أُسْطُرَةَ

[O would that it, by which he may have meant a
word that was to be spoken, had issued from his mouth,
so that the kingdom might return to its owner, and its
rightful claimant!], i. e., says Jh, *حَقَّهُ فِى أَهْلِهِ (AKB)], it is related with Damm and Fath of the
, together with doubling of the م—as for the Damm of
, the answer to it has been given above: and, as
for the doubling, there is no foundation for it in the
word, because they say for its pl. أَوْوَاهُ, and for its dim.
فَوْيَةٍ [above], not أَفْسَمُ [below] nor أَفْسَمُ; but the explana-
tion of it is that they double the م in pause, as they
double [the final] in مَّحَالِدُ يَجْعَلَ [640]; and that
continuity is then treated like pause [647], as in
; and [640, 647, 648] (IV): (c) if *فُمْ be *pre. [to
an explicit n. or a pron. (Tsr)], it is returned to the
o. f., [vid. the و (Tsr),] as [ فُمْ رُيِّدُ Zaid's mouth and
(Tsr) نُرُقَ thy mouth [below] (Aud, A), because prefixion
restores things to their o. fs. (Tsr): and the substitution seldom remains, as in [the saying of the Prophet (Tsr)]

Assuredly the perfume of the mouth of the faster is pleasanter to God than the odour of musk (Aud, A) and the saying of Ru’ba [Ibn Al’Ajjāj (MN)]

[16] (Tsr), where ٍطَّبَان is i. q. َعَطَّفَان, which thus occurs in some places (MN); but F asserts [in the Baghdādīyāt cited below] that the ٰم is not retained except in poetry, which is refuted by the preceding tradition (Tsr): (b) Akh says that the ٰم is a subst. for the ٰس [below], its o. f. being ُنْهُر, which, being transposed, becomes ٰنْهُر, whereupon the ٰس is elided, and the ٰم made into a ٰم; and, in proof of that, he cites ٰهْنَا ُنَفَا أَلْعَم [below], which, according to him, is like ٰلَا تَقْلُوا أَلْعَم [153] in restoration of the elided ٰو by poetic license (R): (c) as for [the explicit n. in] ُنْقَرُ [above], it has three states, (α) severance from prefixion, where the ٰس must be changed into ٰم from the impossibility of eliding or retaining it, because by elision the decl. n. would remain unil. [above], which is not allowable, since the inflection rotates only upon the final of the word, so that it does not rotate upon a word whose final is its initial; while
retention would lead, when [the n. was] pronounced with Tanwin, to the combination of two quiescents, [one of which would have to be elided,] so that its case would be ultimately reducible to [the decl. n. 's] remaining unil. (b) prefixion to the ٖ of the 1st pers., where it has two dial. vars.:—(α) the more notorious of them is ٖ [130] in the three cases [of inflection]: by analogy, it is orig. فَٰرَى , like عَدَى my sorrow; then نُئَي [684], because of the ٖ 's being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha, but since, in what is infl. with vowels, [like غَلَٰبَٰ] : custom runs that, when it is pre. to the ٖ , [as in غَلَامَي , ] one is confined, out of all the [inflectional] vowels, to Kasra [129], [which is then put not for inflection, but] for affinity [to the ٖ ]; while here the ٖ is like an inflectional vowel, the ٖ being like Damma, the ٖ like Kasra, and the ٖ like Fatha [16]; therefore the ٖ is made obligatory in the three cases [of inflection] before the ٖ of the 1st pers., in place of the Kasra [of affinity], although the [latter] Kasra is not inflectional, by assimilating the Kasra [of affinity], which, according to IH, is not a sign of inflection or uninflectedness, or, according to [some of] the GG, the uninflectional Kasra, to the inflectional Kasra, because of its adventitiousness, as the uninflectional Damma in ُبَرَّنُ is assimilated to the inflectional, so that the ٖ and
are put in its place in and [as] the uninflectional Fatha in is assimilated to the inflectional, so that the is put in its place in and [99]; all of this being because of adventitiousness: and therefore, since the , which is an in , becomes assimilated to the inflectional [ , and what is before the inflectional in the six ns. [16] is pronounced with Kasr, therefore the in in is pronounced with Kasr: (β) sometimes , and [above] are said in all the states of prefixion, as [16]: (γ) the first [dial. var.] is more correct and chaste, because the cause of the need for change of the , upon severance from prefixion, is fear of elision of the on account of the [concurrence of] two quiescents; whereas, in the state of prefixion, there are no two quiescents, since there is no Tanwin in the pre. [110, 609]; so that the change of the , is more properly omitted: (c) prefixion to [an explicit n. or a pron.] other than the of the 1st pers., where the more recognised [practice] is to inflect it with consonants, as mentioned [16]; but [or ] occurs, as above shown: (α) the poet has combined the and , saying [231, 233, 306], which is a combination of the subst. and original, [vid. the and (A.K.B)]; but
some endeavour to excuse it by saying that the 무 is a subst. for the ُ [above], which is the ج put before the ع (R on IH upon the Genitives): (β.) the constructive meaning of the first saying, as [shown] in [the Kitāb (IKhn) alMasā‘il (IKhn, BW, HKh)] alBaghdādiyāt [above] by F, is that the poet, by poetic license, prefixes َُمَّ َُمَّ [above]; and then puts the ، which is an ع, though the 무 is a compensation for it; so that this is a combination of the subst. and original, by poetic license, which combination we sometimes find among their methods, as َُمَّ َُمَّ نِمَّ يَا آلللَّهُ أَلِمَ [56], where the poet combines the premonitory ب. [551] and the two 무 which are a compensation for it [52]: and, according to this account, two poetic licenses are combined in نِمَّ مِنْهُمَا, prefixion of ُمَّ with the 무, its predicament being that it should not be pre: therewith; and combination of the subst. and original: but I say that prefixion of ُمَّ with the 무 is chaste; and is not a poetic license, this being refuted by the tradition ُمَّ ُمَّ نِمَّ آلللَّهُ أَلِمَ [above]: (γ) as for the second saying, it [evidently coincides with the saying of Akh recorded in (b) above; but, according to AKB,] looks like the opinion of S, who, in the chapter on Relation, the name of which, according to him, is the chapter on الإسْتَفْعَة, says the following words:—“As for ُمَّ ، two
letters have gone from its o. f., because it is orig. ٛ, but they substitute the ٛ in place of the ٔ, [in order that it may resemble the aprothetic ns. of their language (S)]; so that this ٛ is equivalent to the ٔ, like the ٛ of ٛ, being retained in the n. [through its variations in the gen. and acc., the rel. n., and the du. (S)]: and therefore he that leaves ٛ in its [curtailed] state, when he forms its rel. n. [306], leaves ٛ in its [curtailed] state; while he that restores the ل to ٛ restores the ٛ to ٛ, putting it into the place of the ل. as they put the ٛ into the place of the ٔ in ٛ: the poet says ٛٓٛ ٛٓٛٓ ٛٓٛ, and they say ٛٓٛ (AKB); so that you restore [the elided letter] in the rel. n., as you restore [it] in the du. [231], and [in] the pl. with the ت [234], forming the [rel.] n. [with it], as you dualize with it, except that the rel. n. has more power of restoration (S), for which reason he that says ٛٓٛ has the option of saying, at his will, ٛٓٛ or ٛٓٛٓ; while he that says ٛٓٛ says ٛٓٛٓ in every case [306]: this is the language of S: (S) F in the Baghdádiyát, although he does not report the opinion of S there, reports another mode of accounting for ٛٓٛٓٛ, saying "It is said that AlFarazdak substitutes a ٛ for the ٔ, which is a ٛ, as it is substituted when the n. is aprotthetic; and then substitutes a ٛ for
the $\dot{s}$, which is a $\dot{r}$: and that substitution of $\dot{r}$ for $s$ [686] is not strange, its permissibility being indicated by [the fact] that they are [sometimes] interchangeable in a single word, like $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ [306], the $\dot{r}$ of which is judged sometimes to be $s$, because of their saying $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ [275, 311]; and sometimes to be $\dot{r}$, because of their saying $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ [234, 244, 275, 311]. (c) IJ holds $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ to be du. of $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ [below] with abbreviation, saying on $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ [233] that may be an abbreviated $n.$, like $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ [16]; and that $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ occurs accordingly (AKB): (d) $\dot{\varepsilon}l\dot{\varepsilon}m$ has [ten] dial. vars.: (a) the most notorious and haste of them is (α) inflection with consonants in pre- fixation to [an explicit $n.$ or a pron.] other than the $\dot{r}$ of the 1st pers. [16]; (b) Fath of the $\dot{r}$, together with a single $\dot{m}$, in the state of severance [from prefixion]; and (γ) change of the $\dot{r}$ into $\dot{r}$ upon prefixion to the $\dot{r}$ [180]: (b) the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th are $\dot{m}$, with the $f$ triply vocalized, and the $\dot{r}$ elided as forgotten, unre- strictlyed, [i.e., in the three states (α–γ) just detailed,] together with change of the $\dot{r}$ into $\dot{m}$: (α) the triple vocalization of the $\dot{r}$ is founded upon [the fact] that, in the state of prefixion, the $\dot{r}$, for which the $\dot{m}$ is substituted, is converted into $l$ and $\dot{r}$ [in the acc. and gen. respectively], for which reason the $\dot{r}$ is then triply vocalized in the three cases [of inflection], not for inflection, [but
for affinity]; so that, in the aprotetic state also, it is allowed to be triply vocalized otherwise than for inflection: (c) the 5th, 6th, and 7th are فَبَا, with the 3rd triply vocalized, [and the 1] abbreviated, unrestrictedly, [i.e., in the three states (α—γ) detailed under the 1st var.,] as though it were a combination of the subst. and original, or the م were a subst. for the ل put before the ع, as above mentioned [in (c, c, α)]; so that فِمُّلَّيْهْما is du. of فَبَا [above]: (d) the 8th and 9th are فَمٌّ, with the م doubled, unrestrictedly, [i.e., in the three states (α—γ) detailed under the 1st var.,] and the ف pronounced with Damm or Fath, as inِّ لَيْتهَا قَدْ آلَهٌ [above]: (α) IJ says "It is a poetic license, and is not a dial. var.": (β) it is as though the two مs were substituted for the ع and ل; and the pl. is ظَفَامٌ [above]: (c) the 10th is making the ف imitate the م in the vowels of inflection, as This is a mouth, I saw a mouth, and I looked at a mouth: (α) it is as though the state of prefixion without a م — I mean فَمٌّ [above], فَاكٌ, and فِبَك — were considered here: (β) sometimes the ف of مُرّ also is made to imitate its inflectional letter [in its vowels], as مُرّ, مُرّ, and مُرّ; while the م of أَبْنَم and أَمْرُ imitates the inflectional letter, by common consent [16] (R on IH upon the Genitives):
(1330)

(2) the J [of determination (IY, SH, A), where its substitution is weak, occurring (SH)] in the dial. (M, SH, A) of some of the Arabs (IY) of AlYaman (A), [e. g.] of Tayyi [599, 667, 668] (M, SH), as in لَيْسَ مِنْ أَمْيَرَ الْمَّعَدَّ [599] (M, R), transmitted from the Apostle of God by AnNamir Ibn Taulab, who is said to have transmitted [from the Prophet (IY)] nothing but this (M) tradition (IY); while the poet says ذَلَّ حَلَبُيْنَ الْمَّعَدَّ [599] (Jrb): but, notwithstanding that [tradition and verse], it is anomalous, not to be copied (IY): (3) the ن (M, SH, Aud, A), (a) regularly (IY), necessarily (SH, Aud), when [it occurs (M, Aud)] quiescent before ب (M, R, Aud, A), as in عَندَبُ [677] (M, SH, A) and شُنَبَة (M, SH) having sharp, serrated, canine teeth (MASH), fem. of أَشْتَبَ (Jrb, MASH), and عَنْبَر from Bakr (IY), whether the ن and ب be (Aud) in one word or two words (R, Aud), as عَنْبَر [above] and سَبِيعُ يَصِيرُ عَنْبَر XXII. 74. All-hearing, All-seeing (R), [and] as إِذَا أَنْبَعَتْ أَشْتَفَا حَا XCI. 12. When the most wretched of them arose, [i.e., of Thamūd, vid. Kudār Ibn Sālīf, or he and those who abetted him in the slaughter of the she-camel, because the افعل of superiority, when you prefix it, is applicable to the sing. and pl. (B),] and مَّنْ بَغَتْنا XXXVI. 52. [182] (Aud): (α) IM indicates that by his saying "And before a ب convert [below the ن when it is
made quiescent, into م (Tsr), like مْ[below]” (IM), i.e., Whoso cuts (thee), do thou surely cast out (from thy mind, and reject), where the ی of اُنْدَأ is a subst. for the single corrob. ن [614, 649, 684] (IA, A); (b) that [conversion] is [only (Tsr)] because articulation of the quiescent ن before the ب is difficult, from the difference of their outlets [732], together with the incongruity between the softness and nasality of the ن and the rigidity of the ب [734] (A, Tsr); so that, when the ن occurs quiescent before the ب, it is converted into م (Tsr), the م being exclusively distinguished by that [substitution] (A), because it is from the same outlet as the ب, and is like the ن in nasality (A, Tsr); (c) there is no difference in that [respect] between the [ن (Sn)] detached [from the ب, by its being in one word, while the ب is in another, notwithstanding their concurrence (Sn),] and the attached; and IM has combined the two in his saying “like مْ[above]” (A); (d) it is written as a ن, but pronounced as م (Jrb); (e) they often term change of the ن into م “conversion”, as IM does [above]; but it should rather be termed “substitution”, because of what I made known at the beginning of the chapter [682] (A), vid. that technically “conversion” is only in the unsound letters or the Hamza (Sn); (b) weakly (SH), anomalously
(1332)

(Aud, A), without a ب, when the ن is (α) quiescent, as in بَنَامِ [254, 677]: (b) mobile (A), as in بَنَامِ (SH, A) for بَنَانَ (Jrb, A), which are the [fingers or (KF)] finger-tips (Jrb), in [such as (Aud)] the saying [of Ru'ba (M, R, MN, Tsr, Jsh) Ibn AlAjjaj (MN Jsh)]

يَا هَالَّا ذَاتُ الْبَنَانِ ِ أَلْتَمَّاَمُ # َكِفَّٰكَ أَلْتَمَّاَمُ الْبَنَانِ (M, R, Aud, A), meaning يَا هَالَّةُ [58] (Tsr), O Hula, the [proper (Tsr)] name of a woman, possessed of the lisping speech, and of thy hand dyed in [the tips of (MN, Jsh)] the fingers (MN, Tsr, Jsh) with henna (Jsh), orig. البَنَانِ (Aud), the م being substituted for the ن (MN, Tsr, Jsh), as in عَنْبَرُ, حَبَطلُ, etc. (MN), for observance of the rhyme (Jsh), anomalously, since it does not precede a ب (Tsr); and in طَمَّةُ الْلَّهُ عَلَى الْخِيَرِ God disposed him to good (M, SH), transmitted by ISk (IY), i. e., طَمَّةُ (IY, R, Jrb), from طَمَّةُ disposition (IY, R); (α) the converse of that, [vid. substitution of the م for the ن (Tsr),] occurs in their saying [in describing hair (Tsr)] أَسْوَدُ قَاتِمٍ [black, dusky, orig. قَاتِمٍ [688] (Aud, A): (4) the ب in (a) بِنَاتُ مَخْضُرٍ (M, SH, A), transmitted by As (IY), for بِنَاتُ مَخْضُرٍ, [with Fath of the ب and quiescence of the dotted خ, as in the KF (Sn)], which are [thin (Jrb) white (IY, R,
Jrb)] clouds (IY, R, Jrb, A), that come before the summer (IY, R, Jrb), rising high in the sky (R), the بُخَّارٍ بُخَّارٍ is from بُخَّارٍ (Jrb, A): (a) IS says that it is [taken (IY)] from vapour, exhalation (IY, R), because the clouds are from the بُخَّارٍ أَلْرَفْسِ vapour, or exhalation, of the ground; and, according to this, the ب is original, and the م a subst. for it (IY): but IJ says that, if were said to be from مَخْرُ i. q. شَقَّ cleaning, from the text وَدَرَى أَلْفَلْكٍ فِيهِ مَوَاحِرٍ XXXV. 13. And thou seest the ships in it cleaning [the water by their running (K, B)], it would not be improbable (It): (b) sometimes they say it with the undotted ح, as though it were from بُخَّارٍ sea, because the clouds are from the vapour, or exhalation, of the sea (IY): (b) عَلَى هُدَا (IY) مَا زَلْتُ رَائِيَّا (IY, A)] I have not ceased to be constant (M, SH, A) to this (IY, A) matter, transmitted by IAl (IY), i. e., زَمْتَ زَمْتَ [below] (IY, Jrb), from زَمَبَ inf. n. زَمُّ ثُوبٍ, i. q. was constant (Jrb), the م being a subst. for the ب, [as is deducible] from the frequency, and versatility, of the ب, since you say زَمَبَ [above], aor. زَمَبُ, act. part. زَمِبُ [682], i. e., ثُمَّ ثُمَّ constant; but do not say زَمِبُ, aor. زَمِبُ, in this sense: so that the ب is the original (IY): (a) AA Sh says that مَا زَلْتُ رَائِيَّا عَلَى هُدَا is for
[above], i. e., مُقْبِيًا keeping, the م being a subst. for the ب, because رَمَّب is not said: but IJ says that the م admits of being original, from رَمَّة, which is a thread bound on the finger to remind one of a want, and is also a kind of tree: the poet says

Shall the multiplicity of what thou enjoines and the tying of the Ratam indeed profit thee if she care for them?: for, when one of their men meant [to go on] a journey, he would betake himself to two branches of two trees near one to the other, and tie one of them to its fellow; then, if he returned, and saw the two branches tied together in the same state, he would say that his wife had not been unfaithful to him; but, if not, he would say that she was unfaithful (R): (c) رَأَيْتُهُ مَنْ كُتِب I saw him (M, Jrb, A)] from a near spot (M, SH, A), according to ISk (A), transmitted by Ya‘kūb (IY, R), for كُتِب i. q. قُرِب (IY, R, Jrb, A), where the ب ought to be original, and the م a subst. for it, because كُتِب is [the crude-form] generally employed, as قَدْ أَكْتَبْ لَكَ الْأَمْر The matter has drawn near to thee and رَمَّهَا مَنْ كُتِب He shot him from a near spot, i. e., مِنْ قُرِب (IY): (d) the saying
Then she hastened to her sheep, hurrying, persevering, until she drew water enough for gulps below the bend of her neck, meaning, [says I.A.r (M),] غَنْبَة (M, A), pl. of غَنْبَة i.q. جَرِعَة gulp (I.Y). The [reason why the م is used as a subst. for these four letters is that the]م and  were labial; while the م is akin to the  and  in being vocal, and [intermediate] between rigidity and laxity [734] (R).

§. 688. The ن is substituted for [four letters (A),] (1) the , [anomalously (SH),] in بهرائي and سنعائي و سنعاء and بهراؤ (R, A), rel. ns. of بهرآء سنعاء and بهرآء (R, A), orig. بهرائي and سنعائي [311], because the Hamza [substituted for the ] of feminization [263, 683] is converted into, in the rel. n. (A) : (a) by rule the rel. ns. of سنعاء and سنعائي should be بهرائي and سنعائي, as you say بهراؤ from مسنعاء [304], and بهرآء from خنفساء [247, 273, 390], substituting a ، for the [aug.] Hamza, to distinguish it from the rad. Hamza (I.Y), as before explained [304] in [the chapter on (A)] the Relative Noun (I.Y, A); but they say بهرائي and سنعائي [311], irregularly: (b) authorities differ about that (I.Y):——
(a) according to S, the ن is a subst. for the و (IY, R), as though they said بِهِرَىْنِي and صَنَعَائِي [311], like ضَحَرَائي [above], and then substituted a ن for the و (IY), because the regular form is حُسْنَائِي, like حُسْرَائِي from حُسْرَاء [304]: while the ن and و are akin, because of the nasality in them; and also [because] both are between the rigid and the lax, and are vocal [734]: (b) Mb says "Nay, the Hamza of نَعَلَ is orig. ن"; and adduces, as evidence thereof, its return to the o. f. in بِهِرَائِي and نَبَرَائِي (R): (c) some say that the ن is a subst. for the Hamza [below] in بِهِرَائِي and صَنَعَائِي (IY, Jrb); but the first [opinion] is the most correct (Jrb): (c) the opinion of S is preferable (IY, R, because there is no affinity between the Hamza and the ن (IY, R, Jrb), since the ن is from the mouth, and the Hamza from the farthest [part] of the throat [732]; whereas the ن is akin to the و (IY, Jrb), and is therefore substituted for it (IY): (d) they make the ن a subst. for the و, not for the Hamza of feminization, in order that the rel. n. of the n. containing the [aug.] Hamza may be treated in one way as respects conversion of the Hamza into و (Sn): (2) the ج, [weakly (SH),] in لَعْنُ (M, SH, A), for لَعْنُ [537] (M, A); and لَعْنُ لَا بَنُ نَعَلَتْ كَذَا No, but thou [hast done such a thing, for لَعْنُ [545] (A): (a) it is said [by some] that (R) the ن is a subst. for the ج [the o. f.
being لَعَلْ [Jrb.],] because لَعَلْ is [more (R)] frequently [and generally (IY)] used (IY, R, Jrb): while the ن approximates to the ل in outlet [732], for which reason (α) the ن is incorporated into the ل [749, 751], as من لَدْنِهُ أَجْرًا عَظِيمًا IV. 44. And will bestow from Himself a great reward (IY, Jrb); and (b) the ن of protection is elided with the ل in لَعَلْي، as with the ن in إنِّي [170, 671] (IY); (b) it is said [by others] (R, Jrb), [and] I [myself] think (IY), that both [forms] are original (R), [i. e.,] that they are two [separate] dial. vars. (IY, Jrb), because there is little variability in ps. (IY, R, Jrb): (c) the poet says تَقَلِّبًا يَا صَحِبِيُّ أَلْحَمَ. [696. A]: (d) the reason why IH predicated “anomalousness” of the first two [exs. cited by him in this section], and “weakness” of the third, is only that what is meant by “anomalous” is what is “contrary to analogy”, although it be agreeable with the usage of chaste speakers; and by “weak” what is “contrary to the usage of chaste speakers” (Jrb); (3) the م in مُآَيِّن for مُآَيِّن, [with Fath of their Hamza, and quiescence of their ى (Sn),] denot- ing serpent; and قَانِمُ for قَانِمُ [in this phrase] being a corrob. of قَانِمُ (Sn); (4) the Ham- za [above], جَنَان being transmitted by Fr for جَنَان [384], what is what is used as a dye (A). The ن in the
of ُنُعْلَأ is [said by S to be] a subst. for the Hamza [of ُنُعْلَأ], as the Hamza [in ُحُمْرَأ] is a subst. for the ٍ of ُحُمْرَأ [263, 683] (S). As for the saying of Khl and S that the ُن of the ُنُعْلَأ whose fem. is ُنُعْلَأ, like the ُن of ُسْكَرْأ and ُغُضْبَان ُسْكَرْأ [250], is a subst. for the Hamza of ُنُعْلَأ, what is meant by it is not this [technical (Sn)] substitution [under discussion (Sn)]; but only that the ُن alternates with Hamza in this position [after ُنُعْلَأ], as the ُل of determination alternates with Tanwîn [262, 609] (A), because the Hamza is for the fem., and the ُن for the masc., so that they are not combined. But the unrestricted application of "alternation" to that [appearance of the ُن in ُنُعْلَأ, and Hamza in ُنُعْلَأ,] is tropical, because alternating letters are in one word; whereas what is here is not so, since the fem. of ُسْكَرْأ is ُسْكَرْأ with abbreviation, not ُسْكَرْأ with prolongation (Sn).

§ 689. The ُف is substituted for [seven letters (A),] (1, 2) the ُن and ُي (M, SH, A), when [the ُن or ُي is] (a) ُف [699] (M), in which case its substitution is (IY, SH) of two kinds, (α) regular (IY), obligatory (SH), in [نُعْلَأ] and its variations (IY),] such as threatened [below] (M, SH) and ُيِّتَرَئِن ُيِّتَرَئِن, and ُيِّتَرَئِن [278]
and مَتَّنِينَ, where they convert the ُّ, and incorporate it into the ُّ of اِنْتَعَدَلْ entered [below] (IY): and [such as (M)] divided into portions [below] (M, SH), from يِسَرُ [368], where they substitute a ُّ for the ِّ, as for the ُّ in اِنْتَعَدَلْ and اِنْتَزَّنْ [above] (IY): (α) IH means every ُّ, or ِّ that is a ُّ of اِنْتَعَدَلْ [below], as [will be] mentioned in the chapter on Unsoundness [699, 701] (R): (β) IM indicates that [substitution] by his saying (Tsr) "The soft [letter (IA, A), i.e., the ُّ, or ِّ (Aud, A), not substituted for a Hamza (Tsr)], when a ُّ, is [necessarily (IA, A)] changed into ُّ, [according to the chastest dial. (A, Tsr),] in اِنْتَعَدَلْ" (IM) and its derivs. (IA, A); and incorporated into the ُّ of اِنْتَعَدَلْ and its variations (Aud), vid. the [pret., aor., and imp. (Tsr)] v., and the act. and pass. parts.; from the difficulty of articulating the quiescent soft letter together with the ُّ, on account of the proximity of their outlets [732], and incompatibility of their qualities (A, Tsr), since the soft letter is vocal, and the ُّ surd [734] (A); as, [in the case of the ُّ (A), اِنْتَصَّلُ (IA, A, Tsr), اِنْتَصَّلُ (IA, A), اِنْتَصَّلُ, مُتَضَلَّلُ (IA, A), and اِرْتَصَّلُ (A, Aud), from رَضَلْ (Aud), orig. اِرْتَصَّلُ (IA, A, Tsr), اِرْتَصَّلُ (IA, A, Tsr), اِرْتَصَّلُ (IA, A, Tsr), اِرْتَصَّلُ (IA, A), and
and [similarly] [above], from (Aud), orig. (A), the being converted into ٌ, and incorporated into the of ٌ, because incorporation removes the heaviness (Tsr): and as, [in the case of the (A), interpreted by Frd as playing at hazard with gaming-arrows, which our Master confirms, accounting for its derivation from ٌ by the statement that the heathen used to think that such playing would occasion ٌ ease, opulence (Sn), [above] (Aud, (A), from ٌ) [278], and (A), from (A), orig. [above] (Aud), (A), (A, Tsr), ٌ, ٌ, and (A, the ٌ being converted into ٌ, and incorporated into the of ٌ, from their anxiety for incorporation, because it makes two letters become like one (Tsr): the poet [Tarafa Ibn Al’Abd (MN, Tsr) alBakri (MN)] says

فَانِ القِرَاءِ يَتَّلِيجُنَّ مَرَاحِجًا # تصاوِقٌ عَنْهَا أَنْ تُولِجْهَا آًرِبٍ (IV, Aud), constructively تصاوِقٌ عَنْهَا تُولِجْ آًرِبٍ, And verily the rhymes, by which he means odes, enter places of entrance, from which the entrance of needles has been excluded (MN), orig. تُوْلِيجٌ, from entrance
(MN, Tsr): and the [other (IY)] poet [AlA‘shà Mai-
mùn Ibn Kais (MN, Tsr), satirizing (MN), intimidating
(Tsr), ‘Alkama Ibn ‘Ulātha (MN, Tsr),] says

(IY, Aud) And, if thou threaten me, I shall threaten
thee with the like thereof: and I will add the lasting,
biting (words) (MN), orig. and (MN, Tsr): (γ) the reason why they change the  Franklin has that [formation] into  is that, if they retained it, the vowel of the preceding letter would play with it [from desire of homogeneity (Sn)]; so that it would be a  [rad. or converted from a  (Sn)] after Kasra [685], an  [converted from a  or  (Sn)] after Fatha [684, 701], and a  [rad. or converted from a  (Sn)] after Damma [686]: and, since they see its liability to [perpetual] alteration because of the alteration in the [vocalic] states of the preceding letter, they substitute for it a letter that is constant to one form, vid. the  Franklin has, which [they choose because it (Sn)], among the augs. (issuing (Sn)) from [the fore part of (Sn)] the mouth, [vid. the lips, the central incisors, and the tip of the tongue (Sn),] is the nearest [in outlet (Sn)] to the  [732]; [while they do not make the subst. a  (Sn),] in order that it may agree with, and therefore be incorporated into, the following letter, [vid. the  Franklin has of  [v.]]: (δ) some GG
say that the substitution, [even] in the cat. of لِإِتْصَلُّ, [where the ف is a و, ] is only for ی, because the , is not retained with the Kasra in لِإِتْصَلُّ and لِإِتْصَلُّ؛ while the aor. and act. and pass. parts. are made to accord with the inf. n. and pret. (A): but [the advocates of] the first [theory] may say that the doctrine that , is not retained with Kasra [685 (case 5)] applies only when its retention in perpetuity is meant: whereas here the case is not so; and therefore the , is retained, but then changed into ت (Sn): (ε) “soft [letter]” comprises the , and ی, as above shown: but, as for the ی [697], it is not included in that, because it is not a ف [673]; nor [is it, when original (Sn),] an ع or a ل (A), which is not incompatible with its being an ع or a ل , when it is a subst., as in قَلَم and رَمَى [684, 703, 719] (Sn): (خ) some people of AlHijaz leave this substitution, and pronounce the ف of the word according to the vowels before it, saying لِإِتْصَلُّ [685], aor. مُوْتِصْلُ [701], act. part. مُوْتِصْلُ; and Jr transmits that some of the Arabs say لِإِتْصَلُّ and لِإِتْصَلُّ, with [a second] Hamza, which is strange [661] (A): these two dialectic peculiarities are guarded against by A ’s saying above “according to the chastest dial.” (Sn): (η) we have restricted the , and ی by saying, as in the Tashil, “not substituted for a Hamza”, to guard
against such as أُرْتِيَّنَ [661, 702], inf. n. إِيْتَزُّرَ (MAR), (श) irregular (IY), anomalous (SH), in such as أُرْتِيَّنَ (M, SH), orig. أُرْتِيَّنَ because from لَوْجُ [above] (Jrb), as says the poet [Ímra alKhais (IY)]

ربٌ زَمِّم مِن بَنِي ثَعَالِب مُتَلَمِّيْزٌ كُتَّبِيْدٌ فِي قَتْرِيْهُ (M, R) Many a marksman of the Banû Thu'ail, putting his two hands inside his lurking-places! (MAR), lest the wild animals [see them, and] flee away (IY); and ضَرّبَهُ حَتَّى أَنْكَأَهُ He smote him, so that he made him fall in a reclining posture (R); orig. أُوْرَّاَثُ (MAR): (α) numerous expressions [illustrative] of that [irregular substitution of ] for the , when a ف ] occur (IY); and hence (R) they say (IY, A) نُجِّاَتُ (408, 646, 671) (M, R, A) for نُجِّاَتُ (MAR), نُجِّاَتُ from نُغَالُ i. e., the location in front of everything, as نُجِّاَتُ زَبِيد Such an one is in front of Zaid, i. e., قَدَامُهُ before him (IY); and تُرَطَّبُ [278, 307, 408, 671, 682] (M, A), as كَلَّاُ لَا تَرَطَّبُ LXXXIX. 20. And ye devour the inheritance with wholesale voracity, orig. رَأَةٌ فَعَالٌ تُرَطَّبُ (IY); and the like (A): and تَپِيْقُرُ (M, R), orig. نُعِّرُ (Jh), تَپِيْقُرُ (IY) from كُتَّرُ gravity, staidness (IY, R), as says the poet [Al'Ajjâj (S, Jh)]

فَنَّان يُجَيِّنَ أَمَسَّى أَلْبِيْلِي نَفْقُورَيْ 145.a
Then, if wear have become the cause of my gravity (IV), meaning زَقْارَى (S, Jh): and ْتُكْلِنَّ (M, R) incapacity and reliance upon another (Jh, KF), رَكَّرْتُ نُعْلَانُ from I committed, deputed, delegated, aor. رَكِّبُ (IV): and رَكِّبَةٌ staff to lean upon [682] (M), the ْتُكِلْنَةَ being orig. ْحُ (Jh); and ْتُكِلْتَهُ [807] (M, R), as رَكِّبَةٌ for رَكِّبَةٌ i. e., a man incapable, committing his affair to another, whence رَكِّبَتُ commissioner, deputy, delegate, as though he were commissioned, deputed, delegated, the root in them being one (IV); and ْتُكِلْحَةٌ [278, 646, 682] (M, R), a malady like cholera, from ْبُحَاحَةٌ or ْبُحُحمُ, which is pestilence (IV); and ْتُكِلْبَةٌ suspicion (M, R), نُعْلَةً from أَتِهْتُ I thought, the [first] ْتُهِبْتُ of ْتُهِبْتُ being a subst. for the ْرِبُّمُ ْتُهِبْتَ the fancy of the mind (IV): and ْتُكِرِي (M, MAR), ْتُقِرَةٌ [331, 686] (M, R), and ْتُقِيَةٌ (IV, R), respectively ْتُعَيِّنَةٌ, نَعْلَةٌ, and ْتُعَيِّنَتُ I guarded, or was cautious (IV): and ْتُقِرِّبُ consecutively, uninterruptedly, or at intervals (M, R), نَعْلَى (IV) from ْمُؤْنَةٍ (IV, R), i. q. مُتَابَةٌ making consecutive, uninterrupted; though Lh says "There is no مُؤْنَةٍ but amongst it is an interval, as نَمَّ أَرْسَلْنَا رُسْلَانًا نَتَّرَى XXIII. 46. Then We sent Our Apostles at intervals"; it has two dial. vars.
[282], Tanwín and omission thereof; and those who decline it is a diptote make its 1 denotative of feminization; while, according to those who decline it as a triptote, the 1 is co-ordinative (IY): and ٌتُرَ بْنُوُرُتُرَ (M, R), one of the Revealed Scriptures (IY), from producing fire (R), orig. ٌتُرُبُ أ (IY), ُتُرُبُ أ (IY,R) from The fire-stick produced fire [6 ٌتُرُبُ أ] (IY), because [below] is extraordinary (R); and [similarly (R)] ْتَرْجَ (693) (M, R), the covert of the wild animal, into which he ُبَلْجُ benders (IY), ُتُرُبَأ (Jh, IY, Jrb on §. 693), says S (Jh, Jrb), because you hardly ever find ُتُرَبُأ as a n. [in the language (Jh)], whereas ُتُرَبُأ is frequent (Jh, Jrb), as says the Rājiz [Jarī Jh on ضَمَأ], describing a bull [taking cover (Jh)] among thorn-trees.

Making for himself a covert among trees of the kind called ُضَمَأ: the Bdd say that ُخَرْرُأ is ُتُرَبُأ [above], and ُخَرْرُأ is ُتُرَبُأ [678]; but the correct [opinion] is the first, because ُتُرَبُأ is more frequent than ُتُرَبُأ among ns.: and, according to us, if the Arabs did not convert the [initial], [of ٌخَرْرُأ] into ٌتُرَ بْنُرُتُرَ, its conversion into Hamza would ensue, because of the combination of two ٌخَرْرُأ, as in ُأَرْسُلُ pl. of ُأَرْسُلُ [683, 699, 730. A]; but, according to the Bdd,
that [conclusion] does not follow, because the \( \text{اثناء} \), according to them, is an *aug.* [678], not a *subst.* [for a *rad.* \( \text{اثناء} \), serving as the \( \text{اثناء} \), so that there is no initial, to be converted] (IX); and \( \text{اثناء} \) [253, 255] (R), the measure of (T) which is [construed, says Khl, to be (Jh),] \( \text{اثناء} \) (Jh, T); its *o. f.* being \( \text{اثناء} \), like \( \text{اثناء} \) [above] from \( \text{اثناء} \) (M) entered (Jh); while its derivation is from \( \text{اثناء} \) *agreement*, as though the child \( \text{اثناء} \) \( \text{اثناء} \) \( \text{اثناء} \) \( \text{اثناء} \) *agreed with another in coming*, i. e., \( \text{اثناء} \) (T): and \( \text{اثناء} \) (M) *old property*, vid. what was born in thy possession, contrary of \( \text{اثناء} \) *newly-acquired*; and \( \text{اثناء} \), vid. who was born in the territories of foreigners, and then carried away while young, so that he grew up in the territories of \( \text{اثناء} \) (IV): (b) a \( \text{اثناء} \) (M), in (a) \( \text{اثناء} \) [277] (M, R), orig. \( \text{اثناء} \) [234, 307]; but transferred from \( \text{اثناء} \) \( \text{اثناء} \) \( \text{اثناء} \) | [646] (IV): and [similarly (IV)] [277] (M, R), \( \text{اثناء} \) being orig. \( \text{اثناء} \) [234, 307, 667], on the measure of \( \text{اثناء} \), like \( \text{اثناء} \) *pen*; and then transferred to \( \text{اثناء} \), like \( \text{اثناء} \) [646] (IV): (c) this final \( \text{اثناء} \), and in \( \text{اثناء} \) also, is a *rad.* \( \text{اثناء} \) [below], existing in continuity and pause [646] (D): [for the \( \text{اثناء} \) is substituted for their \( \text{اثناء} \) (IV); and is not [really (D)] the sign of femininization [268, 277, 295] (D, IV), as is proved by the quiescence of the preceding letter (IV),
because the letter before the of feminization is [only (IY)] pronounced with Fath (D, IY), like the in فاطمة and the ر in مَكْرِرٍ [254] (D), the r being equivalent to a n. joined on to [266], and compounded with, a n.; so that the letter before it is pronounced with Fath, like the Fath of the letter before the second n. of دَفْرَة [215] (IY); unless it be an l, like the l in دَفْرَة [254] and دَفْرَة [683]: and, since the letter before the n in يُهْتَدَى and كَعْبَة is quiescent, and is not an l, this proves that the n in them is rad. (D): (β) it is objected against H's saying "is a rad. ﺛ" [above] that the n is [a co-ordinative] aug. [671], not a rad.; so that there is no reason for what he mentions: but this is refuted by [the reply] that, by its being "rad.", he means that it is a compensation for a rad. letter, vid. the l of the word; or [that it is] quasi-rad., because it is for co-ordination with such as ﺟَذْعٌ [or قَفْلٌ] (CD): (γ) the sign of feminization in يُهْتَدَى and كَعْبَة is their formation in these two shapes, and their transfer from their first formation [307]; and, for that reason, the shape and the r of feminization are interchangeable in كَعْبَة [667], where the shape of كَعْبَة corresponds to the r of feminization in كَعْبَة (IY): (δ) the dial. var. more often used is كَعْبَة, with which the Kur speaks in
LXVI. 12. And Mary, the daughter of 'Imrūn, and in Shu'āib's address to Moses أَنَّا أَنْعَمْتُ ٱلۡبَنَاتِ ۖ أُحِبَّتِيَّةً XXVIII. 27. Verily I wish to marry thee unto one of these my two daughters; and to which the saying of Abu-l'Amaithal conforms, vid.

لَتَبُتْ أُنْسِيَةَ ٱلسَّهِيَّةِ زَيْنَبُ عَنْ عَفْرٍ وَخَصَّ حَرَامَ مَسَى عَشْرَةَا ٱلْعَشْرِ فَكُلْمَتَهَا زَيْنَتِينَ كَالتَّلْحِيَّ مِنْهَا عَلَى ٱلْلَّوْحِ زَائِرَةٌ أَحَرًۡ ۚ مِّنْ ٱلْكِرَّ.

[I met Zainab, the daughter of the Sahmi—a rel. n. from Sahm, a clan of Kuraish, and in Bāhila also—after a period, or time, when we were entering upon the state of pilgrimage, on the evening of the tenth of the first ten (days of Dhu-l-Hijja): and I spoke to her two (words, one) oj; which was like snow upon, i.e., with, thirst, and the other hotter than live coal (AKB)], where he means by the first "word" the greeting of arrival, and by the other the salutation of farewell (D): (c) Sf hsd the ت in مُنْتَبِنَتْ, and the like to be the sign of feminization, for which reason, says he, it is elided in the perf. pl. and أَخْرَائُكُمَا [234, 307]; while the quiescence of the preceding letter is because the ت is meant to be co-ordinative (IV): (b) مَنْتَ [263, 277, 307]
I believe Ibn Nizār to have shunned me, and loathed me, on account of things whose course was uninterrupted [690]; and is meant for co-ordination with فعل, like بَكْر and أمْر (IY): كَلَّنا (c) [263, 277] (M), which S [307] holds to be دَكْرِيَ like [272], orig. كَلَّي, the being changed into ب [678]: so that according to him, it is a sing. n. importing the sense of the du. [117], contrary to the opinion of the KK; and is not of the crude-form, but [only] of the sense, of كَلَّي (IY): (d) أَسْتَنْتُرا (M, R), i.e., They experienced drought (IY), from [the crude-form of (IY)] سَنَة [234, 244, 260, 265, 275, 306] (IY, R), according to those who hold its ل to be a and جَرَّة سَنَة a hard year and I hired him by the year: the ت is said to be a subst. for (α) the و, which is a ج: (β) ج, because the و, when it occurs fourth, is converted into ح, as in [685, 727]; and then the ت is substituted for the ح, which [opinion] is more agreeable with analogy (IY): (e) [263, 277, 313] (M, A), orig. قَنْبِي (spelt by YH with Fatḥas (Sn)], because it
is [فعل] 

I was a second to the one.

[of the conjug. of رأي (Sn),] inf. n. كنيت (A), i. e., I became with him a second: so in the Msb (Sn): (α) the في in it is a subst. for the ي, as is proved by its being from كنيت I doubled, or folded; or bent [313]; because one of the two is doubled, or folded, or bent, upon the other: (β) its o. f. is كنيت, like [above], as is proved by their making its pl. أَنْتَانِ [307], like أَنْتَانِ [307, 667] and أَخَا [260, 307]; but they transfer it from كنيت [above]: as they do in كنيت [above]: (γ): as for the في in كنيت [307, 313, 667], it is like that in كنيت [above]: whereas كنيت is like كنيت [above] (IY): كنيت and كنيت [277] (M, A), orig. كنيت and كنيت [227, 277], because they say كَانَ مِنَ الْأَمَرِ كِتَابَةٍ and كَانَ مِنَ الْأَمَرِ كِتَابَةٍ [227] (IY, A), transmitted from the Arabs by Au (IY), the s of feminization being elided; and a ت substituted for the [last (A)] في, which is the ل (IY, A), of the word (A), by way of co-ordination, as in كنيت [above]: so that they say كنيت and كنيت: (α) these [forms] have three dial. vars., being uninfl. upon Fath, as كنيت and كنيت; Kasr, as كنيت and كنيت; and Damm, as كنيت and كنيت: whereas كنيت and كنيت have only one form, which is uninfl. upon Fath: (β) if it be said
""Why do you not say that the ١ is a subst. for ٧, the o. f. of كَبْوَة, but the ٦, being converted into ٧, as in سَيْدٌ ٥٨٥، ٧١٦?"", we say that it is not allowable, because you would arrive at what has no counterpart in their language, which contains no word like حَبْوَة [4, ٥٨٥, ٦٩٨], whose ع is a ٧, and ل ٧, (IY): (γ) [Jh, however, says in article ٧ that possibly] the o. f. of ٦ is upon [the measure of] فَعْلُ, quiescent in the ع; the ٥, being elided, so that ٧ remains bil.; and [its final] being therefore doubled, as [the final of] كَي is doubled when you make it a name [٢٧٥]; and the ٦, being then put as a subst. for doubling: so that, if you elide the ٥, and put the ٧, you must restore the doubling; [and thus] you say كَي ٦ ٧٦٨٤ or ٧٦٨٤ ٦ ٧٦٨٤: (b) if you form the rel. n. of ٦ ٧٦٨٤, you say كَي ٧٦٨٤ ٦ ٧٦٨٤, like نَبَوِي rel. n. of ٦ ٧٦٨٤ [٣٠٧] (Jh): (3) the ٧, in (a) طَسْتٌ basin [below] (M, SH, A), alone [below] (SH), orig. ٧ طَسْسٌ (IY, Jrb), because [its dim. is طَسْسٌ, and (IY, Jrb)] its [broken (IY)] pl. is (IY, R, Jrb) طَسْسٌ (IY) [and] طَسْسٌ (R, Jrb), not طَسْسٌ [below] (R): (a) Fr says "Tayyi say طَسْتٌ, and others طَسْسٌ: the former are those who say نَصُصٌ [below]; and, according to them, the pl. is لْصَصَتٌ [above] and لْصَصَتٌ [below]" (Jk): (b) if it be said "Its pl. is طَسْتٌ also: then why do you decide that the
is original, and the ت a subst., and not the converse? ", we say "Because it is established that the ت is a letter of substitution, whereas such is not established in respect of the س [682, 696. A]" (Jrb): (c) IH says "alone" [above], notwithstanding [below], because the substitution in the latter is for incorporation [682] (R): (b) the num. (A) س ست [307, 316, 671, 682, 758] (M, R, A): (a) its o. f. is س سيدس (IY, A), because it is (IY) from [the crude-form of (R)] تسديس making six (IY, R), since they say [in its dim. (Jh, IY)] سدسيسة [282] (IY, A), and in the pl. أسادس (Jh): but they convert the last س into ب , in order that it may approximate [in outlet] to the د [732] before it; while [they choose the ت because], together with that [proximity to the د ], it is surd, like the س [734]: so that س سيدس becomes constructively س سيدت (IY); and then, [since the د and ت are combined, and they approximate in outlet (IY),] the د is changed into ت , [because of their agreement in surdity (IY),] and incorporated (IY, A) into the ت , so that they say ت س (IY): (c) the saying of the poet

(م، ر)، meaning الناس and أكياس (IY)، أ، or أ (my
people) [59, 551], God fight against, meaning slay, the sons of she-devils, ‘Amr Ibn Mas’ūd, the worst of men, incontinent and not sharp-witted! (Jsh), where he substitutes a  for the س (IY; Jsh), because of their agreement in being surd [734], aug. [671] letters, adjacent in outlet [732]; for extension of the vocabulary (IY), in order that لَصْبَتْ أَكْيَاسُ النَّاسِ (Jsh); which is extraordinary (R): (4) the ص, in [below] (M, SH, A) and لَصْبَتْ (IY), for لَصٌ (IY; R, A) and لَصَ [682] (IY), the  being a subst. for the ص, as is proved by their saying تَلْصَبَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ He committed robbery upon them and هُوَ بَيْنَ الْقُرُشِيَّةِ It is plain robbery (IY, Jrb), with Damm and Fath of the ل (Jrb), and أَرْضٌ مَُسْتَهْلَكَهَا land infested by robbers (IY): (a) the pl. is لَصْبَتْ [above], as

(IX, R) Then they let Nahd—a clan of AlYaman—with its children destitute, and the Banū Kināna like insolent robbers (MAR); and those who say that make لَصْبَتْ a dial. var. [682], because the ت is substituted for the ص [in its variations also]: (b) its derivation is from لَصْبَتْ, which is narrowness of the interstices between the teeth, as though the thief, or robber,
narrowed himself, and made himself small, lest he should be seen (IY): (c) Jh mentions in the Sahih that [according to Fr (Jh)] لَصِّتُ, with Fath of the ل, is i. q. لَصُّ in the dial. of Tayyi, who say لَصُّتُ [above] for لَصُّ; and that the pl. is لَصُّتُ لُصُّتُ: (d) it is mentioned in the CHd that لَصُّ is said with all three vowels of the ل, Kasr being the chastest; and لَصُّتُ with Fath of the ل [682], pl. لُصُّتُ, like بُرَتُ [242, 256] (Jrb): (5) the ب in دُعَالِيَتُ (M, SH, A) and دُعَالِيَتُ (IY), for دُعَالِيَتُ (M, A) and دُعَالِيَيْبِ (IY), as

صفقة ذي دُعَالِيَت سُمُول # تبيع أميري ليس يستقبل

The bargain of the poor needy purchaser, wearer of worn-out rags is, in irreversibility and conclusiveness, like a sale by a man that is not desirous of rescinding (MAR), i. e., دُعَالِب (R), the ب being a subst. for the ب (IY): (a) IJ says “They ought to be two dial. vars.; but”, says he, “it is not improbable that the ب is substituted for the ب, since it is sometimes substituted for the ب [above], which is the partner of the ب in [having its outlet from] the lip [732]”: this is his language; and the better [opinion] is that the ب [in دُعَالِتْ ] is orig. ب, because دُعَالِبُ is more often used, i. q. دُعَالِيَب (R): (b) دُعَالِبُ [below], which are bits of worn-out rags (R): (b)
[and دَعَالِيْبُ (A)] are [bits of rags, and of (IY)] worn-out clothes (M, A), as

مَنْسَرْحاً عَنْهُ دَعَالِبٌ الْغَرِّقَ

With the bits of rags stripped off him [below] (IY): (c) the sing. is دَعَلَبٌ (IY, R, A), like مُعَصْفَرِ ٌ [253, 396] (Sn): (d) Jh mentions in the Ṣahāḥ that (Jrb) دَعَالِيْبُ are bits of rags, as مَنْسَرْحاً عَنْهُ آلْحُ [above]: and [that (Jrb)] IAl says "And the ends of garments are called دَعَالِبٌ, sing. دَعَلَبٌ"; and cites by Jarīr

وَقَدْ أَكُونَ هَلْيُ الْصَّاجَابِ ذَةَ لِبَثٍ

وَأَحْرُضُ ۖ إِذَا أَنْصَمْ الدَّعَالِيْبُ

And indeed I am possessed of patience against needs, and am active when the ends of the garments are tucked up (Jh, Jrb): all of that is mentioned in the Ṣahāḥ: (e) hence one knows that دَعَالِيْبُ [above] is orig. دَعَالِبٌ [above] by conversion of its [sing.'s s] letter of prolongation into ی, as is the rule, like قُرَاطِيْسُ تَرَاطِيْسُ pl. of قُرَاطَاسُ [253, 685] (Jrb): (f) the substitution in لِصَتْ دَاوَالِيْبِ and لِصَتْ دَاوَالِيْبِ [above] is weak (SH): (6) the ضُطِّ ابَنَ [with Damm of the F, the tent (Sn),] orig. ضُطِّ ابَنَ [385] (R, A), because they say in the pl. ضُطِّ ابَنَ [390], not ضُطِّ ابَنَ صَبَّ رَيْطُ a tractable she-camel, orig. كَرْبَتُ, i. e., broken in,
because it is from being accustomed to, and bold towards, the thing, since, from the animal's being accustomed to, and bold towards, a thing, his tractability therein is ensured (Sn). IM says in the Tashil that the th is seldom substituted for the s. The ex. of it is the interpretation put by some upon the saying [of Abû Wajza asSa’dî, praising the family of AzZubair Ibn Al‘Awwâm (AKB).]

[The kind when there is not any one kind, and the feeders at the time (of the question) "Where is the feeder?" (AKB), that he means the with the s of silence; and afterwards changes it into t, which he mobilizes from metric exigency (A): but this is open to the objection that the metre would be correct without mobilizing it; so that there is no metric exigency, as will not escape the notice of those who have the least acquaintance with prosody (Sn). And some exemplify it by such as [ and ] [646], because they hold the s to be the original [sign of feminization in the n.] (A).

§. 690. The s is substituted for [six letters (A),] (1) the Hamza (M, SH, A), as before mentioned [682] (A); (a) when aug. (IV), as in (a) [ ] [682] (M, Jrb) [ ] I poured out [658, 679, 682] (M, SH) the wat•
(M, Jrb), i.e., أَرْنَتْهَا (IY, Jrb): (α) in أَفْرَقْتِ [349, 382, 671, 679] the s is aug., a quasi-compensation for the departure of the vowel from the ج, as the س is aug. in هُرْقَتْ [671, 680, 682] (M, R, Jrb) [الذَّابِة] (b) أَرْنَتْهَا [658, 682] (M, SH), i.e., أَرْنَتْهَا (IY, R, Jrb), meaning I brought the beast back to the nightly resting-place (Jrb): (c) أَفْرَقْتَ أَلْتَوْبَ I put a woo to the cloth, or an ornamental border to the garment (M, R), i.e., أَرْنَتْهَا (IY, R), أَنْفَتْهَا (IY) : (d) أَفْرَقْتُ أَلْتَوْبً I wanted the thing [682], transmitted by لَه (M, R), i.e., أَرْنَتْهَا (IY, R), aor. أَفْرَقْتُهَا with Fath of the s, like أَفْرَقْتُهَا [349] (R): (α) those [four exs.] are all transmitted by IِSَK (IY): (b) when rad. (IY), as in (a) أَيَّان [658, 682] (M, SH), for أَيَّان (IY, Jrb), whence أَيَّان تَنْبِدُ رَهْيَانَ تَنْبِيِّسُهُ I. 4. [Part I, p. 39A] (IY): the s being a subst., because أَيَّان is more frequent (R): (α, it is transmitted from Ktb that some say أَيَّان, which is read in I. 4. (K, B), with Fath of the Hamza; and then substitute the s for it, saying ثلاثك (IY): (b) لَهَنَك (521, 682] (M, SH), orig. لَهَنَك (IY, Jrb), whence لَهَنَك [521] (IY): (α) when the ل of inception is prefixed, they alter the Hamza into s, because the ل is not combin.e.d with إن.
since they do not combine two ps. having one meaning
(Jrb); and [then] they do not mind the succession of
two corrob. ps. [521], because the form of the second is
altered by the substitution (Sn on § 682): (c)
[لَفْتُ كَانَ كَذَا] (M) (IY, R) (551)
Now, by God (M, R), assuredly
such a thing did indeed happen! (M), meaning
[أَماُّ وَلَّدِيَ] (M, Jrb) (d) [نُعُلُتَ]
If thou do (M, SH), I will do (M, Jrb), meaning (IY, Jrb), in
[the dial. of (M, Jrb)] Tayyi (M, SH), who convert the
Hamza of the cond. إن (R) : (e) (SH) :
the poet says (R, Jrb)
(554) (R) : (α) they [justly (IY)] change the
Hamza into s [in these cases (Jrb), by way of allevia-
tion (IY)], because the Hamza is a rigid, independent
letter, and the s a surd, faint letter [734]; while their
outlets are approximate [732] (IY, Jrb), except that the
Hamza is [sounded] farther in the throat than the s
(IY): (a) the substitution of the s for the Hamza is confined to hearsay (SH): [for] this substitution, though often transmitted from them, according to what has been mentioned, is inconsiderable, trifling, in comparison with what is not changed, for which reason it may not be copied; so that you do not say مَنْحُصَدُ for أَحْمَدْ, nor عَبْرِهِمُ for أَبِرَهِيمُ Abraham, nor أَثْرَةُ for a citron; but you follow what they say, and stop where they end (IY): (2) the َأَنْ in (a) أَنْ َمَ [648] (M, SH, A), where the s may be (IY, R, A), (a) as is said [here] (R), a subst. for the َأَنْ in pause [upon َأَنْ; which is most likely (IY)], because [أَنْاً with (IY)] the َأَنْ is more often used [in pause (R)] than [أَنْاً with (IY)] the s (IY, R), which is rare (IY): (b) as we have mentioned in the chapter on Pause [and elsewhere], the s of silence, as in َأَنْ [615, 644, 671, 679] (R), affixed (A) in pause (Sn), like the َأَنْ [161, 497, 647] (IY), to make the vowel [of the َأَنْ (IY, Sn) in أَنْ (IY)] plain (IY, A); and not a subst. for the َأَنْ (IY, Sn): (b) حَيْيَمْلَةُ (M, SH, A): (a) the َأَنْ in حَيْيَمْلَةُ is to make the vowel plain: and (IY) the [last (A)] َأَنْ in حَيْيَمْلَةُ is a subst. for the َأَنْ (IY, A) in حَيْيَمْلَةُ [615; 648] (A); or may be [affixed, like the َأَنْ, ] to make the vowel plain, as is allowable in َأَنْ [above] (Sn): (c) َأَنْ in interrogation 147a
(SH), and هَنَّةُ (Jsh), as in (R) the poet's saying قد رَزْدَتْ آلهُم [175, 181, 646] (M, R, A), where he substitutes s for the ْلِنّ (A), meaning ْلٍ (IY): while [مَعْهُ in] ْلٍ may be an instance of that [substitution of s for َلٍ (Sn)], i. e., ْلٍ أَصْغِنُ Then what (shall I do)? [below], or فَمَا أَصْغِنُ فَمَا آَنْتَظِرَيْ لَهَا Then what (is the good of my waiting for them)?; or may be i. q. [187]; i. e., They have come to water from every side, and have become numerous: then, if I quench not their thirst, do not thou blame me, but hold off from me (A): (α) ْلٍ admits of two alternatives: — (α) that he means ْلٍ ْلٍ Then what?; but that, pause upon the ْلِنّ being disliked, on account of its faintness, he substitutes the s for it, because of their proximity in outlet [732]; what is meant being ْلٍ أَصْغِنُ [above], or the like [181]: (β) that ْلٍ is a chiding, i. e., Then hold! (O man), as though he addressed, and chid, himself (IY): (b) [on the supposition that مَهِي here means مآ ] the better [opinion] is that the s is a subst. for the ْلِنّ: but it may be said that the ْلِنّ is elided from the interrog. مآ not governed in the gen., as it is elided from the one governed in the gen., as in إِلَٰٓمْ فِيٖمَ and [181, 615, 648]; and that the م is then strengthened with the s of silence, as [the ر and ق are] in and ْلٍ [above] (R): (d) ْلٍ رَزْدَتْ رَبِّي الْمَحَى (SH), [as [Part I.
p. 15A], where the \( \xi \) is substituted for the \( \iota \) converted from the \( \, \) [appearing] in \( \mathtt{\text{تاناتس}} \) [234] (M), according to one opinion (SH): (α) there is a dispute about its [last (IY)] \( \xi \) (IY, R):——(α) according to the BB (W, R), the \( \xi \) [in \( \mathtt{تاناتس} \) (W)] is a subst. for the \( \, \) [below] (W, IY, R), which is the \( \jmath \) of the word (IY), in [\( \mathtt{تاناتس} \) and (W, IY)] [16, 234] (W, IY, R), [as] in \( \mathtt{تاناتس} \) [689] (IY); its o. f., [according to them (R),] being \( \xi \) (IY, R), \( \xi \) from \( \mathtt{تاناتس} \) [14]; but the \( \, \) being then changed into \( \xi \) (IY); so that the \( \xi \), being a subst. for the \( \jmath \) of the word, may, for that reason, be pronounced with Damm [48]: while AZ says on \( \mathtt{تاناتس} \) [616] that the poet assimilates [the \( \xi \) in it] to the letter of inflection, [i. e., the final of the n.], and therefore pronounces it with Damm (W): (β) it is indicated by Z [and IH] that the \( \, \), being final after an aug. \( \iota \), is converted into \( \iota \) [below], the \( \xi \) being a subst. for that \( \iota \) (IY): (γ) according to AZ, Akh, and the KK, it is the \( \xi \) of silence [615, 616] (R): [for] AZ holds that the \( \xi \) is affixed after the \( \iota \), for pause, on account of the faintness of the \( \iota \), as it is affixed in lamentation, as in [55, 615]; and that it is mobilized by assimilation to the \( \text{راد} \); \( \xi \), [as he says on \( \mathtt{تاناتس} \) above]: and this saying is transmitted from Akh also: while, according to them, the \( \iota \) [not the \( \xi \)] is a subst. for the \( \, \), which is the \( \jmath \) of the
word; but this is an unsound saying, inasmuch as the s of silence is affixed only in pause, and, when you pass to continuity, you elide it decidedly; and [because] it is found only quiescent, not mobile, for which reason the saying of Al-Mutanabbi

[Ah! the heat of my heart from its love for him whose heart is cold, and near whom sickness is in my body, and disorder in my state! (W)] is rejected, because he expresses the s of silence [in continuity (W)], and mobilizes it (IY): (S) some hold that the s [in بَقِينَ (IY)] is original, [not a subst., but only the j of the word, as in ظَفْتُة calumniated and شَفَّة consumed (IY),] which is [a (IY)] weak [saying (IY)], because the cat. of سِلسِ and قَلَقْي is rare [674, 685, 690] (IY, R): (b) the substitution of the s for the l is anomalous (SH): (S) the , [671], in رَقَدُ أَنْئُي أَلْحَمْ [above]: (a) that is disputed, the majority holding that the s is substituted for the , [above], the o. f. being يَا ڨَنْأَرْ while IJ says "If the s were said to be a subst. for the l converted from the , occurring after the [aug.], it would be a strong saying, since the s is nearer [in outlet] to the l than to the , [732]; [and his opinion is adopted by Z and IH above] (A): (b) his meaning by "the l" is apparently "the Hamza", which is the [letter] substituted for the
in the cat. of ١٣٦٣ [683] and ١٣٦٣ غُطَاءَ covering (Sn): (4) the ١٣٦٤ (M, SH, A), in (a) ١٣٦٥ [648, 671] (IY, SH, A), with quiescence of the ١٣٦٦ [174] (IY, A), [as] in ١٣٦٧ [648] (M): (a) the s of ١٣٦٨ is a subst. for the ١٣٦٩ in pause, according to the Banû Tamîm (R), who say ١٣٧٠ with quiescence of the s, which is substiuted because, in pause after the Kasra, the ١٣٧١ is faint, the s being more apparent than it; while the s is approximate [in outlet] to the sister of the ١٣٧٢ [697], i.e., the l [732]: but these [Arabs], when they continue, restore the ١٣٧٣, saying ١٣٧٤ This is Hind, because the ١٣٧٥ is made plain by what follows it: (b) Kais and the people of AlHijâz make pause and continuity alike, [saying ١٣٧٦] with the s, as Tayyî make pause and continuity alike in ١٣٧٧ [686] (R on Pause): (c) this [substitution] is not regular in every ١٣٧٨, [as conversion into ١٣٧٩ is regular, according to Tayyî, from every l (R on Pause);] so that ١٣٨٠ is not said for ١٣٨١ [176] (R): (d) this ١٣٨٢ is mostly converted into s, in order that it may be assimilated to the s of the masc. [pron.] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in ١٣٨٣ غَلَامِهُ ١٣٨٤ and ١٣٨٥ [161, 648], and be therefore conjoined [with ١٣٨٦]: (e) the [conj.] ١٣٨٧ is elided in pause: (f) ١٣٨٨ with quiescence is allowable in continuity and pause, but is rare
[in the former] (R on Pause): [for] some of the Arabs make this ی quiescent, like the ی, in continuity and pause: while some assimilate it to the ی of the pron., because it is attached to a vague indecl. n.; so that they pronounce it with Kasr in continuity, saying ہُدِ اللہ یہ۔

This is Hind [and ہُدِ اللہ (IY on §. 648)], as you say نظرت یلی علیمی (648); and terminate it by ی, [as ہُدِ اللہ (648).] to make the Kasra of the ی plain; but [even] those who say this pause upon the ی quiescent: (g) one proof that the ی is [affixed] to make the vowel plain, and that the ی is not for feminization [648], is that, if you named a man ده, you would inflect, and pronounce with Tanwin, as ہُدِ ده, I saw Dhih, رآیت ده I passed by Dhih, eliding the ی, because rendered unnecessary by the vowels and triptote declension; whereas, if the ی were for feminization, you would not decline it as a triptote, as you do not decline حمرة طلحة [18] as triptotes (IY): (b) for ہنیه [277] (A), which is the trifling thing (Sn): (5) the ینی (M, SH, A), in (a) the cat. of رحمہ [682] (SH), i. e., the n. containing the ی of feminization [646] (MASH), [e. g.] in [such as (IY, A)] حمرہ (M, A) and حمرہ (M), in pause (M, SH, A), according to the opinion of the BB (A): (α) some treat
continuity like pause, saying ُقَلَّةَ أَرْبَعَةٍ ٦٤٧, ٦٦٣]; and some treat pause like continuity, saying بَلِ جُوْزُ تَنْهَاةَ آلِهَةٌ [١٨٣, ٦٤٠, ٦٤٦] (IY) (b) كَيْفَ كَيْفَ الْبَيْنَةَ وَالْبَيْنَةَ [٦٤٦], transmitted by Ktb from Tayyi (M, A), which are anomalous: (c) ُتَأْبَوْتُ لَأْبَوْتُ for chest (IY, A), which also is anomalous; "but," says IJ, "is read" [in إِنَّ آيَةً مُّلْكِيَ ۖ أَنْ يَلْيَمُّمَ أَلْتَابِوْتُ II. ٢٤٩. Verily the sign of his kingship is that the ark should come to you, where Ubayy and Zaid Ibn Thabit read ِتَأْبَوْتُ with the s (K), meaning "among the anomalous [readings]" (A): (a) [many hold that] ُتَأْبَوْتُ [with the s (Jh, K, IY)] is [a dial. var. (IY),] the dial. of the Anṣār (Jh, K, IY, KF); and ُتَأْبَوْتُ the dial. of Kuraish: KIM says that [the dials. of (Jh)] the Anṣār and Kuraish do not differ about anything in the Kur except ُتَأْبَوْتُ (Jh, IY): (b) the measure of ُتَأْبَوْتُ is ُتَأْبَوْتُ (K, IY, B), like ُرَحْمَتُ (K, IY, B), from returning, because [it is a receptacle wherein things are placed, and deposited; so that (K)] what is taken out of it does not cease to return to it (K, B), and its owner returns to it for such of his deposits as he needs (K): not ُقَاعُولَ (K, B), because such formations as سَلِسَ ُقَلِقَ [above] are rare; and because ُتَأْبَوْتُ is an unrecognized crude-form, for which the recognized [crude-form تَوَبُّ] may not be abandoned
(K): (c) it is like ١٠٠٠ devil (IY), which is ١٠٠٠ from ١٠٠٠ I exceeded in wickedness (KF); formed by transposition, because it is from ١٠٠٠ (Jh); [orig.] ١٠٠٠ from ١٠٠٠, its ١٠٠٠ and ١٠٠٠ being transposed (B): (d) its o. f. is ١٠, the [first], of which they convert into ١٠٠ (IY): (e) as for those who read [١٠٠٠] with the ١ (K, B), it is ١٠٠, according to them, except among those who make its ١ a subst. for the ١٠٠ (K); [and] perhaps they [may all] substitute the ١ for the ١٠٠ (B), because these two letters participate in surdity [١٠٠٠] and augmentativeness [١٠٠], for which reason the ١ is substituted for the ١ of feminization [above] (K, B): (d) ١٠٠ said by some, who pause upon ١٠٠ AlLūt with the ١ (IY): (e) ١٠٠٠ ١٠٠, which some one was heard to say, meaning ١٠٠٠ ١٠٠ (١٠٠٠), which is said in the Msb to mean (Sn): (c) ١٠٠ praised him, i. q. ١٠٠: (a) some distinguish between ١٠٠ with the ١ and ١٠٠ with the ١, holding ١٠٠ to be [praise] in absence, and ١٠٠ to be [praise] to one's face; but the correct [opinion] is that they are synonymous, except that ١٠٠ is the o. f. (A).
§. 691. The  is substituted for [two letters, as before mentioned (A),] (1) the  (S, M, SH, A) in أَصْيَلاَن (A), which [substitution] is [very (S)] rare, as أَصْيَلَل (S, SH), which is [orig. (R) only (S)] (S, R), whence

[682] (M), by An Nābigha adh Dhubyānī (IY, MN), praising AnNu‘man Ibn AlMundhir, I stopped in it a short time at evening, questioning it (about its inmates): it was unable to answer, nor was any one in the abode (MN), said by Khl to be recited with أَصْيَدَلَا (ABk), meaning أَصْيَلاَنًا (IY), an irregular dim. of أَصِيلَ (285, 286) (IY, MN); the [second (Sn)]  being a subst. for the  (ABk, IY, MN, Sn): (a) I asked Khl about your saying أَنْيَكَ أَصْيَلاَنًا I will come to thee for a short time at evening: and he said "It is only أَصْيُلاَن, for [the  of] which they substitute the  and that is verified by the saying of the Arabs" (S): (b) [R says that ] أَصْيُلاَنَ is dim. of أَصْيَلاَنَ: and [that], if أَصِيلَ be pl. of أَصِيلَ, like رَغْفِانَ pl. of رَغْفٍ [246], which is apparently the case, then أَصْيَلَل is anomalous in two respects, the substitution of the  for the  and the formation of a homomorphous dim. from the pl. of multitude [285, 286]; but if أَصِلَ be a sing., like رَمَّانَ.
and ṭeṣbā'ān oblation, notwithstanding that it is not used, then ʿasīlāl is anomalous in one respect, vid. the conversion of the ʾān into ʾā (R): (c) [according to ABk.] whoever fancies that ʿāsīlān is dim. of [ʿāsīlān], the pl. of ʿāsīlāl, makes a mistake, because it is a pl. of multitude, which does not form a dim. [285] (ABk); and [IY holds that] ʿāsīlān is only a sing. n., peculiar to the dim., like ʿusyīsya (KF) and ʿīnaʿīn [234, 236] and such ns., which are not used except in the dim. (IY): (d) the poet puts the dim. to indicate the shortness of the time (MN): (e) Akh says that, if you used ʿāsīlāl as a name, it would be declined as a diptote, because the ʾān is quasi-retained, being indicated by the retention of the ʾān in the dim., as in ʿāsīlān [274]; and similarly ʿārāqī [690], when you use it as a name, is diptote, because the Hamza is virtually retained (R): 

(2) ʿāsīlā (M, SH, A) in ʿāsīlā (A), as ʿāṣṣṭāqū (SH), whence


[647, 682] (M, R), meaning [692, 756], the in which is changed into ʾā: (a) there is a version ʾāṣṣṭāqū (IY, MN), according to the o. f. (IY); and ʾāṣṣṭāqū (IY, MN), where a ʾā is substituted for the.
and then incorporated into the ُل, because of their connection in vocality and covering [734] (IY); and ُضَحَّجٌ also: so IJ mentions (MN).

§ 692. The ُل is substituted for [two letters (A),] (1) the ُل (M, SH, A), (a) regularly (IY), necessarily (SH), in ُقَمَتْاَلٌ after the letters of covering (A), [i.e.,] when the ُل of ُقَمَتْاَلٌ is one of the [elevated (R)] letters of covering, which are [four (IY),] the ُض, the ُم, the ُط, and the ُل [734] (IY, R), as in َضُكِبَرْ ُقَمَتْاَلٌ had patience [671, 682, 756] (M, SH), َضُكِبَرَ ُقَمَتْاَلَ collided, ُقَمَتْاَلَ was regular, and ُقَمَتْاَلَ put up with wrong (IY), as [will be] mentioned [756] (A): (a) that [substitution] is because the ُل is surd [732], with no covering in it; whereas these letters are vocal, covered: so that they choose an elevated letter [632, 734], having the same outlet as the ُل, vid. the ُل; and put it in place of the ُل, because it is akin to the ُل in outlet, and to the ُم, the ُض, and the ُط in covering [682] (R): (b) anomalously (IY, SH), in [the attached nom. pron. of] every [pret.] v. of the 1st or 2nd pers., whose ُل is one of the letters of covering (MASH), as in ُضَحَّ ُل I waded, ُضَحَّ ُل I surrounded, and ُضَحَّ ُل I kept (MASH): (a) this is the dial. of the Banû Tamîm (R, MASH), and is not frequent—I mean making the pron. a ُل
when the ٰ of the word is a ص or ض، and similarly after the ط and ط، as in جَغْضَطَ عَينَةٌ I sealed its eye [above] (R), and ٰقَذْطَ ٰرِجْلٍ I scraped a hollow with my foot [693] (M, R), and ٰأَحْطَ ٰفَحْضُطٍ [above] (R): (b) if the ٰ of the ٰ. be a ط، it is incorporated [into the ط of the pron.] (MASH): (c) that [substitution] is (R, MASH) rare (R), [and] anomalous, because it is a complete alteration of a word, destructive of its o. f.: and therefore this dialectic variation is not commonly known among chaste speakers (MASH), because the ٰ of the pron., being a complete word, is not to be altered; while it is also an independent word, upon which analogy requires that the letter of covering should not take effect: but those who convert it do so because, being ٰنِبلٰ, [and] like part of the preceding word, as is proved by the fact that the letter before it is made quiescent [20, 403, 607], it is like the ٰ of جَغْضَطَ [above] (R): (2) the ٰ: Ya’kūb transmits from As ٰمُقَطَ اَلْحَرَقَ He prolonged the letter, for ٰمُقَطَ، and إِبْعَاطَ removing to a distance for إِبْعَاطَ (A).

§ 693. The ٰ is substituted for [three letters (A):] (1) the ٰ (M, SH, A), (a) in جَغْضَطَ after the ٰ، the ٰ، the ٰ، and the ٰ، as [will be] mentioned [756] (A), (a) regularly (IV), necessarily (SH), in [such as (SH)]
checked (M, SH) and was adorned; and remembered, when subjected to incorporation, according to what I.Al transmits (M) from the Arabs (IY); and [below] (SH): (α) when the ف of the v. (R) is [one of three letters (R),] a ز, or a ﴾ (R),] the ﴿ is converted into ﴿ (IY, R), as ﴿ and [above], orig. and ﴿ (IY): and the ﴿ and ﴿ are incorporated into it, as incurred a debt and [above]; but it is allowable for the ﴿ not to be incorporated, as [above]: (β) the three letters being vocal, and the ﴿ surd [784], the ﴿ is converted into ﴿, because the ﴿, being akin to the ﴿ and ﴿, in vocality, and to the ﴿ in outlet [782], is intermediate between the ﴿ and them; while the ﴿, but not the ﴿, is incorporated into the ﴿ because the outlet of the ﴿ is near to, and the outlet of the ﴿ far from, the outlet of the ﴿: (γ) the incorporative conversion, however, is [properly] not part of what we are concerned with, as we mentioned at the beginning of this chapter [682] (R); and, as for [above] or [671, 682], and sifted, winnowed, those are not instances of what we are considering, but only of incorporative substitution (IY): (δ) conversion of the ﴿ into ﴿ after the ﴿ is necessary; and, after the conversion, incorporation is more frequent than omission thereof; while, if you incorporate, you convert either
the first into the second, or the converse, as will be explained in the chapter on Incorporation [756] (R):

(b) anomalously (SH), in they gathered together and cut [below] (M, SH), in some dialects. (M):

(α) conversion of the of into after the is anomalous, because, though the is vocal, and the surd [734], still the is nearer than the and to the , since the articulation of the is easy after the , and difficult after the and (R): (β) they say for [above] (IY):

the poet [Mudarris Ibn Rib‘i al-Asadi (MN, Jsh), according to IBr (MN),] says

(М, R) Then I said to my companion "Do not thou detain us from roasting the flesh with pulling out [the tree by (MN)] its roots, but cut some wormwood," a well-known plant (MN, Jsh), where is in the shape of the du. by poetic license, the sing. being meant by it (Jsh); for [Jh says that (MN)] sometimes the Arabs address the sing. with the form of the du., as says the [other (Jh)] poet [Suwaid Ibn Kurā‘ al-Ukhši (MN, Is), addressing 'Uthmān Ibn 'Affān (Is)].
Then, if thou chide me, O Ibn Affûn, I will forbear; and, if thou let me alone, I will defend an inviolate honor (Jh, MN): (γ) that [conversion] is not regular, but confined to hearsay; so that اَحْقَرْ (IY, R) for إِحْقَرُ (IY, MAR), nor إِحْقِرْ (IY, MAR) for إِحْقَرُ (IY, R) for earned (IY, MAR): (b) anomalously (SH), in (a) [such as (SH)] (α) I succeeded, prospered (M, SH), like فُرَّ (SH) [692] (R), the o. f. being from قَوْرُ (331), where they substitute ٰ for the ض because of the influence of the ض (IY); (β) جُدُّ I was liberal for جَدُّ, where its conversion after the ؤ is likewise anomalous (R): (b) دَّلَّ (M, SH), for تَّلَّلَّ [689] (IY, Jrb), from رُلِّي (R, Jrb), the [first], being converted into ض, and the ض then converted into ؤ (R), as though, seeing the ض to be surd, and the ض vocal [734], they substituted the ؤ for the ض, because it is the sister of the ض in outlet [732], and of the ض in vocality; so that homogeneity of sound is attained (IY): (α) that [theory] is [advanced] because تَّلَّلَّ (R): (β) this [substitution] is rare, anomalous, in usage, though good in analogy; and, from the rarity of its usage, is not to be copied (IY): (γ) the conversion of the ض into د in إِجْدَمَعُ إِزْدَجَرْ [above] is from affinity of sound, as in سُوثُق [695] (R) for سُوثُق meal,
gruel (MAR); contrary toُدِرْجُ (R): (2) they say مَرَطَى مَرَّدَى for [248, 272], which is where the hair is plucked out round the navel (A); but, in the KF, a kind of running: while مَرِيْطَا is what is between the navel, or the breast, and the pubes, with a string of other meanings; and moreover what encloses the tuft of hair on the lower lip on both its sides, like مَرِيْطَارِنَّ with Kasr; and the arm-pit: and مَرَطَى, with abbreviation, is the uvula (Sn): (3) the ُدِكْرُ in ُدِكْرُ pl. of ذَكْرَة remembrance (A), like عَبْرُ pl. of عَبْرَة admonition, as SBd says: (a) the author of the KF transmits from Lth that the ُدِكْرُ is changed into ُدِكْرُ for [ذَكْرُ] pl. of ذَكْرَة when synarthrous; but that, when anarthrous, ُدِكْرُ with the ُدِكْرُ is said (Sn).

§. 694. The ُدِكْرُ is substituted for the ُدِكْرُ (S, M, SH, A), as before mentioned [643, 682] (A), when (1) double, (a) in pause (S, M, SH), as ُدِكْرُ [643] (SH), for ُدِكْرُ [311], a rel. n. (MASH): (a) the ُدِكْرُ is substituted for the ُدِكْرُ and nothing else (IY), because they are partners in vocality [734] (IY, R, Jrb) and outlet [732] (IY, Jrb), except that the ُدِكْرُ is hard (IY, R), and, but for its hardness, would be a ُدِكْرُ [643] (IY); while the ُدِكْرُ, when doubled, becomes [extremely near to (R)] a ُدِكْرُ (IY, R): Ya'qūb says "Some of the Arabs,
when they double the ى, make it become ا, as *كان* [below], meaning *الابْنِيْلِ[682]* (IY); while both are from the middle of the tongue [732] (R, Jrb): but the ى is plainer [below] in pause, where plainness is desirable since the letter paused upon becomes faint, for which reason ى and ى with the َ are said [643, 685, 686] (R): (b) this substitution is *orig. [employed]* in pause upon the ى, because of its faintness and resemblance to the vowel (IY), as and عَمْلُ جَعْلَى 'Ali and عَمْلُ جَعْلَى 'Ausi (S): IAl says "I said to a man of the Banu Hanifa 'Of whom art thou?', and he said فُقَيْيِّيَّ", [i.e., فُقَيْيِّيَّ *Fukaimi (IY);] then I said 'Of which of them?', and he said مَرْجُ 'Murri (IY), which is anomalous (SH): (b) not in pause (R), [but] in continuity when treated like pause [647] (M, R on Pause), according to the GG (R on Pause), as in [the saying of the Rājīz (IY), an Arab of the desert (MN).]

[643, 682] (M, SH), told to me by one that heard them say it (S on Pause), [and] cited by As, who said

149a
that it had been recited to him by KhA, who said that it had been recited to him by an inhabitant of the desert (IY), My maternal uncle is 'Uwaif and Abū 'Alī, who provide meat for food at evening, and at morning portions of the kind of date called [294], torn off with the tent-peg and with the horn of the ox (MN), meaning [above] and (IY, MN) (S, IY, MN) and (S, MN) and (IY, MN), which is more anomalous (SH); and the saying [of Abu-nNajm (MAR)]

[above] (M, R), cited by IAr (Jh, M), As though in their, i. e., the camels', uplifted tails, from the dry dung and urine of summer, were the horns of the mountain-goat; (MAR), meaning (Jh, MAR): (2) single (R), not double, (a) [in pause, but less often than when double (R),] as in [the saying (M) of the other (IY), an inhabitant of AlYaman (MN, Jsh),]

لاَهْمٌ إِنَّكَ تَقِلتُ حَكِيَّتَيْنِ فَلَا يَرَأَلُ شَاهِيْجٌ يَا ثَبُّبَاءَيْنِ

[682] (M, SH), cited by (IY, R on Pause). Fr (IY) [and] AZ (R on Pause), O God, if Thou hast accepted my pilgrimage, then a mule, white, braying, that jogs my hair extending to the lobe of the ear, shall not cease to bring me to Thee (MN, Jsh), i. e., حَكِيَّتَيْنِ and and
(Jrb, MN, Jsh), which is [still] more anomalous (SH), because the ج is more akin to the double ي, as we have said (R): (a) some of Tamim substitute the ج for the ي in pause, whether the ي be double or single, because of the ج's proximity to the ي in outlet [732], together with its being plainer [above] than the ي (R on Pause): (b) that also is to make the ي plain in pause (R on Substitution): and (b) [not in pause (R),] as in

حَتَّى إِذَاٰ أَمْسَكَتْ رَأَمْسَكَاجا

(M, SH) Until, whenever she entered, and he entered, أَمْسَكَتْ أَمْسَكَتْ (R), orig. أَمْسَكَتْ (IY, Jrb, Jsh) and [أَمْسَكَتْ, which, with the letter of unbinding, becomes] أَمْسَكَاتِ (Jrb, Jsh): (a) since the ي is converted into ج, it is not converted into ل [684, 719], nor elided because of the two quiescents [607, 663], like the ي in أَمْسَكَتْ and أَمْسَكَتْ respectively (R): [or] the ل [of أَمْسَكَتْ] is restored to its o. f., vid. the ي, which is afterwards converted into ج (Jsh): (b) [in either case] the ج is a subst. for the ي (IY, Jrb), and is then mobilized with the vowel that the ي had in the o. f. (Jrb): (c) this [substitution] is more anomalous [again] (SH), because the general rule is that the ج should be substituted in pause, to make the ي plain, whereas the ي in the like of أَمْسَكَتْ [and أَمْسَكَاجا] is not paused upon (R); [and] because they treat the supplied
"[in أَمَسْتُ and أَمَسْتَ] like the expressed (Jrb). The ٰج is sometimes said to be a subst. for the ٰج of أَمَسْي; for, although the ٰج is not [ordinarily] substituted for the ٰج, that is permissible [here (IX)], because the ٰج is substituted for the ٰج [684, 719] (IX, Jrb). This [substitution of ٰج for ٰج (Sn)] is named the عَجْعَجَة of كُعَذَء (A), who transmuted ٰج into ٰج [when it occurs] with ع [immediately before it], saying هِذَا رَأَعُ خَرْج مَعَج This is a herdsman that has come out with me, i. e., رَأَع خَرْج مَعَج (Jh).

§. 695. The ٰس is [allowably (M, SH)] substituted for the ٰس (M, SH, A) before (1) a غ (M, SH, Sn), as وُأَسْبَغ عَلَيْكُمْ نُعْمَة XXXI. 19. And hath fully bestowed
His benefits upon you (M, SH), orig. وُأَسْبَغ (Jrb), read with the ٰس and ٰس (K); and ٰسُلَّغ (M), for سُلَّغ (K) shedding the tooth that is behind the ٰسَدْس , which takes place in the sixth year (Jrb) : (2) a غ (M, SH, Sn), as ٰسُلَّغ stripped off (M, SH), for سُلَّغ (K, Jrb); and ٰصَحَر subjected (M), ٰصَحَر being i. q. ٰصَحَر (KF) : (3) a ق (M, SH, Sn), as مَسْ صَر LIV. 48. The touch, or feel, of Hell (M, SH), for سَقَر (K on XXXI. 19., Jrb), a proper name of Hell [18], from سَقَرْنَةٌ النَّارُ The fire scorched him or سَقَرْنَةٌ ُلْوَحْتَهِ (K on LIV. 48., B);
VIII. 6. [516] and I drove; I outstripped; [693]; and [below] (M): (4) a ط (M, SH, Sn), as [682] (M, SH, A), orig. سِرَاطُ (Jrb); صاطع radiating; and مُسيطَرُ (M), for مَسيطَرٌ, from exercised absolute authority over us, whence LXXXVIII. 22. [1] (Jh), transmitted from Ks: with the س, according to the o. f. (B): (a) it is said to be pronounced مُسيطَرٌ with Fath of the ط in the dial. of Tamîm, on the ground that set in absolute authority is trans., according to them, as is indicated by their saying exercised absolute authority (K). These [four] letters are vocal, elevated [734]; while (IY, It) the س is [a (Jrb)] surd, depressed [letter (Jrb)]: so that, [when it occurs before these elevated letters (Jrb),] they dislike the transition (IY, R, Jrb) from it (IY, R) to these letters (R), [i. e.,] from the depressed (Jrb) to the elevated (IY, Jrb), because that is heavy (IY, R); and therefore they substitute a ص for the س (IY, R, Jrb), allowably (Jrb), whether these letters be second, third, or fourth, as مُعَفَّة for صَعْبٌ hunger, مُعَفَّة for حَمْل clamour, مُعَفَّة for ٍمُعَفَّة [253] for صَبْعٍ, and صِلَاطٍ and سِرَاطٍ [above] and بَصْطٍ spreading (Sn), because the ص agrees with the س in surdity and sibilance, and with these letters in elevation; so that the sound
becomes consonant, and is not dissonant (IY, Jrb). And this process is similar to Imāla [626] in making one part of the sound approximate to another (IY, R), without being considered necessary (IY). If, however, the س be posterior to these letters, that substitution [which is permissible when it precedes (IY, R)] is not permissible in it, because, when it is posterior, the speaker is making the voice descend from a high [to a low letter]; and that is not heavy, like ascent from a low [to a high letter]: so that you do not say قِسْت for I measured (IY, R, Jrb), nor يُخْصِرْ for He loses the commodity (IY), nor بَخْصٌ for deficient, inadequate. But there is no difference between the س's being adherent to these letters, and its being separated from them (Jrb): [so that] the conversion is allowable with these letters, whether they be conjoined with the س, as in سَقَرُ [above]; or separated [from it] by one letter, as in سَلَحَ [above]; or two, as in سَلَقَ [for level plain (MAR)]; and سَرَضَ [above]; or three, as in سَلَقَ (R) for سَلَقُ (MAR). This conversion is regular, but not necessary. And, in such [positions], the س may not be converted into a pure ز, except in what has been heard, as زَرَاطُ [682], which is [allowable] because the ز resembles the
But the س is changed into ز with the ق exclusively in the dial. of Kalb [696], who say مَسّ زَقْر LIV. 48. [above] (M).

§. 696. The [pure (M on §§. 695, 696)] ز is substituted for [two letters (A),] the س and ص, [allowably (Jrb on the س, M on the ص),] in the dial. of chaste speakers among the Arabs (M on the ص),] when [these two letters occur (M, SH)] quiescent before a د, as in يَرْدَل (1) (M, SH, A), for [ثُوْب (M, Jrb, A) loosens (IY, Sn) his garment (IY); and يَرْدَر for يَسْرُدِر (A) (آلبيبر) (M, A) The camel (A) becomes dazed (IY, A) from the intensity of the heat (A): (a) سَدَل with the ل is of the conjugs. of ضَرُب, and سِدُر with the ر is of the conjug. of فَرَج: so in the KF (Sn): (b) the cause of this [substitution] is that (IY, Jrb), the س being a surd, and the د a vocal [734], letter, they dislike the transition from one letter to another incompatible with it (IY, R, Jrb); and especially when the first is quiescent, because the vowel is after the letter [below], being part of a soft letter intervening between the two letters [697] (R); while incorporation is not possible (IY): and therefore they approximate (IY, R, Jrb) one of them to the other (IY, Jrb), [vid.] the س to the د (R), by substituting a ز for the س, because the ز is from the same outlet as the س [732] and is like it in sibilance,
while it agrees with the MatrixMode in vocality; so that the two sounds become consonant (IY, R, Jrb): (e) S says that simulation, i.e. (M), imbuing [the س (IY, R)] with the sound of the MatrixMode , is not allowable (M, R) here (R), as it is in the ص (IY, R), as ـمـُـصـَكـر is issue, way out [733] (R), because in the ص there is covering [734], so that they simulate in order that the covering may not be taken away [by the conversion (R)]; whereas the س is not like that (IY, R): (2) ـيـُـصـُدـُنـى ـبـَرـَّـرى (Sn) [with a ق course (A)] ـلـِـمـ ـيـُـبـَخـُـرـُـمـ (A) [ـمـَـيـِـلَـدَـ]] ـأـَـلـِـدَـ]] ـمـِـنـ فـَرـَّـةـ لـُهُ He has not been refused [help (A)], for whom a camel has been bled (M, A), a [proverbial (IY)] saying (IY, A) in their language (A), applied to him that intends a matter, and obtains part of it (IY), [and] to contentment with a little (Md), meaning ـفـُـصـَكـَر , the ص being made quiescent (IY, A), for alleviation, as in for ضَرِب ـ ضَرَب was struck, and for قَبِل ـ قَبِل for accepted [368, 402] (IY), and [afterwards (IY)] changed into ز (IY, A); the saying of حَشَّتَب [below] (M, R) ـتـثـَأـَث (R) ـهَـبـكـذَا ـقـَرْـدِي أـَنْـهَة Thrus is etc. [648] (M, SH); and ـمـُـرْـدَر ـمُـرْـدَر for أَـصَـرَّـت ـأَـصَـرَّـت I issued [trans. ] (IY): the poet says

وداعاً دا الهوى قبل اللفلى ترك ذي الهوى
مثينين الفوى خي من الصبر مدرزاً
And let the object of thy love alone before hating (him): the leaving of the object of love, while unimpaired in its forces, is better as an issue, or a way out, than rupture (M). The م, when occurring quiescent before the د, may be pronounced [in three ways (IY, Jrb)], (1) as a pure ز [above] (IY, R, Jrb), as in هُدَيَةً فَرَنَّى أَنْتَهَ [648], said by Ḥātim [above] when he had slaughtered a she-camel [for a guest (IY)], and it was said to him "Wherefore didst thou not bleed her?" (IY, Jrb): (a) that [change (IY, R) of the م into a pure ز (IY)] is because the م is covered, surd, lax [734]; and [without any intervening vowel or other barrier (R)] is in the vicinity of the د, which is open, vocal, rigid (IY, R, Jrb); so that, from this incompatibility between their sounds, the د recoils somewhat from the م; and therefore the Arabs approximate one to the other (IY, Jrb): but [incorporation is not possible; while (IY)] they do not [venture to (IY)] change the د, like the ت in إِنْتَعَلَ, as in إِضْطَرَ [692], because it is not aug., like the ت [671] (IY, R, Jrb), which is therefore more fit for alteration: so that they alter the first [of the two incompatible letters; vid. the م], because of its weakness, in consequence of the quiescence, by approximating it to the د (R); and therefore they change the م into a pure ز, whereupon the sounds become consonant, because the ز is from the same outlet as the م [732], and is like it in
sibilance, while it is akin to the ۰ in vocality (IY, R, Jrb), and openness [734] (R); so that the ۰ and ۰ coalesce (IY, Jrb), and that recoil ceases: S says "We have heard the chaste-speaking Arabs make it a pure ۰" (IY): (2) as a ۰ simulating, i.e., imbued with [somewhat of (IY, Jrb)], the sound of the ۰ (IY, R, Jrb); so that it becomes betwixt and between, i.e., becomes a letter whose outlet is between the outlets of the ۰ and ۰ (IY, Jrb); inclining towards the ۰, but not changed into a [pure (R)] ۰, [as in the preceding way (IY),] for preservation of the [excellence of (R)] covering (IY, R), in order that the sound of the ۰ may not be altogether gone, and so the covering in it be gone (IY, Jrb), the covering in the ۰ being an excellence, the removal of which would be a mutilation of this letter: whereas the ۰ in ۰ یس۰د یس۰د۰ل [above] is not like that, because in it there is no covering to be taken away by conversion; for which reason simulation is not allowable (IY), as we mentioned (R): (a) this is indicated by the saying of [Z and] IH (Jrb) "But the ۰ is sometimes simulated by the ۰" (M, SH), meaning that the ۰ is made to simulate the ۰, vid. through the ۰ 's being inclined towards the ۰ (R); "not by it" [below] (SH), i.e., by the ۰, which is not made to smack of the sound of the ۰, but is converted into a pure ۰ (R), this simulation not being allowable in the ۰, (a) because the ۰ and ۰
are from one outlet, and both are sibilant letters; so that, with such closeness of proximity, intermixture [of sound] is difficult; contrary to the " which the covering makes it possible to imbue with the sound of the \( j \); whereas there is no covering in the \( s \) (Jrb): (b) because [of what we have mentioned, vid. that (R)] there is no covering in it (R, Jrb) to be preserved (R), which would be taken away by conversion: (c) thus \( j \) is said, with the " made to smack of the \( j \); but not \( s \) \( s \) \( s \), with the " made to smack of the \( j \): (b) the pron. in IH's saying "not by it" [above] relates to the " but some commentators fancy that it relates to the \( j \), the sense being that the \( j \) is simulated by the quiescent " but not the " by the \( j \); which is a mistake, the sense being what we have mentioned, as is proved by what IH mentions in the CM, and another [authority] in the CHd (Jrb): (c) if the " [before the \( d \) (R)] be mobile, (a) it is not changed (M, R, Jrb) into a [pure (R)] \( j \) (R, Jrb), (c) because a barrier, vid. the vowel, occurs between the " and \( d \) (IY, R, Jrb), since the place of the vowel, in respect of the consonant, is [said to be (Jrb)] after it [667, 697] (IY, Jrb): (b) because this substitution here belongs to the class of incorporation, since it contains an approximation of one sound to another, for which reason they mention it with incorporation
[733]; and therefore, as the vowel prevents incorporation [731], so here [it prevents substitution] (IY): (γ) because the consonant is strengthened by the vowel (IY, R, Jrb), so that it is not converted (IY, R), since the consonant is not converted, except after its being weakened by quiescence (IY): (b) nothing, therefore, remains [as an alternative to sounding the 成功举办], except simulation because of [the 成功举办's vicinity [to the 成功举办 in outlet] (R); [and accordingly they sometimes make it simulate the 成功举办 (M), [so that] the 成功举办 is simulated by it even when mobile (SH), simulation being allowable because [it is the weaker of the two ways, since (IY)] it involves some regard for the 成功举办 (IY, Jrb), and therefore does not act like incorporation (IY), as 成功举办 issued, emanated,成功举办 and 成功举办 spoke truth (M, SH), where that simulation is regular, constant, [because nothing but the vowel of the成功举办 intervenes between the成功举办 and成功举办] (IY): (α) [such] intermixture [of sound] is rarer in the mobile than in the quiescent [成功举办], since the mobile is made to accord, in this respect, with the quiescent, which is altered only because of its weakness by reason of quiescence (R): (β) conversion into 成功举办 is not allowable, except in what has been heard from the Arabs (IY): (γ) if the成功举办 and成功举办 be separated by more than one vowel, [as by one or two consonants (R),] simulation is not constant, but is
confined to what has been heard from the Arabs (IY, R),
like issuing, emanating (R), and صادر (M, R), because the ط is like the د (IY, R): (d) such as مس زقر LIV. 48. [695] is Kalbri (SH), which means that, if the س be mobile, it is not changed into ج except in the dial. of Kalb (Jrb); [for] the clan of Kalb convert the س occurring before the ق into ج, as others convert it into م [695], because, since the س and ق are incongruous, the س being surd, and the ق vocal [734], they change the س into ج, which is akin to the س in outlet [732] and sibilance [734], and to the ق in vocality (R): (e) like the م in simulation are the ج and چ.

He is more worthy and أشذنق wide in the corner of the mouth (M), for أشذنق and أشذنق (IY) : (a) the ش [quiescent before the د (R)] is made to simulate the ج (IY, R), because, though the ش is not from the same outlet as the ج, still [the outlet of] the ج is extended until it merges in the highest part [of the outlet] of the ش, which is therefore from approximately the same outlet as the ج [732]; while in surdity and laxity it is likely the م [734], so that the ج may be simulated by it, as by the م, because it is from a position near the ج, and similarly the چ, which they approximate to the ج, because it is from the same outlet as the ش [732] (IY):
(1388)

and with simulation [of the sound of the
by the ج and ش occurring before the د (R)] are rare
(SH): but this is contrary to what is stated by S, who
says, about imbuing the like of this ش with the sound
of the ج, that sounding plain is more frequent and
recognized; while this is [good] Arabic, [and] frequent
(R): (c) [Jrb takes “with simulation” to mean] with
simulation of the ش by the ج, and of the ج by the ش,
there being no real difference between them, since the
pronunciation [of the ج and ش] in أَجَّدَرُ and أَشَدَّرُ [733], when simulation is employed in them, is one
(Jrb): (d) the ش and ج may not be made a pure ج, like
the ص and س above, because they are not from the outlet
of the two latter, [which have the same outlet as the ج]
(R): (f) the sum of the matter is that this substitution
and approximation are [found in letters] of three kinds,
(a) a letter wherein substitution and simulation are
allowable, vid. where two causes are combined, as in the
ص, which they (α) make to simulate the ج, but do not
change into [pure] ج, in order to preserve the covering;
(β) change into [pure] ج, from the strength of the affi-
nity between the ص and ج, the former being from the
same outlet as the latter [732], and like it in sibilance
[734]: (b) a letter wherein only substitution is allowable,
vid. the س, because there is no covering in it to be preserved [by simulation]: (c) a letter wherein only simulation is allowable, vid. the ش, which they do not change into ژ, because of the distance between it and the outlet of the ژ; and similarly the چ (IY): (3) as a pure ص, which is the o. f. (IY, Jrb); and, says S, is the most frequent (IY): (a) this is indicated by the saying of [Z and] IH (Jrb) “S says that simulation is more frequent and racy than substitution” (M), meaning “with the quiescent ص” (IY): “while sounding plain [below] is more frequent” (M, SH) “than both” (SH), i.e., than simulation and substitution (R, Jrb); or [in some MSS (MAR)] “in both”, i.e., in the quiescent س, and the quiescent or mobile ص, occurring before the ژ (R): (b) by “sounding plain” he means (R, Jrb) pronouncing the ص or س pure, without conversion or inter-mixture of sound (R), [i.e.,] leaving it in its first state (Jrb): (c) in the quiescent ص before the ژ, sounding plain is most frequent, then simulation, and then conversion into ژ (R): (d) in the quiescent س also, sounding plain, as یسَدَنْ (Jrb), is more frequent than substitution, as یسَدَنْ (Jrb). This is the end of what is mentioned by [Z, IH, and] IM in the chapter on Substitution (A).

§ 696A. Substitution occurs in other letters also; but is not common. And I have thought fit to supplement what has been previously mentioned by an exhaustive,
but concise, discourse upon the substitution of all the letters, arranging them according to their order in outlets [732]:—(1) the Hamza [683]: (2) the l [684]: (3) the s [690]: (4) the ج is substituted for two letters, (a) the ج, as ضَبَّحَ الصَّرْفُ for ضَبَّحَ الرُّفْرُ A: (a) one says ضَبَّحَ الرُّفْرُ The horse snorted, like جْ مَنَعْ, i. e., uttered a sound not a neigh, nor a whinny (Sn): (b) the Hamza, as عَنْ زَيدًا [527, 580, 682], i. q. عَنْ عَنْعَةَ أَنَّ, which is the عَنْعَةَ of Tamīm: (5) the ج is substituted for two letters, (a) the ج, as جَطَّرَ بِيِّدْهُ [682], aor. جَطَّرَ, جَطَّرَ [682], aor. جَطَّرَ, transmitted by IJ: (b) the ج, in لَعَنْ لَعَنَّ (A), a dial. var. of لَعَنْ لَعَنَّ [537, 688] (Sn): AlFarazdaq says تُقَيَّمُ يَا صَادِقِي بِنَا لَعَنَّا * نَرَى الْعَرْصَاءِ أَوْ أَثُيرُ الْحَيَاةِ [688] Tarry, O my two companions, with us: may-be we shall see the courts, or the trace of the booths (Jh): (6) the ج is substituted for the ج, as رَبَّعَ for جَرَّبَ [682]; which is rare: (7) the ج is substituted for the ج, as أَغْنَ أَحْنَ [682]: (a) reciprocity therefore occurs between them, [i. e., substitution of each of them for the other (Sn)]; but that [reciprocity (Sn)] is extremely rare: (8) the ج is substituted for the ج, as وَلْنَتْنَا for جَلْتَنَا [682]; transmitted by Khl: (9) the ج is substituted for two
letters, (a) the ق, as $\kappa^{\nu}$ for $\kappa^{\mu}$ [682]: (a) reciprocity therefore occurs between them; but substitution of the لل for the ق is more frequent than its converse: (b) the ث, in ج [694]: (10) the گ [129, 169, 682]: (11) the ش is substituted for three letters, (a) the لل denoting the fem., as أَكُرَمْتُكَ I honored thee for أَكُرِمْتُكَ, which is the شکْشَة of Tamım [617, 680, 682]: (b) the ج, in the saying

إذ دَأَكْ إِذْ حَبَلُ الْقُصُّالُ مُدَمِّمٍ

At that time, when the bond of union was strong, i. e., مُدَمِّمٍ: (a) IU says "But no other [ex.] has been preserved; and that is facilitated by the agreement of the جفُّرُشَة in outlet" [732]: (c) the س, as جفُّرُشَة for جَفُّرُشَة, which is despicable, mean; and forms its pl. جَفَّارُشَة (Jh) with س, not ش, by which the substitution is known [682]: (12) the ح [685]: (13) the ض is substituted for the لل, in رَجُل حَصَد, i. e., جَدَد [682] (A): (a) some MSS have "the ض is substituted for two letters, the س in سِرَاط for سِرَاط, and the لل in رَجُل حَصَد, i. e., جَدَد"; and, according to this version, A's saying below "the ض is substituted for the س, as سِرَاط" [695] is a repetition: but other MSS have "the ض", i. e., the dotted, "is substituted for the لل, etc." [above]; and,
according to this version, there is no repetition: [and moreover the prescribed "order in outlets" necessitates the placing of the ص here, and the ص below, because in order of outlets the ص is the 13th letter, and the ص the 20th:] (b) the two versions are opposed in رجل جمض, which the first requires to be with the undotted ص, and the second with the dotted ص: therefore examine it carefully; for I have not found in the books on lexicology, after consulting [them], anything about the two expressions (Sn): but Sn's saying "I have not found etc." requires consideration, because the author of the KF writes [i. q, جُلْدُ جُمس], where they change the ل into ص (KF), distinguishing it with the red color indicating that it is one of his additions to the Şahâh; while his Glossator objects that it is found in the Şahâh, i.e., where Jh says, in the crude-form جلد, "And sometimes they say رجل جمض, making the ل, with the ج, a ص, when it is quiescent"; and I have seen that the author of the Mr, in the 22nd chapter, on [the Recognition of (Mr)] substitution, transcribes from the DAd [by Frb (HKh)] the like of what is in the Şahâh: and God is the guide! (Note by Naṣr al-Hûrînî on the margin of the Sn): (14) the ل [691]: (15) the ر, is substituted for the ل in i. q. نَحْلًا [682], and i. q. رَعَلَ [537]: (16) the م [688]: (17) the ط [692]: (18) the د [693]: (19) the ت [689]: (20) the ص [695]: (21) the ز
[696] (A): (22) the س [below] is substituted, [say they (R),] for [three letters (A),] (a) the ث in إستَفَضَتْ إِنَّهُ [671, 682, 759] (R, A), according to one of the two accounts [759] (A), its o. f. being تَحْفَدْ (R, A), from تَحْفَدْ [702] (R), i. q. أَحْلَدْ (MAR): (a) its o. f. is also said to be تَحْفَدْ [759]; but in that case it contains no proof [of substitution of the س]: (b) it is the like of إستَفَضَتْ that Z lays hold of [as evidence that the س is a letter of substitution]; not إِسْتَفَضَتْ, as IH says [682] (R): (b) the ش, in مَشْدُود [337] [Rجَلْ], a man (R)] bound fast for مَشْدُود (R, A), and for شِدَة [337], where the ش is original, because it is more often employed (R): (a) the ل, in إستَفَضَتْ, which [substitution of the س for the ل (Sn)] is extremely anomalous: (23) the ُه [below]: (a) I have not seen any instance of its [unincorporative] substitution: (24) the ُه is substituted for two letters, (a) the د, in the reading فَشَرَّدْ بِهِم VII. 59. [682]: (b) the ث, in تُلْعَدُومنَ أَحْلَدْ for meaning The man was slow, or backward, in answering [682] (A): (a) IH does not reckon the س [above] of such as إِسْتَفَضَتْ, nor the ُه and ُه [above] in إِنَّهُ and إِنَّهُ [682], among the letters of substitution, because the substitution in these things is not intended for itself; but, since the س, د, and ُه are
approximate to the ﺡ in outlet [732], they intend incorporation, which is not possible in two approximate letters until they are made alike [735]; so that the ﻣ is converted into ﺖ, ﻥ, and ﺪ respectively; and, since the substitution is for the sake of incorporation, he does not take it into account (R): (25) the ﺡ is substituted for two letters, (a) the ﻣ in مُمْثَرٌ [676]; (b) the ﺖ in جُدةٌ ﻣِنْ ﺲَلَارْ ﻣِثْوَةٌ a brand from the fire: (26) the ﻣ is substituted for two letters, (a) the ﺡ in قَامٌ [540, 682], transmitted by Ya’kūb: (b) ﻓُومٌ, [which is wheat (K, B on II. 58); and is said for bread (B), whence ﻥُمْرَأ لَنَا Make bread for us (K, B), i. e., إِخْبِرُوا (K); and is said to be (K, B)] i. q. ﻓُومٌ garlic (A), which is indicated by the reading of ['Abd Allāh (Jh)] Ibn Mas‘ūd ﻡُدُرِّمًا ﻯِداً ﻯِداً ﻯِداً II. 58. And its garlic, and its lentils, and its onions, being more congruous with the "lentils" and "onions" (K): (b) the ﺖ in ﺖَدُهُ بَلَاغًا Take it in its time, i. e., ﺖِلَاغِيَ (Sn): (27) the ﻣ is substituted for two letters, (a) the ﻣ in ﻣَآ ﻣُسْك [682], meaning ﻣَآ ﻣُسْك: (b) the ﻣ in ﻣُسْكُ meaning ﻣُسْكُ (A), like ﺖُنَفَّذُ male hedge-hog and ﺖُبْرِجٌ [392], the horse that
comes in last in the race; whence زَجْلٌ فُسْكِلْ, like زَجْلٌ, a low man (Sn), for which the vulgar say فُسْكِلْ with Ðamm (Jh): (28) the م [687]: (29) the , [686] (A).
CHAPTER X.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNSOUND.

§. 697. Unsoundness is the liability of the affected [letter or formation] to alteration from its [original] state. The meaning of transformation is alteration [703] (IY). Transformation [in their conventional language (R)] is [peculiar to (R)] alteration of the unsound letter, [i.e., the ٌ, ٤, or ى, by conversion, elision, or quiescence (R),] for alleviation [719] (SH). IH's saying "alteration" comprises transformation, alleviation of the Hamza [658], and substitution [682]: but, when it is restricted by his saying "of the unsound letter", then alleviation of the Hamza and some substitutions, vid. for what is not an unsound letter, as in أصلال [691], are excluded; and, when he says "for alleviation", then such [a substitution] as [in] عالِم [683] for عالِم is excluded. Thus between alleviation of the Hamza and transformation there is a total dissimilarity: but between transformation and substitution there is a community in one respect, since both are found in such as قال [684, 703]; while transformation without substitution is found in يُغَيِّر [below], and substitution without transformation in أصلال [above] (Jrb). Alteration of the Hamza by one
of the three [modes], as in مَرَأَهَ [658], and مَسْلُوْنَ, and is not called "transformation", but "alleviation of the Hamza". Nor is the substitution of letters other than the unsound letters and the Hamza, as in هِيَبَاتٍ [690] and يِبَاتِ [694] for إِبَاتٍ and عَلَى for جُرَّ عَلَى [275]; nor their elision, as in إِبَلٍ for إِبَلِّ [368]. IH's saying "for alleviation" is to exclude the alteration of the unsound letters in the six *ns.*, as أَبْوَكَ [16], أَبِيكَ, and إِبِيكَ; and in the *du.* and *perf. pl. masc.* مَسْلُوبَ، and مَسْلِمُونَ, مُسْلِمَانَ [16, 228] and مُسْلِمَانَ [16, 234]: that being for inflection, not alleviation (R). Transformation includes [three things (Jrb),] conversion, [as قَالَ (Jrb);] quiescence, [as يَقُولُ (Jrb);] and elision (SH), as قُلْتُ [703] (Jrb). The expression "conversion" is peculiar, in their conventional language, to substitution of the unsound letters and the Hamza [278, 682], one in place of another: while, in the case of letters other than the four [just mentioned], the well-known expression is "substitution", which is likewise used in the case of the Hamza also (R). Transformation by elision is of two kinds, regular and anomalous (A). The [regular (A)] elision, [which is what IM addresses himself to mentioning in this section (A),] is of three sorts (Aud, A), [only the second of which properly belongs to this chapter, while that deals only with
elision of the ف:-] (1) what appertains to the aug. letter (Aud, Sn), when the v. is on the measure of أَنفَعَ, in which case the Hamza is elided [347, 428, 661, 699] in the paradigms of its aor. and act. and pass. parts., as مَكْرِمُ, تَكْرِمُ, يَكْرِمُ, أَكْرِمُ; while the saying [of Abū Ḥayyān al-Fākāsī (Tsr)]

قَانَةَ أَحْلَلْ لَنْ يُؤْكُرُ نَا

For verily he is worthy to be honored is anomalous (Aud): (a) this Hamza may not be retained, according to the v. f., except in poetic license, as أَنْفَعَ أَحْلَلْ أَلْحَمَ [above]; or in a word deemed extraordinary, as أَرْضُ مَوْرِنَةَ, with Kasr [or Fath, as in the KF (Sn)], of the ن, i. e., land abounding in hares, and كَسَّاءٌ مَوْرِنَبُ i. e., wrapper whose wool is mixed with fur of hares, according to the saying that the Hamza of أَرْتَبٌ is aug. [672], which is the more obvious [hypothesis]: (b) if the Hamza of أَنفَعَ be changed into س, as أَرَاقٌ [690], or أَرَاقٌ مَّنْهَلٌ, watered the camels for أَنْهلْ, it is not elided, because the motive for elision is lacking: so that you say يَهْرِيقُ [with Fath of the س (Sn)], and [similarly (Sn)] مَهْرِيقٌ and مَهْرِيقٌ, act. part. مَمْنُولَ, pass. part. مَمْنُولةٌ (A): (2) what appertains to the ف (Aud, Sn) of the v. [699] (Aud): (3) what appertains to the ع
(Aud, Sn) or ل, according to different opinions (Sn), of the v. [759] (Aud). "Euphonic elision" [281] is a term well-known, in their conventional language, to denote elision regularly made for a necessitating cause, like the elision of the ل of عَصَّا and the ل of قَامُ [16, 643]; and "curtailing elision", or ["arbitrary elision", i.e.,] "elision for no cause", to denote irregular elision, like the elision of the ل of يَمُنٌ [719], though it also is an elision for alleviation (R). Transfer of the vowel [667] of the unsound [mobile (Aud)] letter to the preceding sound quiescent [706] occurs in four cases, vid. when the unsound letter is the ع of (1) a v. [703]; (2) a n. resembling the aor. in its measure, but not in its augment; or (Aud, Sn) conversely (Sn), in its augment, but not in its measure [712] (Aud): (3) [an inf. n. commensurable with (Aud)] إِفْعَالٍ or إِفْعَالُ (Aud, Sn), as إِفْعَالٌ and إِفْعَالٌ [338, 703] (Aud): (4) [the form (Aud)] مَفْعُولٍ [703, 709, 714] (Aud, Sn). And, in the four cases, after the transfer, you must (1) retain the unsound letter, if it be homogeneous with the vowel transferred [from it (Tsr)], as يَقُول [above] and يَبْيَعُ [703, 704, 721], orig. يَقُول and يَبْيَعُ, like يَقُول and يَبْيَعُ [482]; (2) convert it into a letter akin to that vowel, if it be not homogeneous therewith, as يَكَبَّ (703, 704, 721) and يُكَبَّ [aor. of the past tense (Tsr)], orig. يَكَبَّ and
[Transfer of the vowel is, therefore, subsidiary to quiescence, with or without conversion; and is not an independent mode of transformation.] The letters of transformation are the ی, ی, ی [253, 643, 663] (M, SH), which are so named because of the regular alternations that occur in them (Jrb). These [three (R)] letters are [also] named “unsound letters” [below], because they [often (IY)] alter (IY, R), and do not remain in one state; like the invalid disordered in constitution, and altering from one state to another (R). And, for that reason, some make Hamza [below] one of the unsound letters; but the majority do not reckon it, since, in many cats., that invariable regularity, which obtains in the unsound letter, does not obtain in it (Jrb). The alteration of these [three] letters, however, in quest of lightness, is not because they are extremely heavy, but because they are so extremely light [671] that they do not tolerate the least heaviness: and also because they are frequent in speech, since, if a word be free from any of them, its freedom from their constituents—I mean the vowels [below]—is impossible; while every [letter] frequent [in occurrence] is deemed heavy, even if it be light (R). The vowels [663] are really parts of the unsound letters; to pronounce a consonant with Ġamm, Kasr, or Fath being really to put, immediately after it, part of the ی,
기, or |, respectively. For mobility and quiescence are qualities of corporeal substances, and do not reside in sounds: but when, immediately after a consonant, you put part of a letter of prolongation [663], the consonant is named "mobile", as though you moved it to the outlet [732] of the letter of prolongation; while "quiescence" of the consonant is opposed to that. The vowel, therefore, is after the consonant [667, 696, 719, 731]; but, from the excess of its attachment thereto, is fancied to be with, not after, it. And, when you implete the vowel, which is part of the letter of prolongation, it becomes a complete letter of prolongation (R on IH upon Inflection). Syt says, on the authority of the Author of the Basît and others, "The vowels are six:—(1—3) the well-known three; (4) a vowel between Fatha and Kasra, which is the one before the | pronounced with Imāla [626]; (5) a vowel between Fatha and Damma, which is the one before the broad | in Warsh's reading of such as مَلَةٍ [733], رَكَّةٍ, and حَيَّةٍ; (6) a vowel between Kasra and Damma, which is the vowel of Ishmām [436, 668, 706] in such as يُذِيلَ and غَيْصٍ in XI. 46. [436], according to the reading of Ks (Sn on the Pro-Agent) and Hishām (MKh). All three [letters (IY)] occur in the three kinds [625], [ns. (IY)], as حُوضُ [703], مَالٍ and بَيْتٌ [674], and [يبت] tent and eggs; [vs., as (IY)] tried to get,
and ٍبَالِعَةٍ [683, 698]; and [ps., as زَا and (IY)] ٍلاٍ [546,
547, ٍلُوٍ [585], and ٍكِيٍّ [595] (M). The ٍ, however, (1)
in [decl. (IY, SH)] ns. and in vs., is not rad., but [only
(IY) either (Jrb) aug. or converted (M, Jrb)] from a
[rad. (IY)] ٍ, or ٍىٍ (M, SH), because, (a) in the decl. n.,
(a) when tril., it is impossible to begin with ٍ[673], while
the final is the seat of the inflectional vowels [16], and
the medial is mobile in the dim. [274]; so that it is not
possible to constitute [any of] them an ٍ, [since the ٍ is
quiescent]: (b) when quad., the first, second, and fourth
[cannot be ٍs], because of what has been mentioned
[about the initial, medial, and final] in the tril.; while
the third [also] is mobile in the dim. [274]: (c) when
quin., the first, second, and third [cannot be an ٍ],
because of what has been mentioned [about the corre-
sponding letters] in the quad.; while the fifth is the seat
of inflection, and so is the fourth [upon the elision of the
fifth] in the dim. [274] and broken pl. [245]: (b) in the
v., (a) when tril., because all three [letters] are mobile
in the pret. [403]: (b) when quad., because it follows the
tril.; but some mention that the ٍ in ٌكَحَـيْتُـ and ٍعَمِيْتُـ
[674] is unconverted (R): (2) in ps. [673, 686] is [only
(M)] rad., because they are prim. [and (Jrb)] aplastic
(M, Jrb), no o. f. being recognizable for them other than
this apparent one, which is therefore not to be deviated
from without proof: so that the ٍ of مَا or ٍلَّ [above] is not
said to be *aug*., for lack of a derivation wherein its ı is missing; nor to be a *subst*., because substitution is a kind of plasticity, and is not recognized for *ps.* *(Jrb)*: (a) similarly, [for lack of derivation *(Jrb)*,] in *(a)* *uninfl. ns.* *(673, 686) *(IY, Jrb)*, which go far in resemblance to *ps.* *(147, 159)*; (b) imitative *ejs.* *(200) *(IY)*; (c) foreign names *(673, 676) *(IY, Jrb)*, which follow the course of *ps.* in that their ı's are *rad*., not *aug*., nor converted, because we decide that, in the case of *ps.*, for lack of derivation, which [lack] is found in these names *(IY)*. The formations, [whether unaugmented or augmented *(R)*,] are divisible into sound and unsound *(SH)*, because they either have not, or have, an unsound letter for one of their *rad*. letters *(Jrb)*. The *quad. n.* or *v.* is not unsound, nor reduplicated [below], nor formed with *Hamza* [below] in the *ف* *(672)*. Nor is the *quin* reduplicated: but, in the *ف* alone, it is sometimes unsound, as *زَرَّتَل* *(671, 675)*; or formed with *Hamza*, as *إِصْطَبَل* *(283, 672)*. The *quad.* however, is reduplicated, on condition that a *rad*. letter be interposed between the two likes, as *ذِلْلَلَل* *(332, 671) *(R)*. The unsound [formation] is what contains an unsound letter *(SH)* in in its crude-form, i. e., in the position of the *ف* , *ع* , or *ل* , [this clause being added by R] in order that the definition may not [appear to] be infringed by such as *حَرَقَلْ* and *يَضَرِّب* *(482, 483)* and *بَيْطَر* *(404, 674)*. By the
“unsound letter” IH means the ٣, the ٤, and the ٥, which are named “unsound letters” [above] because, in many positions, they are not preserved, nor sounded true, i.e., do not remain in their [original] state; but are altered by conversion, quiescence, and elision. The Hamza [above], though it shares with them [in unsoundness] in this sense [658, 682], is not currently named “unsound letter” [726] in conventional language. The formations are divisible also into (1) formed, and not formed, with Hamza, the former being sometimes sound, as ٥أَمْرٍ commanded, ٣ْسَأَل asked, and ٥ْتُرَأَ read; and sometimes unsound, as ٥ْؤُل ٥َآ and ٥ْؤُل ٥٠٥ [357]: and similarly the latter, as ٥ْضُرُّبٍ [482, 671] and ٥ْغُدٍ [699]: (2) reduplicated and unreduplicated, the former being either sound, as ٥مْدَم extension [781]; or unsound, as ٥ْعُفٍ affection, ٥ْحِي living [698, 728], and ٥ْقُو [685 (case 1, a, a)]: and similarly the latter, as ٥ْضُرُّبٍ [381] and ٥ْغُدٍ [698, 699]. But IH omits these two divisions. And similarly the reduplicated is either formed with Hamza, like ٥٥٥ [rousing and inciting (MAR)]; or not so, like ٥م٥ [above]. The “formed with Hamza” is what has a Hamza for one of its rad. letters, like ٥ْسَأَل, ٥أَمْرٍ, and ٥ْتُرَأٍ [above]. And the “reduplicated” is what has its ع and ژ alike, which is the frequent [formation, like ٥م٥ above]; or its ٥ ف and ٥, like ٥م٥ [357], which is extremely rare [672, 674, 683]: or has
two rad. letters repeated after two rad. letters, as َرَّلَّ [332, 674]. As for what has its َف and َل alike, as ُقِلْقِلْ [674, 685, 690, 698], it is not named "repeated."

The divisions of the unsound formations are seven, because the unsound letter is (1) not multiple, being (a) a َف; (b) an َع; (c) a َل: (2) multiple, (a) two, (α) conjoined in the (α) َف and َع, as َراَثُوم woe and ُيَوْم day [698], from which [division] no َع is formed [41]; (β) َع and َل, as ُتَقَرَّى [728]: (b) separated, [as ُرَلَّ and ُرَلَّ below]:

(b) more than two, as ُزَار and ُرَي [698], names of letters, which [division] IH does not mention, because of its rarity (Jrb). The unsound, (1) in the َف, is [named (Jrb)] quasi-sound (SH), because it resembles the sound (R, Jrb) in the freedom of its pret. from transformation, as ُرَعَد and ُيَسَّر [663, 699], contrary to the hollow and defective [below]: (a) it is named after the quality of the pret., because the aor. is a deriv. of the pret. in form, since it is a pret. augmented by the aoristic letter [369, 404, 671], and altered in its vowels [404, 482]; so that the pret. is the primary paradigm of the vs. in form (R): (2) in the َع, is [named] (R, Jrb) (a) hollow (SH), by assimilation to the thing whose inside we have taken, so that it remains hollow, because its َع is often gone, as ُتَقَدُت and ُتَبَعت [703], and ُتَبَع [663, 703], َكَمَّ يَبَع [703] (R): (b) tril. [below] (SH), from
regard to the first of the \textit{pret.} forms, since the etymologists, when they conjugate the \textit{pret.} and \textit{aor.}, mostly begin with the 1st \textit{pers.}, as صَرَّبَت \textit{I struck}, because the person of the speaker is the nearest to him; while the 1st \textit{pers.} of the hollow is of three letters, as قُلْتُ and بَعَدت \textit{[above]} (R): (3) in the ج, is [named (R, Jrb)] \textit{(a)} defective (SH), from regard to the reason for its being named "defective" in the chapter on Inflection \textit{[16]}: for there it is named from the deficiency of its inflection; while here it is named from the deficiency of its final letter in the \textit{imp.}, as لا تَفْرَعُ, إِخْشَ, إِرم, [428, 431, 719], and \textit{apoc.}, as لا تَتْخَشُ\textit{[below]} \textit{[SH]}, because, though it contains an unsound letter, it does not become \textit{tril.} in the first of the \textit{pret.} forms, as the hollow does (R), since its \textit{pret.} is of four letters when you predicate of yourself, [as غَرَوت \textit{I raided and} رَمَيت \textit{I shot}] (Jrb): \textit{(a)} their being named "\textit{tril.}" and "\textit{quad.}" \textit{[above]} is from regard to the \textit{v.}, not the \textit{n.} (R): \textit{(4)} in the ف and ع, [as يَزم and يَرَح mercy \textit{(R),}] or in the ع \textit{and ج,} [as نَوَى purposed, حَبَي lived, and قَّوَى \textit{[R),}] is \textit{named} (R, Jrb) reduplicated in one respect, and (R) complex-conjoined (SH) in another (R), because of the complexity and conjunction of the two unsound letters.
§. 698. Z [followed by IH] now begins to show you the positions of these letters in words. As for the \( \text{ل} \), its matter has been mentioned; and that it is not \( \text{راد} \) in decl. ns., nor in us. [697]. But, as for the \( \text{ع} \) and \( \text{ي} \), they are sometimes \( \text{راد} \); and occur as \( \text{ف} \) or \( \text{ل} \) (IY). The [unaug. (M)], and \( \text{ي} \) agree [in their positions (M)], in that (1) both occur as (a) \( \text{ب} \) \( \text{s} \), as \( \text{زغذ} \) [683, 697, 699] and \( \text{رسَل} \) [368, 689] (M, SH), \( \text{يَبَس} \) \( \text{was} \) \( \text{dry} \) (IY): (b) \( \text{ع} \) \( \text{s} \), as \( \text{قَول} \) [663] (M, SH), \( \text{قاَّزم} \) [713] and \( \text{بَانَع} \) [683, 697] (IY): (c) \( \text{l} \) \( \text{s} \), as \( \text{عَرْزَو} \) [719] (M, SH), \( \text{رَمَيْت} \) [697, 719] (IY): (d) \( \text{ع} \) and \( \text{l} \) (M, R), together, as \( \text{قَوْة} \) [697] and \( \text{سَرْبَن} \) (M); [and] as \( \text{قَوْة} \) [729] and \( \text{زَبُر} \) [a she-camel's young one (MA\( \text{اق} \)], \( \text{حَي} \) [697, 730. A] and \( \text{حَي} \) \( \text{incapable} \): (a) both [double \( \text{ل} \) and double \( \text{ي} \)] are as rare as a double guttural for \( \text{ع} \) and \( \text{ل} \), like \( \text{نَحْي} \) [stuck together (MAR)], \( \text{تَّخَ] \) [vomited (MAR)], and \( \text{بَحْر} \) [200]: (b) double Hamza is not used for \( \text{ع} \) and \( \text{ل} \); and double \( \text{s} \) for them is extraordinary, as \( \text{فَال} \) [failed, broke down, in his speech (MAR)] and \( \text{فَلا} \) ( ) he (the drunken man)
belched in my face (MAR): (2) either of them precedes the other, when [they are combined at the beginning of the word, one of them being (IY)] a ف, and [the other (IY)] an ع, as زیل and یوم [697] (M, SH): (a) precedence of the, is more frequent; as though they disliked the transition from the ی to what is heavier than it, vid. the (IY): (b) the ف as a ی and the ع as a ی, have not been heard [together], except in یوم and یبر [a name of The sun (Jh on یبر, KF)]; nor the converse, except in زیل, زیب, زیس, زیح woe or mercy [41, 200] (R). And they differ in that (1) the ی precedes the ع (M, SH) as ف or ج respectively (SH), as یار I guarded and (M) یار I folded (M, R, Jrb), where they put the, before the ی (IY), which is frequent, as یار I was governor and یار I fulfilled. [I perished (MAR)] and یار I erred (MAR): whereas [the converse (SH)] precedence [of the ی before the ی (M, Jrb)] does not occur (M, SH), with the ع as ف or ج, and the ی as ج (R, Jrb), because the last letter ought to be lighter than what precedes it, since the word grows heavier as its letters increase, and the last letter is the seat of inflection: (a) ی, and ی for ع and ج respectively, as in عیل [above], are more frequent than double ی, as in سیل [above]; so that, when the o. f. is obscure, conformity with the first is more proper, for which
reason the dem. ی is said to be orig. گری [293] (R): (b) the in گیا (M) is a subst. for a ی (M, SH), according to S and his school (R), like the ی in جبارة [686] (M), orig. جبایة (IY), the o.f. being گیا [730. A] (M, Jrb) and گییة [Part I, Note on p. 8, l. 1] (M), where they substitute ی for the second ی, from dislike of the reduplication: this is the opinion of S and Khl (IY): (a) by analogy گییان should be گیاین, because the [first] ی is mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 703]; but they let [the ی in] it remain mobile, in order that the word may correspond with what it signifies, [vid. animal,] in mobility, like جولن [331, 684 (condition 11, a), 703] and چفتان fluttering; while in مرنان inanimate object [703] they make opp. conform to opp.: (b) for the same reason they do not incorporate [the two ی s] in گییان o.f. of گیوان: but, since they dislike the combination of two similar letters, they convert the second into ی; not the first, because alteration is more appropriate in [the second as being] the final [of the crude-form] (Jrb): (c) Mz holds that the ی of گیوان is [not substituted, but (IY)] original (IY, R); nor is there in گییت I lived [728, 730. A] any proof that the second [unsound letter] is [orig.] ی, because it may have been converted into ی on account of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Kasr
[685 (case 1, a), 724]: but S arrives at his decision because, if the were made original, حَيْوَان would have no counterpart in their language (R); and the [correct] opinion is that of S: (d) there is no word, says S, like حَيْوَة [4, 685 (case 7, c, b, γ), 689, 716] in their language, i. e., none whose ع is a ی, and ل a ِ, while حَيْوَة [itself] is orig. حَيْوَة [above], because it is from حَيْٰی [697, 728]: (e) the substitute a ِ for the last ی, irregularly, for a kind of alleviation, through the difference of the two letters, because they deem reduplication, and uniformity of the two letters, to be heavy (IY): (2) the ی occurs as (a) ف and ع [together (M)] in يَّبْن Yain [715, 730. A] (M, SH), which is the name (M, R) of a place (M), [i. e.,] of a valley (R); and has no counterpart (IV, R), known to me (R), among ns: (a) this is like گَرْبُكَ and ۰ُدُوُن [674, 697] in the sound (IY): (b) ل [together (M)] in لَدِن, orig. لَدِن, with quiescence of the د, its Д being proved to be a ی by their saying (IY) [لَدِّيَتُ (M, SH), i. e., I hit on the hand, or (R)] I bestowed a favor (IY, R, Jrb): the poet [of the Banū Asad (T)] says

یَدَیْتُ عَلَیْ یَبْنِ حَسْکِانِ بْنِ یَعْفَق

یَبَسْفَلِی ذِی الْقَیَدَةِ یَدُ الْکِرْمِ
bestowed upon the son of Ḥassūs, or in one version Ḥassūs, Ibn Wahb, in the lowest part of Dhu-l-Jidhāt, the favor of the generous (T)]: and in the du. they say 

which is more frequent, from the permanence of the elision (IY) : whereas the , does not occur like that [in case (a) or (b)] (M, SH), except in (a) 357, 683, 699, according to the soundest [opinion] (SH), i. e., that its  and  are , s: (a) the truth is that the , and agree here in being, each of them,  and  together; but each in one word only: (b) in the sound letters also homogeneity of the  and , as in بَرٌ [with two  s, which I think to be exotic, not of the speech of the Arabs, a kind of wild beast, which the Persians name بَر tig (Jk)], is rare [699], extraordinary, from the concurrence of two likes, together with the impossibility of incorporating the first into the second: (c) the disagreeableness is somewhat lessened by the occurrence of separation between them, as in 373; or by the existence of a cause necessitating incorporation, as in جَرٍ [above] (R): (b) 683 (case 1, c, a), 697, 723, according to one account (SH): (a) F holds that its o. f. is بَرٌ, from dislike to forming the word of [three],  s, which [sort of formation] does not occur [even] in the sound letter, except in the single word بَرٌ,
Babba [4], and that [only] because of its being [an imitation of (MAR)] a sound [Part I, Note on p. 8, l. 19]; but Akh holds that its o. f. is ٰٰ٤, because the ی does not precede the ج as ج and ج respectively [above] (R):

(b) if we say that ٰٰ٤ is composed of ﺔ، ی، and ج، because the cat. of ﺔٰس [below] is more numerous than that of ٰٰ٤ [above], then the ج is like the ی in occurring as ﺔ and ﺔ [above]; but, if we say that it is composed of ﺔ، ﺔ، and ﺔ، then the ج is like the ی in occurring as ﺔ، ﺔ، and ﺔ [below]: (c) the reasons for saying the latter are (α) that, in the dim. of ٰٰ٤، they say ﺔٰ١٠١٠، by converting the ﺔ into Hamza, because it is the first of two initial ج، ﺔ [683, 699]; whereas, if its ﺔ were ﺔ، then ﺔٰ١٠١٠ would be said; (β) that the ﺔ is ﺔ، as in ﺔٰ١٠١٠ shifted, was transmuted, more often than a ی، as in ﺔٰ١ sold [684, 703]; while conformity with the more numerous [cat.] is better (Jrb): (d) you say, according to the opinion of F، ٰٰ٤٢٠٢٠ I wrote ﺔ، converting the last ﺔ into ﺔ [685 (case 4), 727], as in ﺔٰ١٠١٠ and ﺔٰ١٠١٠ I elevated, exalted: but according to the opinion of Akh، ﺔٰ١٠١٠؛ while Th says ﺔٰ١٠١٠، which is rightly rejected by IJ, because the heaviness in ﺔٰ١٠١٠ is more than in ﺔٰ١٠١٠ [683, 699], on account of the combination of [three] ﺔ، ﺔ (R); (e) they say that in Arabic there is no word whose ﺔ and ﺔ are ﺔ، except ٰٰ٤١ [above]; and
for that reason they prefer the *fray* to be written with ع (M), lest the ف and ل become : (f) similarly we decide that the ز in زأخيت is substituted for the Hamza in آخيت, not that they are two *dial. vars.*, because, the ل in آخ [16] being أ و , as is proved by the du. [231], the decision that the ف is أ, would lead to the establishment of a paradigm whose counterpart is rare in the language (IV): (g) similarity of the ف and ل, even if they be sound, is rare in the tril., as سلس [674, 685, 690, 697] (R): (3) the ع occurs as ف, ع, and ل [together] in I wrote أ م (Jrb), contrary to the ع, except in دار [above], according to one account (SH): (a) the opinion of F is that the o. f. of أ م [697] is بوي, so that he says I wrote أ beautiful ع; but, according to others, its o. f. is بوي: (b) there is a similar dispute between them about all the names of the letters of the alphabet whose second [letter] is an ١, as كا, ب١, and كا: so that the others say I wrote أ, كب١, ب١, etc.; but F says كب١, كب١, كب١, etc.: while their pl. [234], according to F, is أبو١ and آ١ وأ١; but, according to others, آ١ وأ١ and آ١ وأ١: (c) the reason why the others decide that the ١s here are *orig. ع* is the occurrence of Imāla [639] in the whole of these names,
which is of no account, because they are pronounced with Imāla only when they are indecl. [159, 321, 663]; and at that time their ı́s are original, like the ı́ of مَا and نَا [697]: while their ı́s are judged to be converted only when another ı́ is added at their end, and made into Hamza, by analogy to such as حَسَانٌ [683 (case 1), 723], vid. when they occur constructed, infl., in which case their ı́s are co-ordinated with the ı́s of the rest of the infl. ns. [697] in being [regarded as] converted [from a ُ or ی ]; and then these names are not pronounced with Imāla: so that their being pronounced with Imāla before construction contains no proof that after construction their ı́s are orig. ی : (d) the reason why F' decides their ı́s to be [orig. ی] َوَ, and their ْل to be ی, is that the cat. of طُرْبِتْ [above] and ْنْوَيْتْ [697] is numerous, and more prevalent than the cat. of قَرْةِ and ْحَبْيْتْ [697, 728]; while the ُوَ of حِبْرَانَ is [orig. ِِ] a ی, according to the sounder [opinion], as before mentioned : (e) as for those names [of letters] which have an ı́ for their second, followed by a sound letter, like گَافِ, ُصَادِ, ِصَانِ, ُدَالِ, ِدَالِ, and ُلَمِ, their ı́, before their construction and inflection, is original, because they are orig. indecl., as before mentioned; and, after their inflection, should be regarded as orig. َلاِّ, rather than a ی, because the cat. of ُكَافِ is more numerous than that of ُكَابِ [684, 703, 711]: so that we
say,  I wrote a ل, and گُرفتُ کافًا, ص صُرْفَتُ صادًا.  I wrote a د, while the pl. is گُرفَانُ, قُصْرًا, and دَوَلُتُ دَالًا.  

(f) as for عین, چیم, their ع is a ی, like that of یبیت [674, 697], since the ی is present, and there is no proof of its being [converted] from ی; and, according to S, چیم may be orig. فعل with Damm or Kasr of the ف, contrary to the opinion of Akh [710] (R).
§ 699. The و (1) remains sound in such as وَرَّعَ [663, 697] and وَرَّعَتْ [683, 697, 698] and وَلَدَ [below] (M), pl. of وَلَدُ child (KF): (a) the و in all of that is sound, because nothing to necessitate alteration or elision is found in it: (b) hence وَرَّعَتْ وَجْهُ هُوَ مُرْثِيَة II. 143. [below] (IY) And every (sect) hath a point, to which it turneth (its face) (K, B): (2) is elided in (a) that aor. of وَرَّعَ or وَعَلَ whose ع is pronounced with Kasr, literally, as in وَعَدَ promises [333, 482, 671] and يَعْقِب promises [333, 482, 700] and وَعَلَ is ample, where the o. f. is Kasr, the Fath being on account of the guttural letter (M): (a) the o. f. of وَعَدَ and يَرَّدَ weighs is وَعَدَتْ [333, 482] and يَرَّدَتْ (IY): (b) the و is elided [from such as يَلُدَ begets and يَعْدُ (SH)] because of its occurrence [quiescent] between a ق [pronounced with Fath (R)] and [an original (SH)] Kasra [below] (IY, SH), expressed, as in [لَقَدْ and] يَعْدُ; or supplied, as in [قَدْ يَعْدُ [below] and يَسْعَ (R): (α) the و is then elided (IY, R), from desire of alleviation (IY), because combined with the ق in such a way that incorporation of one into the
other, as in مَلَأٌ [685 (case 7, a, b)], is not possible: and especially [is elision necessary] when the ٰ is followed by Kasra, which is part of ﯾٰ [697]; and preceded by a vowel not congruous with it, as in ٰيَعَدٌ [below], aor. of ٰيُعَدَ threatened (R): for the ٰ is homogeneous with Pamma, being considered as equivalent to two Pamm mas; while the Kasra after it is homogeneous with the ﯾ before it; and the occurrence of a thing between two things opposed to it is deemed heavy, and must therefore be avoided (Jrb): (ب) the ٰ, and not the ﯾ, is elided, because the ٰ is the heaviest of the two, while the ﯾ is the sign of the aor.; and because the heaviness arises from the ٰ, since it is second (R): (γ) the Kasra may not be elided, because by it the measure of the word is recognized [482]; so that there remains nothing [to elide] but the ٰ, which is therefore elided: and its elision is most effective in alleviation, because it is heavier than the ﯾ or the Kasra; while it is quiescent, [and consequently] weak, so that the cause of its elision is strong (IY): (δ) the ٰ is not elided from such as ٰيَعَدٌ [above], because it is orig. not between a ﯾ and Kasra, but between a Hamza and Kasra since the о, is ٰيَعَدَ [428, 661, 697] (Jrb): (α) the KK say that the ٰ is elided only to distinguish the trans. [of this cat. (IY)] from the intrans., because you say, [in the trans.\]
promised it, aor. يَعِدُ, and زَرَّة weighed it, aor. خَلْت, and (IY).] in the intrans., [fell into the mud, aor. خَلْت, and (IY).] خَفَر, aor. (IY).] خَفَر [333, 700] (IY, R): but that [theory] is vicious, because the, is sometimes elided in the intrans. of this cat., as رَكَف آل بَيْت The tent, or house, dripped with rain-water, aor. يَكِف, and مَن الدَّبَّاب The fly dropped excrement, aor. يَكَف, and مَن الدَّبَّاب The camel went along, throwing his legs out like an ostrich, aor. يَكِف, so that what we have said is thereby established (IY); whereas what they say is of no account, since, if the case were so, the, would not be elided from حَزَن of i. q. حَزَن. "grieved" (R): and one proof thereof is that there are some w. whose aor. occurs on [the measure of] يَفَعَل, with Kasr and Fath, in which case the, is elided from وَحْر صَدْرُ, and retained in وَحْر, as يَفَعَل. His breast was filled with rage, aor. وَحْر, and يَفَعَل. [482]: which proves the truth of our reason, and the falsity of theirs: (5) if the letter after the, be pronounced with Fath in the aor., as in يَفَعَل and يَفَعَل [above], the, remains, and is not elided, because one qualification [for elision], vid. Kasr, is removed, as in the pass. يُوْحَل is promised and يَرْزَن is weighed, whence CXII. 3. [404], where the,
is elided from َيِلَدُ, because the letter after it is pronounced with Kasr; but remains in ُبُولَدُ, on account of the Fatha (IV): (η) IH's saying "an original Kasra" [above] comprises such as ُيَقَعُ [above] and ُيَقَعُ [362, 482], orig. (R): (θ) as for ُيَضَعُ [above] and ُيَضَعُ [482], the reason why the, is elided from them is that the o. j. is ُيَقَعُ and ُيَقَعُ, since the aor. of ُقَعَلْ in this [cat., whose ف is a ه ], occurs [orig.] only on [the measure of] ُقَعَلْ with Kasr [482, 671], being pronounced with Fath in ُيَقَعُ and ُيَقَعُ through the influence of the guttural letter; so that the Fatha is then adventitious; and, the adventitious not being taken into account, because it is like the non-existent, the, is elided in them, because the Kasra is virtually pronounced (IV): and, as for ُيَسَعُ [above] and ُيَكَتْأَ [482, 671, 700], [whose prets. are on the measure of ُقَعَلْ, ] it is plain to us, by the elision of the, that their ع [also] is [orig.] pronounced with Kasr [in the aor.], being pronounced with Fath because of the guttural letter; while these two expressions have no third (R): and for that reason Z says "literally ...... or constructively" [above], the lit. being in ُيَقَعُ [and ُيَقَعُ], because the Kasra is [actually] pronounced; and the constructive in ُيَضَعُ and ُيَسَعُ, because the ع is virtually pronounced with Kasr
though literally with Fath (IX): (c) the , is elided in leaves [482] for conformity with ' (above), because it is syn. therewith: (x) finds with Dam, according to the Banu 'Amir [482], is anomalous, the , being elided from it either because it is orig. with Kasr; or because , is deemed heavy between the ү pro-nounced with Fath and the Damma in a conj. other than that of ү, aor. ү, with Dam of the , in both (R): (c) the remaining variations of the aor. (IX, R), [being] the congerens of ү (SH), are made to accord with it [in elision of the , (MASH)], as ү, ү, and ү [Note on p. 246, \textit{I}. 19] (IX, SH), the , being elided, 'although it does not occur between a ү and Kasra (IX).\textit{]} in order that the conj. [of the aor. (IX)] may [not vary, but (IX)] be uniform (IX, R), and because of the alleviation that is [found] in elision (IX); and [similarly] its imp. mood [423, 482, 667, 668] (SH), because derived from the aor. whose , is elided, as ү (R): (b) such inf. ns. as ү [482] and ү (M): (a) the o. f. of ү [and ү (IX)] is ү (IX, Jrb, Tsr) and ү (IX), with Kasr of the , and quiescence of the , as they distinctly declare (Tsr): (x) the , is elided because of the heaviness found in the Kasra upon the , together with [the fact] that the v. is transformed; so
that the Kasra of the  و is transferred to the  ل، and the  و then elided [below] (Jrb): (b) what necessitates elision of the  و, here is two matters, that the  و is pronounced with Kasr, Kasra being deemed heavy on  و; and that the  was is transformed, as in  يَعُدُ and  بِرَنَّ [above], the inf. n. being transformed by reason of the transformation, and sound by reason of the soundness, of the  و, as  قُمْتُ inf. n. of  لَرَنَّ and  يَرَنُ inf. n. of  لَرَنَّ [685, (case 2, b), 713]: (γ) the combination of these two qualifications is the cause of the elision of the  و from the inf. n.: so that, if one of the two qualifications stand alone, the  و is not elided because of it, as  رَعُدُ [above] and  زُرُن , where, since the  و is pronounced with Fath, and Kasra is removed, elision does not ensue, although the  و is transformed in  يَعُدُ and  بِرَنَّ; and as  دُرُدُ inf. n. of  رَذَتُنَّ I loved him in return for his loving me and  دُصُلُتُ I held close intercourse with him, where the  و, although pronounced with Kasr, remains [sound], because the  و is not transformed: (δ) when the simple substantive, not the inf. n., is meant, as in  وَلَدُ [above], the  و is not elided: (ε) the transformation of such as  عَدَكَ and  رَنَّ is only by transfer of the Kasra of the  ف, which is the  و, to the  ل: but, since the  و becomes quiescent, while it is not possible to begin with a quiescent, they subject it to elision, because, if
they put the *conj.* Hamza pronounced with Kasr [667, 668], that would lead to conversion of the *א* [685, (case 5), 699], on account of the preceding letter’s being pronounced with Kasr, and of its own quiescence; so that they would say "איבעד", with a *א* between two Kasras; and, that being deemed heavy, they are reduced to elision: and, in that case, the intention is to transform by transfer of the vowel; while elision occurs [merely] as a consequence: (כ) it is said [by some] that, since transformation of "עדה*א* and "ת*א* is necessary, the intention is to elide the *א*, as in the *א*; so that they transfer the Kasra of the *א* to the *א*, in order that a mobile *א*, may not be elided in the *inf.* *n.*; in which case the *n.* would exceed the *א.* in elision, [since the *א*, elided in the *א.* is quiescent]: whereas the *n.* is subordinate to the *א.* in that [liability to transformation]; so that, when not inferior to the *א.* in degree [of elision], it is equal, but not superior, to it (IY): and [similarly] we say "the Kasra of the *א*, is transferred to the *א*, and the *א*, then elided" [above]; the *א*, not being elided mobile, lest the transformation of the *n.* exceed the transformation of the *א.*, in which the *א*, is elided quiescent, not mobile (Jrb): (ב) [some say that] the o. f. of "ס*א* [and "ס*א* (MASH)] is "ס*א* (A, MASH) and "ס*א* (MASH), on the measure of "ס*א* [without a *א*] (A);
and [this description of the o. f. seems to be more consistent with the statement that] the š of feminization is inseparable [from such inf. ns.], like a compensation for the elided [265 (reason 11, a)] (IY, Jrb): (α) its ف is elided for conformity with the aor.; and its غ mobilized with the vowel of the ف, vid. Kasra, in order that the Kasra may remain as an indication of the [elided] ف; while the š of feminization is put as a compensation for the ف, for which reason the two are not combined (A): (β) if it be said that the , is not elided in II. 143. [above], notwithstanding that this involves a combination between the compensation and what it is put as a compensation for, the answer is firstly that ُجهة is not an inf. n. conformable to the v. [331], but a simple substantive denoting the direction turned to; while the , remains in the simple substantive, like ُلود [above], pl. of لَبَنَّ meaning boy and slave: and secondly that it is an inf. n.; but remains sound for a notification of the o. f., like قُرْن and ُإسْتَهْسَرَن [685 (case 6, o), 703]; and this is the saying of Mz (Jrb): (γ) the š as a compensation is necessary here (A); so that its elision is anomalous, according to the preferable opinion (Sn): but some allow it to be elided, on account of prefixion, [because this supplies the place of the š (Sn),] relying upon ُأَخْلَفَكَ أَلْقِ [331, 338], which is the
opinion of Fr.; whereas some explain مَعَدَى here as عَدِيَّة pl. of عَدَّةٌ i. q. نَكَاحَة side, part, i. e., and have failed to perform to thee the particulars of the matter that they promised (A): (c) [R. holds the o. f. of عَدَدٌ to be عَدَدٌ, from which he thus evolves it:—] as for the inf. n., since it is the original of the v. in derivation [331], its transformation is not necessary by reason of the transformation of the v., except when an element requiring transformation exists in it, like the Kasra in ُمَلَام [above]; or [when] it corresponds to the v. in initial augment, like ُعِقَامَةٌ and ُعِقَامَةٌ [708, 714]: and, for this reason, the ُجِبِي in the inf. n. of ُعِدَدٌ may be elided, as عَدَّةٌ; or retained, as عَدَدٌ; since it does not contain any cause for elision, nor the correspondence mentioned: and, when anything is elided from the inf. n. by transformation, the elided is not quietly forgotten; but the ُجِبِي of femininization is put at the end as a compensation for it, as in ُعِقَامَةٌ and ُعِقَامَةٌ [265 (reason 11, a, b), 388]. because the transformation in it is not according to the general rule, since it is an imitation of the deriv. by the original: (α) the ُعِدِي in ُعِدِيٌ, which is orig. ُعَدِيٌ, is pronounced with Kasr, because the quiescent, when mobilized, is generally pronounced with Kasr [664]; and also in order that it may be like the ُعِدِيٍ of the v., to
which is made to conform: and therefore the conj. Hamza is not imported after elision of the ف: (8) when the ē in the aor. is pronounced with Fath because of a guttural letter, it may be pronounced with Fath in the inf. n. also, as يُسَع [above], inf. n. سَعَ [306]; or not, as يِهَب with Damm for junction, union, is anomalous: (8) when the ل is guttural, the inf. n. of يَفُعُل, aor. يَفَعَل, with Damm of their ē, is sometimes treated like the inf. n. of يُسِع [above], as وُدُعَ was tranquil, aor. يُودُع, inf. n. طَعَ [306]; and رَطُوّر was level, aor. يُرَطُر, inf. n. طَطَر and this being to notify that the ē of its aor. ought to be elided, because its occurrence between a ē pronounced with Fath and a Damma is deemed heavy; though it is not elided, in order to make the form correspond with the sense, since يَفُعُل denotes inseparable naturcs [432, 484], continuing in one state: and likewise [to notify] that the ē of its aor. ought to be pronounced with Fath, because the ل is guttural: (8) لِدِيَّ born at the same time as another [234] is orig. an inf. n.; but is made a simple substantive to denote the مُولَوَّد born, as ضَرْبُ الْأَمِيرِ struck, or coined, by the sovereign means مَضْرَوَّة; (5) as for چَهَة ىَخَدَّى direction and گُدَّر coined silver [234], they are anomalous, because they are
not inf. ns.; so that their s is not a compensation for the
(η) the, is not elided in such as يُرَاعُ [a fictitious
word (MAR)], on the model of يُقْطِين an acaule plant,
from رَعَد, because the reason for elision is weak (R):
(3) converted [below] in what has been mentioned under
substitution [683, 685, 689] (M), as [مِيَارَانٍ] أَوْأَصِلُ [below],
نَكْأ [below], and the like (IY). The ى is like the ى,
except in elision (M). The ى remains where the ى is
elided (IY); [so that,] when ى occurs in the aor.
between a ى pronounced with Fath and a Kasra, it is
not elided, like ى, because the combination of two ىs is
not so heavy as the combination of ى and ى (R). You
say يُرَاعَ يُسَر [played at hazard
with unfeathered. and headless arrows (IY)], aor.
ىَسَرّ [482], retaining it, [because of its lightness (IY),] where
you drop ى (M) in ىَعَد, etc. (IY). The ى is not elided
from such as يُسَرُّ because it is homogeneous with the
Kasra: nor from such as يُسَرُّ also, for the same reason;
though here elision of the ى does occur, because two
ىs are deemed heavy with Hamza (Jrb). S relates
that (IY) some of them say يُسَرُّ [482, 684], aor.
ىَسَرُّ, ىَسَرُّ ke يُسَرُّ, aor. يُسَرُّ [above] (M); and يُسَرُّ, aor.
ىَسَرُّ [82], [like رَعَد, aor. يُعَد; ] eliding the ى, as they
ide the ى, since ى, though lighter than ى, is deemed
heavy in comparison with [643, 671], for which reason they elide it (IY), treating it like the ۶, but this is rare (M). S transmits elision of the ی in [only] two words, یِسَرُ ِنَبِّيَعَر [divided the limbs of the camel (MAR)], aor. نَبِّيَعَر ؕ and both are anomalous (R). Its conversion [686, 689] is in such as [مَوْسِرُ and] اِنْتَسَرُ [below] (M). The ۶ is converted into Hamza [683], (1) necessarily in such as ۶َرَىٰلْعَسِ [730. A], ۶ُرِّيَلُسِ, and ۶ُرَىٰلْعَسِ, [i. e. (Jrb).], when [two ۶ are combined at the beginning of the word, and (Jrb)] the second is mobile [below] (SH), in which case the first must be converted into Hamza, because they consider two mobile [۶, ۶] heavy (Jrb); contrary to ۶َوَرِٰى (SH), where the quiescence of the second, together with its being a letter of prolongation, relieves some of the heaviness (MASH): (a) they deem the combination of two likes, at the beginning of the word, to be heavy; for which reason such [formation] as ۶ُرَىٰلْعَسِ [697, 698] are rare: so that, if two ۶ occur at the beginning, then, the ۶, being the heaviest of the unsound letters, the first of them is converted into Hamza [below], necessarily; except when the second is a letter of prolongation converted from an aug. letter, as in ۶َرَىٰلْعَسِ [683, 730. A], in which case conversion of the first into Hamza is not necessary, because the second is adventitious in respect
of its augmentativeness and conversion from the ٰ, and because the prolongation relieves some of the heaviness: (b) conversion of the first into Hamza is [therefore] necessary, if the second be (α) not a letter of prolongation, whether it be converted from an aug. letter, as in ﴛُرۡضَتُ [above]; or unconverted, as in ﴟٰعَدَ [683]: (β) a letter of prolongation, but [either] not converted from anything [below], as in ﴟٰعَدَ 683]; or converted from a rad. letter, as Khl says ﴟٰعَدَ، for ﴟٰعَدَ from ﴟٰعَدَ [716], when [its Hamza is] alleviated [by conversion into ٰ, ]: (α) hence the opinion of the KK on ﴟٰعَدَ [357], which, according to them, is orig. ﴟٰعَدَ، then ﴟٰعَدَ، then ﴟٰعَدَ[683]: (β) Mz refutes Khl with [the argument] that the [second], in the like [of ﴟٰعَدَ alleviated from ﴟٰعَدَ] o. f. of ﴟٰعَدَ] is adventitious, not inseparable, since alleviation of the Hamza in such a case is unnecessary [658]; and he says that ﴟٰعَدَ for ﴟٰعَدَ is allowable because of the Damma of the ٰ, like ﴟٰعَدَ أَجْرَ [below], not because of the combination of two ٰ, as: (c) original, not converted from anything [above], whether it be a letter of prolongation, as in ﴟٰعَدَ [357, 633], according to the BB, orig. ﴟٰعَدَ; or not a letter of prolongation, as in ﴟٰعَدَ [357, 683, 698], according to them: (c) as for IH's saying "when the second is mobile" [above], this is a condition not prescribed by the leading GG, as you see
from the saying of Khl on "above:" while F also says "When two, s are combined, the first of them is changed into Hamza, as in اَوْلُ"; and then says "and hence their saying ْ بِ اللَّهِ فِي مَعْلُوم distinguished for the fem. of لَّا "and afterwards says "but, if the second be not inseparable, it is not necessary to change the first of them into Hamza, as ْ بِ اللَّهِ فِي مَعْلُوم "above:" and S says "When you form a [n.]
like اَوْلُ from بِ اللَّهِ فِي مَعْلُوم "above:" so that you see how they differ from IH's saying: (a) IH bases upon his opinion [two conclusions,] that the conversion of the first [ ] in اَوْلُ [above] is unnecessary; and that the [first], [in اَوْلُ o. f.] of اَوْلُ is necessarily converted into Hamza [only] for conformity of the sing. to the pl. [ below]: (d) the, deemed heavy is converted into Hamza, not into ی, because of the excessive affinity between the, and ی, whereas the Hamza is more remote; for, if the were converted into ی, that combination of two s, which is deemed heavy, would be, as it were, remaining (R): (2) allowably, [with unbroken regularity (R),] in such as اَوْلُ [683] and اَوْلُ [for the mentioned (MASH)]; and, says Mز, in such as اَوْلُ [683] (SH), اَوْلُ اَوْلُ for اَوْلُ اَوْلُ [above], and اَوْلُ, because in Kasra also there is heaviness, though less than in دامم (R): (3) invariably in اَوْلُ,
[notwithstanding the quiescence of the second (Jrb, MASH),] for conformity with [its pl. (MASH)] اذ [above]: (4) irregularly, [by common consent (R, MASH),] in ُحَسَبَة and ُحَسَبَة [683] (SH), ُحَسَبَة (R) morose, looking down from intensity of grief (MAR), and ُحَسَبَة (SH), because a single, pronounced with Fath is not heavy at the beginning of the word (MASH): (a) S says that ُحَسَبَة is orig. [683], ُحَسَبَة meaning beauty of face, diptote because of the 1 of feminization [18]; while Mb says that it is pl. of ُحَسَب [667], its measure being ُحَسَب , diptote because of the quality of proper name and id. feminization: but the first is more obvious, because eps. are used as names more often than pls; and because, if used as a name for a masc., it would still be diptote (Jrb): (b) some GG say that ُحَسَب took is orig. ُحَسَب , on the evidence of ُحَسَب [702], like ُحَسَب [689].

No word, whose initial is ُي pronounced with Kasr, occurs in the language of the Arabs, like words whose initial is ُي pronounced with Damm, except a dial. var. of ُيُسَار left hand [701] and ُيُقَاطُ pl. of ُيُقَاطُ awake [and ُيُعَار (248)]. Sometimes they escape the combination of two ُي, at the beginning of the word, by converting the first of them into ُي, as in ُيُرِّئ and
which is rare; as a single, at the beginning of the word is escaped by conversion into ُتُئَلَج١٣١, as in ُتُرَّثَت١٣١ and ُتُقَوَّى١٣١ [689]. The ُت occurs as a subst. for the ُت, frequently, as ُتْحَاجَة١٣١ [above], ُتْقَعَى١٣١ and ُتْرَأَت١٣١, and ُتْقَوَّى١٣١, the last, according to the BB, being from ُزَرِى١٣١ أَلْرَنَذ١٣١ ُتُعَلَّكْ١٣١ [689], since the Book of God is a Light; but not regularly, except in the conjug. of ُتُعَلَّل١٣١ [689] (R). The ُت and ی are necessarily, regularly (R),] converted into ُت١٣١ [and incorporated (Jrb),] in such as ُتْنَسَر١٣١ and ُتْنَعَد١٣١ [played at hazard (Jrb, MASH), where the unsound letter is not converted from a Hamza (Jrb)]; contrary to ُیَلْتَرَر١٣١ [689, 702] (SH), orig. ُیَلْتَرَر١٣١, where the second Hamza, being quiescent, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is converted into ی١٣١ [661], which is not converted into ُت١٣١, because it is accidental, being removed in continuity, as ُأَلْزَر١٣١; and wore a waist-wrapper (Jrb). The [quiescent (Jrb)] ی١٣١ is converted into ی١٣١ [685], when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, as ُمُيِّقَات١٣١ [above] and ُمِيْرَان١٣١; and the [quiescent (Jrb)] ی١٣١ into ی١٣١ [686], when the letter before it is pronounced with Damm, as ُمُرَّتَط١٣١ awakening and ُمُوَسِّر١٣١ [above] (SH).
§ 700. What differentiates "\( \text{يَرِجَعُ} \) had a pain and "\( \text{يَرِحُلُ} \) aor. of "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) and "\( \text{يَرِحُلُ} \) aor. of "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) [699] from "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) aor. of "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) [482, 699], so that the remains in one of the two [classes], and drops off in the other, though both classes contain a guttural letter, is that in the Fathā [of the \( \text{ع} \)] is original, like that in [333, 699] (M), where the Fathā is original, because "\( 
\text{يَرِجَعُ} \), aor. "\( 
\text{يَرِجَعُ} \), belongs to the conjug. of "\( 
\text{فَعَلُ} \), aor. "\( 
\text{يَفَعَلُ} \), with Kasr of the \( \text{ع} \) in the pret., and Fath in the aor., like "\( 
\text{knew} \), aor. "\( 
\text{يَعْلَمُ} \), and "\( 
\text{شَرَبْ} \) drank, aor. "\( 
\text{يَشَّرِبُ} \) (IV): whereas is "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) it is adventitious, imported on account of the guttural letter (M), because "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \), aor. "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) and "\( 
\text{يَّطَأ} \) trod, aor. "\( 
\text{يَنْفَعُ} \) [482, 671, 699], belong to the conjug. of [\( 
\text{عَلِمُ} \), aor. "\( 
\text{حَسْبُ} \) accounted, aor. "\( 
\text{يَحْسِبُ} \), and "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) was pleasant, aor. "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) [482]; and similarly, in the unsound, as "\( 
\text{يَرِتْ} \) [482, 682], and "\( 
\text{يَرِتْ} \) "\( 
\text{يَلَي} \) [697], aor. "\( 
\text{يَلَي} \) [482] (IV). The antagonism of the two [Fathas mentioned] is therefore [like] that of the two Kasra of the \( \text{s} \) in "\( 
\text{تَجَارِبُ} \) and "\( 
\text{تَجَارِبُ} \) (M). The Fathā in "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) [and "\( 
\text{يَسَّعُ} \) (IV)] is likened to the Kasra in rivalry, competition, where the Kasra is adventitious, the o. f. being [332]. For they convert the Damma into Kasra [724] (IV,
Jrb), because of its occurrence before a final ی (Jrb), in order that the ی may be sounded true, since, if Đamma occurred before the final ی, the latter would be converted into یو; and you would arrive at a paradigm unprecedented among [decl.] Arabic ns., in which there is none whose final ی is preceded by Đamma [721]. And, since the Kasra in نَجَّارُ is adventitious, the paradigm is not accounted a preventive of triptote declension [18], because it is [not فَعَّل, but] virtually فَعَّلْ with Đamm of the غ [256] (IY). And the Fata in یَرِجلُ is likened to the Kasra in نَجَّارُ trials, where the Kasra is original, because نَجَّارٍ [339] is pl. of نَجْرَة [332] (Jrb).

§ 701. Some Arabs [of the Hijāz are induced, by desire for alleviation, to (IY)] convert the [unsound letter, whether (IY)] ی or یی, in the aor. of فَعَّل, into ی (M), notwithstanding that it is quiescent [684, 703] (IY), saying یَاتَعَّدُ and یَايَتَعَّدُ [below] (M), because the combination of ی with ی is lighter, according to them, than its combination with یو, for which reason they say یَاتَعَّدُ, substituting an ی for the quiescent یو, as they substitute it for the ی in یَايَاتَعَّدُ (IY). Some inhabitants of the Hijāz do not regard the difference between یو and ی in the formations of the v., saying [pret.,] یَیَتَعَّدُ and
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[689]: aor., يَبِتَسُ [above]; not and يَبْتَسُ [689], because the و and ی are deemed heavy between the ی pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha, as in يَبِسُ and يَبِسُ [below]: act. part., مُبِتَسُ and مُبِتَسُ [below]: imp., يَبِتَسُ and يَبِتَسُ [689]. This, according to them, is an universal rule (R). And, agreeably with it, مُبِتَسُ and مُبِتَسُ occur in the dial. of [the Imam (Jrb)] Shf (SH), who used to pronounce so in speaking (Jrb). Some convert the ی occurring [in the aor.] between the ی pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha, as in يَبِسُ [333, 699, 700], into ی, as يَبِسُ [below], because there is heaviness in this و, though not so much as to cause it to be elided [699]; and others convert it into ی, [as يَبِسُ, ] because ی is lighter than و; while some, disapproving conversion of و into ی for no apparent cause, pronounce the ی of the aor. with Kasr, [as يَبِسُ, ] in order that the conversion of the ی may be because of its occurrence after Kasra [685 (case 5), 699] (R). There are [thus] four dial. vars. in the aor. of [يَبِسُ, aor. يَبِسُ, whose ف is a و, as (IY) [aor. يَبِسُ, وَبِسُ, and یَبِسُ, aor. (IY)][1] [above] (Jh, M), the most excellent of them. and the one used in the Kur, as قَالُوا لَا تَرَجِسُ XV. 53. They said, "Fear thou not, because the و does not occur
between a ی and Kasra [699], and therefore remains (IY); (2) [333, 674, 684, 703]; (3) [333, 685]; (4) [404] (Jh, M), with Kasr of the [aoristic] ی (Jh). But یَبِیجَلُ; یَبِیجَلُ, یَبِیجَلُ, یَبِیجَلُ, یَبِیجَلُ; [which is the most outrageous of them (Jrb),] are anomalous in the aor. of یَبِیجَلُ [below] (SH), the chaste [form] being یَبِیجَلُ [above], according to analogy (Jrb). This Kasra is not like the Kasra in [the dial. of those who say (M, Jrb)] یَعَلَمُ (M, R, Jrb) and یَعَلَمُ (R), since they [who pronounce the aoristic letter there with Kasr (IY, R)] do not pronounce the ی with Kasr (IY, R, Jrb), as یَعَلَمُ [404] (IY, R), because they deem beginning with a ی pronounced with Kasr to be heavy; for which reason no n. is found whose initial is a ی pronounced with Kasr, except یَسَر [699] (IY): whereas here the ی is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the , may be converted into ی [above]. Jh says in the ِسَحَّا* (Jrb), یَبِیجَلُ with Kasr of the ی is according to the dial. of the Banū Asad, who say ْنَخْصُنُ نَبِیجَلُ, ْأَنَا «یَبِیجَلُ» I fear, ْأَنَا ْنَبِیجَلُ We fear, and ْأَنَّ تَبِیجَلُ Thou fearest, all with Kasr; and, while not pronouncing the ی with Kasr in یَعَلَمُ, because they deem Kasr upon the [initial] ی to be heavy, pronounce [it] with Kasr in یَبِیجَلُ, in order that one of the two یs may be strengthened by the other (Jh,
Jrb). And its *imp.* is یَبَحْلُ, the, becoming اَلَّاق from the Kasra of the letter before it (Jh). The language of Sf and F appears to indicate that conversion of the, in یَبَحْلُ [above] and یَبَحْلُ [699, 700] into ی or اَلَّاق is regular [703], even though it be rare. Sf says "They convert the اَلَّاق into ی in یَبَحْلُ and what resembles them, saying یَبَحْلُ and اَلَّاق", and F says "As for [the aor. of] فَعَلَ, اَلَّاق, یَبَحْلُ, اَلَّاق, and اَلَّاق, اَلَّاق, it has four *dial. vars.*"; [while the language of Jh and IY above is to the like effect]. But this is contrary to what IH appears to say—I mean his saying that such and such [forms] "are anomalous in the aor. of اَلَّاق" [above], which imports that the forms mentioned are peculiar to [the aor. of] this word (R). And some of the Arabs say یَبَحْلُ [above] and یَبَحْلُ [684] (M, R), for یَبَحْلُ and یَبَحْلُ [482] (M), converting the ی that occurs in the aor. between the ی pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha [into ی], for conformity with the اَلَّاق [above]. This [conversion], like [that in] such as یَبَحْلُ and یَبَحْلُ [above], is [found] only in the [aor.] pronounced with Fath of the اَلَّاق; and, says S, is not regular. The [initial] اَلَّاق is not pronounced with Kasr here, as in یَبَحْلُ [above], because that is [done], in the aor. whose ف is a ی, with the intent that the cause
for conversion of the, may appear, as before explained (R).

§ 702. When فَأَمِّنَ أَمْرُ أَكَلَ ate, commanded, [and was safe (IV),] in which case was eaten away, corroded, obeyed, [and trusted (IV),] are said (M), ای being substituted for the Hamza, because quiescent and preceded by the conj. Hamza pronounced with Kasr [661], on the principle of its conversion in ذَيَبُ [658, 685] (IV), the ای is not incorporated into the ای as and ای [689, 699], because here it is not permanent (M). As for the whose ف is Hamza, as ایتَرَ put on, or wore, a waist-wraper [below] and ایتَسَنَ [above] its ای is not converted into ت, because, though: conversion of its Hamza into ای is necessary with the conj. Hamza pronounced with Kasr [661], while the predicament of the unsound letter necessarily converted from Hamza is [the same as] that of the unsound letter [689, 699], not [as] that of Hamza [733], still, since the conj. Hamza is not inseparable, as when you say [pronounced] قَالَ اتَنْتَرَ He said “Put on a waist-wraper”; in which case the Hamza returns to its o. f., the general rule of
Hamza [738] is observed (R). In you say [above] (Aud), by changing its Hamza into (Tsr); but change of the into , and incorporation of the latter into the , are not allowable, because this is a subst. for a Hamza, and is not original (Aud). The saying [from (Tsr)] is wrong (M, Tsr): so says Sd (Tsr). And [661] from is anomalous (Aud), which IM indicates by his saying [in continuation of the passage quoted in §. 689] (Tsr) "But this [change of the of into (A)], in the case of Hamza, as in [and for (A)], with the changed into , and then incorporated into the , and similarly in for (A), is anomalous" (IM): whereas in the Tashil he makes it rare, saying "And sometimes it is changed, when it is a subst. for Hamza"; while the author of the Aud, in his Glosses on the Tashil, says "The ex. of it in the , is the saying of some , and in the is the saying of some " (Tsr). The chaste dial., in all of that, makes no change [of the or into ], otherwise two transformations would occur consecutively (A). And the saying of Jh that took for himself [699] is a mistake (Aud,
A) because, if it were from اُنْتَفَعَ without [change and (Sn)] incorporation would necessarily be said so says Sd (Tsr, Sn), as [is stated] in the Tsr (Sn). Its [first (Sn)] ْتُفَعَّلَ is original; [not a subst. for a ى substituted for a Hamza, as Jh asserts (Sn)]. [took for himself (Tsr)], like ِإِنَّ ْلَتَهْبَ being from ْتُحَدَّث ْلَتَهْبَ, followed (Aud. A): so says F (Tsr). Zj contests the existence of the crude-form ْتُحَدَّث ْلَتَهْبَ, asserting that is orig. ِإِنَّ ْلَتَهْبَ from اُنْتَفَعَ, as Jh asserts; or from اُنْتَفَعَ, as A transmits below (Sn);] but is cut down (A), the conj. Hamza and the ْل of ِإِنَّ ْلَتَهْبَ being elided from it; and, the ْل, which is the ف of the word, being pronounced with Fath, and the خ with Kasr (Sn). But F's opinion is verified by their saying, transmitted by AZ, oor. اَنْتَفَعَ, َبَعْضَ, َبَعْضَ, inf. n. اُنْتَفَعَ [696A] (A), of the conjg. of َبَعْضَ; though the خ of the inf. n. is sometimes made quiescent: so says Fm in the Msb (Sn). Some [of the moderns (A)] hold اُنْتَفَعَ to be an instance of the whose ف is changed into ْل (A, Tsr), according to the chastest dial. [689] (A), because اُنْتَفَعَ has a dial. var. ْلُعْلَأ with ْل [699] (A, Tsr), in which case the ْل is not original; and, according to this, اُنْتَفَعَ is said, like اُنْتَفَعَ [689, 699] (Tsr). And, though this dial.
var. is rare, still the formation of إِنْخذُ (Sn), is better [than making it إِنْتَعَلَ (Sn)], because they unequivocally lay down that إِنْسِن [661] is a corrupt dial. var. (A). But [some of (R)] the Bdd [are reported to (Tsr)] allow conversion [of the ی into ت (R)] in the case of Hamza, [transmitting certain words (Tsr)] as [instances of that, vid. (Tsr)] إِنْتَعَلَ, إِنْسِن (R, Tsr), إِنْتَعَلَ إِنْسِنُ (Tsr); and إِنْسِنَ took example (R), whence the tradition [661]: so in all the versions of the مَوَاذِئَة (Tsr) on Tradition, by the Imam MIAAN (HKh). And فَنَبَّأَ اَلْذِي أَنْبَأَ أَمَانَةُ II.283. Then let him that hath been entrusted repay his trust [658] is [reported to be (K)] anomalously read (R) by ‘Āṣim (K), with incorporation of the ی [in أَلْدِرَةِ ٌ] into the ت (K, B), by analogy to إِنْتَعَلَ (K); but it is wrong, because the [ی (K)] converted from the Hamza is in the predicament of Hamza (K, B), and is therefore not incorporated [738] (B). And إِنْتَعَلَ [above] is vulgar; and so is زِيَا [685, 716] for زِيَا [272, 658] (K).
THE  AND Ы AS ﻋ S.

§ 703. They are transformed, elided, or preserved (M). Transformation is alteration [697] of form (IY). The transformation occurring in the ﻋ is by conversion, by transfer of the vowel and quiescence, or by elision. As for the first [mode], it has three divisions, conversion of ﻋ and Ы into ١ [684]; conversion of both into Hamza [683]; and conversion of one into the other, i.e., of ﻋ into Ы [685], or the converse [686] (Jrb). The ﻋ and Ы are converted into ١ when they are mobile [below], and preceded by a letter pronounced, or virtually pronounced, with Fath [712, 714] (SH). IH's saying "mobile" [above] means "orig.", thus excluding such as ضَرُّ light and شِيّ [658], when aleviated; and "permanently", to exclude such as بَيْضَات and جُرَآت [240], according to the Banu Tamím (R), or rather Hudhair (MAR). They are then converted into ١ for two reasons:—(1) that each of them is construed as equivalent to two vowels [697]; so that, if its own vowel and the vowel of the preceding letter be joined to it, four consecutive vowels are constructively combined in one word; and, that being deemed heavy, they avoid it by converting the ﻋ or Ы into ١, in order that it may be homogeneous with the vowel of the preceding letter:
(2) that the ﺖ and ﻰ, when mobile, are, each of them, equivalent to a letter of prolongation, and part of one [697], or to two letters of prolongation; the ﺖ, pronounced with Fath, Kasr, and Damm being like a, and ﺏ, ﺏ, and ﻰ, and two, s, respectively; while the predicament of the ﻰ is similar: and, the combination of unsound letters being deemed heavy, they convert the ﺖ or ﻰ into ﻖ, because this is a letter with which one is safe from any vowel [711] (Jrb). The cause for conversion of the mobile ﺖ and ﻰ, preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, into ﻖ is not very substantial, since they are converted into ﻖ because deemed heavy; whereas, when the letter before them is pronounced with Fath, their heaviness is lightened, even if they also be mobile; while Fatha does not require ﻖ to occur after it, as Damma requires ﺖ, and Kasra ﻰ, since such as ﻖ ﻖ ﻖ and ﻖ ﻖ [below] are frequent, while such as ﻖ ﻖ ﻖ and ﻖ ﻖ with Damm, and ﻖ ﻖ and ﻖ with Kasr, of the ﺖ are not to be found [713]: but, nevertheless, they, though lighter than all the sound letters, are converted into ﻖ; because the large circulation of the unsound letters, of which they are the heaviest, allows them to be converted into that unsound letter which is lighter than they, vid. ﻖ; and especially when they are heavy, by reason of the vowel; and when a cause for alleviating them, by conversion into ﻖ, is ready at hand, through
the preceding letter's being pronounced with Fath, since Fatha is akin to ١ [697]. And, from the infirmity of this cause, (1) they are converted into ١ only when they are at the end, i.e., when ج s [719, 723, 728]; or near the end, i.e., when خ s; not when ف s, as in دز and دیل [663, 683], although the vowel [on them here] is permanent after [its] supervision: because alleviation is more suitable to the final: (2) it is restrained from taking effect by the least accident, as when another [unsound] letter is there, which [by reason of its position as a ج] is worthier of conversion; but is not converted, from the breach of some condition of its transformation, [e.g., that the preceding letter should be pronounced with Fath]: for, in that case, you do not convert the letter the cause of whose conversion exists, because of the non-conversion of the letter that, if the preceding letter were pronounced with Fath, as in روز drew water, related and کری twisted, would be worthier of conversion; so that, [since the ج is not converted into ١] when the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr, [as in علوّر hungered and حیّا lived (MAR)], the خ [also] is not converted into ١ [728, 729], although the conditions of its conversion are combined. The weakness of this cause, then, being established, we say
that it is principally effective in the v. [667, 684 (condition 11, a), 711, 712], to which, because of its heaviness, alleviation is more suitable. And in the v. this transformation is of two kinds, (1) original, vid. where the ٰ or ى is mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as ٠بَعْ[684]: (2) conformable to the original, vid. where the ٰ or ى is pronounced with Fath after a letter pronounced with Fath in the tril. pret., which occurs in (a) the aor., (a) act., like يُخَافِ [697, 704] and يَهَابُ reverences [704]; (b) pass., like يُخَافُ is feared and يَهَابُ is reverenced: (b) the pret. of two conjugs. in the augmented tril., أَتْفَۡلَ as set upright and أَبَانُ separated; and إِسْتَفَعَلَ, as إِسْتَقَامَ appraised and إِسْتُبَانَ made plain: and their pass. aors., as يُقَامَ is set upright and يَبَانُ is separated, يُسْتَقَامَ is appraised and يَسْتُبَانَ is made plain. Only the aor. whose ٰ or ى is [orig.] pronounced with Fath, [as يُخَافِ and يَهَابُ, ] not the one whose ٰ or ى is [orig.] pronounced with Damm, as يَقُومُ, or Kasr, as يُبيِّعُ and يُقِيمُ, is conformable to the tril. pret. in this conversion, because the inducement to transfer [697], in the whole of that, whether the َعَ be pronounced with Fath, Damm, or Kasr, is imitation of the original by the deriv. in quiescence of the َعَ, together with indication of the mode of formation, which [indication] is not possible
with conversion of the whole into ل [below]. The نس. subjected to this transformation are only four sorts [714], (1, 2) two resembling the ل, that being regarded because of what we have mentioned, vid. that transformation is principally in the ل; and that this cause [of conversion into ل], not being strong, is more suitable to the ل: — (a) that [تيل. ن.] which is commensurable with the ل, as (a) تاب and باب [278, 684], orig. رجل مال and تيب and بو and (b) a wealthy man [278, 682, 683] and نويل مول and نويل with Kasr of the ل; and similarly كبش صاف a woolly ram [278, 708]: (α) by its commensurability with the ل. we mean here its equality with the ل. in number of letters, and in special vowels, though it differ from the ل. in the special augments and their places: so that مفعّل [712, 714] is on the measure of مفعّل, though its augment is not that of مفعّل; and فاعل [708] is commensurable with مفعّل [343, 712, 714], though its augment is not that of مفعّل, nor is the place of its augment that of the augment of مفعّل: (β) the تيل. ن. is either unaugmented [711], or augmented [712]: (γ) as for the quad. and quin., they are not commensurable with their ل, except the cat. of جَعْفَر [392], as جَعْفَر [374], where the ل. and ل. being co-ordinative [712], because the ل. and ل. with three
words are only aug. [674, 675], is not transformed, in order that the formation of co-ordination may be preserved: (b) the n. containing اً or ی pronounced with Fath, when it is a regular inf. n. conformable to its v. in keeping its augments in the same relative positions as those of the v., like یستتقّوم [338, 697, 699, 709, 714], in which case, by reason of its perfect correspondence to its v., it is transformed in the same way as the latter, by transferring the vowel of the, and ی to the preceding letter, and converting them into !: (3, 4) two sorts of ultimate pl. [256], vid. the cat. of یبَّوَانَغ [715], and the cat. of یعَجَرَز [246, 683 (case 3), 717], which, though they do not resemble the v., are subjected to the transformation mentioned, because of the اً of the pl. in one of them, and the intention to distinguish in the other [708] (R). That [conversion into اً] is [found] (Jrb) in (1) a tril. n., as (a) یبَب ثابْ [above] (SH) : (b) لَع یکَش صَقِف (R) and لَع جَلَّ مَال [above], and لَع (M) cowardly, which is لَع حَجَب [348, 368], from لَع was cowardly, aor. لَع بَلْيغ; though ISk transmits لَع I was cowardly, aor. لَع (IY): (2) a v., (a) قَأَم [684]: (b) conformable to the tril., as قَأَم [above] and قَأَم [above] offered for sale (SH), and قَأَم [above] (R): (a) hence قَأَم [was humble,
Submissive (H)], contrary to the opinion of most (SH); because it is from ِکَانٍ was (Jrb), meaning came to have a being contrary to his being, like ِعَسْتَخَالٍ altered from state to state, except that ِعَسْتَخَالٍ is general, applicable to every state, while ِعَسْتَگَانٍ is peculiar to alteration from a particular being, vid. the contrary of humility and submission; or from ِکَیْنٍ clitoris, because it is in a most low and humble position, meaning became like it in contemptibleness (H): not ِفَٰکَوْن اِفْتَعَلٍ from ِقَؤِسٍence (Jrb), with ٌ added for impletion of the Fatha (H), because [such] addition [of the letter of prolongation, as in ٌمَنَّرَحٍ (Jrb), whence

ٍفَٰکَت من الْفَوْرَائِل حِين تُرَمَي ُو ِمِن ذُم الْرِّجَال بِمَنَّرَحٍ (H), by Ibrahim Ibn Harma, lamenting his son, Then thou from the calamities, when they shoot, and from the blame of men, art far removed (Jh), i. e.; ٍبِمَنَّرَحٍ (H),] is improbable; and because they say ِعِسْتَگَانةٍ (SH) for its inf. n. (Jrb); and, says F, ِعِسْتَگَانٍ for its act. part, as in the saying of Ibn Ahmar

ٍفَلا تَصْلُى بِمَطْرَقٍ إِذَا مَا ِسَرِى فِي الْقُرُؤَ أَصْحَبُ ِعِسْتَگِانًا

Then put not up with a flabby man, who, whenever he journeys by night among the folk, is humble in the
morning; and also [for its aor.] (H): (b) the
tril. v. is sometimes conformable to the tril., as [above], ṣayd, and ṣayb [above], because the aor., being a deriv. of the pret., since it is the pret. with the addition of the aoristic letter [404], is transformed by reason of the transformation of the pret. (R): (3) a n. conformable to 2 (a) or 2 (b), as ṣam'a and ṣam' [338, 697] (SH), conformable to ṣam'a and ṣam' respectively (Jrb); and ṣam'a and ṣam' [712] (SH), conformable to ṣam'a and ṣam' respectively (Jrb): contrary to (1) and ṣam'a [663, 684 (condition 1), 698] (SH), where the, and ʾay are quiescent (R, Jrb): ʾalāʾiṣ [298, 311, 684] and ṣājil [333, 674] being anomalous (SH): (a) we have mentioned that such as ṣājil is regular, though weak [684, 701]: (b) similarly some of the Hijāzīs regularly convert the quiescent ʾa' with ʾa in the aor. of such as ʾaʾnassarwa into ʾa ʾanassarwa [701]: (c) some of the Banū Tamīm regularly convert the [quiescent] ʾa in such as ʾaʾlān children, i.e. the pl. of that [n.] whose ʾa is a ʾa, into ʾa, as ʾaʾlān: (d) when ʾa is mobilized with an uninflectional Fathā, and is final, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, Tayyī [regularly] pronounce the letter before the ʾa with Fathā, in order that the ʾa may be converted into ʾa, [as ʾaʾrās and ʾaʾrās for ʾaʾba]
and رَضَى (349, 482, 724) (T, MAR),] because the final is the seat of alteration and alleviation; (a) Fatha of the ي is stipulated [above], in order that it may be transferred to the preceding letter; and its being uninfl ectional, in order that, not being adventitious, it may be taken into account; and the preceding letter's being pronounced with Kasr, because, Kasr being the brother of quiescence, as is plain [from what is stated] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents [663, 664], it is as though you transferred the Fatha to a quiescent [697], as in [آقُومَا [above]: (b) a poet [of the Banū Baulān, of Tayy (T),] says تَسْتَقَوْدُ الْقَبَلَ بِالْحَضَيضِ يُقَصُّ . ثَانِيَةً نُفُورًا بَنَتَّ عَلَى الْكَرْمَ (R), orig. بَنُيَطَ (T, MAR), the ن. being pronounced with Fatha, and the ي then changed into ل, which is elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents (MAR).

Making the arrows strike fire from the stones in the depressed ground at the bottom of the mountain, and hunting souls formed in honor meaning that the حرب war [in the preceding verse] was doing that (T): (c) if the ي be intermediate, because of the inseparable س [266], as in ناصِية [349, 482] for ناصِية, [and بَادِية for بَادِية desert (T),] such conversion is rare, not regular (R): (2) كَأَوْل (683 (case 1, a))ه convers'd
together and ٌبَّأَعُ trafficked, one with another, ٌبَّأَعُ was established [730. A] and ٌبَّأَعُ was explained, ٌبَّأَعُ was plain (SH), i.e., the augmented *tril.* [v.] (R), where the letter before the [mobile] َىٰ is quiescent (R, Jrb), but that quiescent is not a letter pronounced with Fath in the [unaugmented] *tril.* (R): (a) َقَارَلْ and َتَقَارَلْ, etc., are not made to conform to the *tril.*, as are ِءَسْتَقُومُ and ٌبَّأَعُ ِءَسْتَقُومُ, َبَّأَعُ ٌبَّأَعُ because we stipulated [above] that the quiescent before the mobile َىٰ or َىٰ should be pronounced with Fath in the *tril. pret.*: (b) if you say "Do you not transform the act. part. in َبَّأَعُ and َقَكَلْ by converting the َىٰ or َىٰ into َلْ [683, 708, 712], notwithstanding that it is preceded by an َلْ, and is in the َلْ, where transformation is contrary to the general rule, it being generally in the َلْ?", I say "The case is so, except that َبَّأَعُ and َقَكَلْ have the sense, and government, of the َلْ, and belong to the *conj. of the [unaugmented] tril.* [343], contrary to َبَّأَعُ and َقَارَلْ. " (c) if you then say "But ٌبَّأَعُ and ٌبَّأَعُ belong to other, [i.e.,] *non-tril., conjugs. ", I say "Yes, except that the letter before the unsound letter [here] is the one pronounced with Fath [before the unsound letter] in the *tril.*: (d) the [rule] intended is that, when the deriv. belongs to a *conjug.* other than that of the original, it needs, [as a qualification] for transformation, that the
quiescent before the unsound letter [in it] should be the letter pronounced with Fath before the unsound letter in the original; but that, if the deriv. belong to the conjug. of the original, it is transformed, even though the quiescent [before the unsound letter in it] be not that letter pronounced with Fath [before the unsound letter in the original], provided that the quiescent be an ِ, because of its excessive lightness: (e) as for transformation of تَبَيّن and تَقَوَّم and قَوْم, it would be more strange than transformation of كَأَوْل and كَبَاع, because incorporation of the ع in the [first] two conjugs. is necessary (R). Such as صَبُّدْ قُوَّدَ [684], and [عَلَّمْ أَطْبُ، أَطْرَفَ (R),] أَعْمَعْتَ أَخْحَاتَ [It (the sky) became rainy (R)]. It became cloudy, and [She suckled notwithstanding pregnancy (R)], are anomalous [711, 707] (SH); and similarly deemed right, إِسْتَمْرَّح آلْدِرُ عَرْفَ يَسْمَئُلُ the odour, and إِسْتَنْسَحَد [707]. AZ allows the conjugs. of إِسْتَفْعَال to be treated as sound unrestrictedly, regularly, when they have no tril. v., like إِسْتَنْقَق [became a she-camel (MAR)]: but, according to S, such as also is anomalous, analogy requiring it to be transformed, for uniformity of the conjug., as the rel. ns. سَأْئُبَ [312] from سِيفُ sword and خَيلُ horses.
are transformed, although no transformed \( v. \) comes from them, for uniformity of the cat. of َناعل \[683, 708\]; and, since َنعيد, َنعيد, and َنعيد are made uniform [with َنعيد], this [opinion] is more probable. So says that the whole of the anomalies mentioned have been heard transformed also, according to rule, except ِناريخ, ِناريخ, and ِناريخ; and that there is nothing to prevent their transformation too, even if it have not been heard, because transformation is frequent, regular; while the only reason for not transforming these \( vs. \) is to indicate that the transformation in their like is not original, but for conformity with what is transformed (R). The َو, and َى are made quiescent, their vowel being transferred to the preceding letter, in such as َيقول says and َيبيع sells [697, 704, 721], because of their liability to confusion with the conj. of َيقلاع [below] and َيهاب (SH), if they were made to accord with the pret. in conversion of their unsound letter into ِل (MASH). When the َو, and َى are mobile, and what precedes them is quiescent, analogy requires that they should not be transformed, because that [combination] is light: but, if that happen to be in a \( v. \) whose َى \( f. \) is transformed by quiescence of the َع [through conversion of َو or َى into ِل], or in a \( n. \) conformable to such a \( v. \), the َع of that \( v. \) or \( n. \) is made quiescent in imitation of its
o. f.; and, after the quiescence, the vowel [of the ع] is transferred to that preceding quiescent, to notify the mode of formation [below], [i.e., the measure,] because the measures of the v. vary only through the vowels of the ع [482, 704]. This quiescence is principally in the v., not the n., because the v. is heavier (R). When the ع of the v. [712] is a, or ى preceded by a sound quiescent, the vowel of the ع, being deemed heavy on the unsound letter, must be transferred to the sound quiescent, as ٌيقُرُمُ يَبِينُ stands and ُيِبِينُ is plain, orig. ٌيقُرُمُ يُبِينُ and ُيِبِينُ with Damm of the ؤ, and Kasr of the ى, the vowel of the ؤ and ى being transferred to the preceding quiescent, vid. the ؤ of ِبُيِبُمُ and the ب of ِبُيِبُمُ; so that the ؤ and ى become quiescent (A). In the augmented conjugs. [also] of these tril. vs. unsound [in the ع], when the letter before the unsound letter is orig. quiescent, and is not an ى, or ى, you make the unsound [letter] quiescent, transferring its vowel to the quiescent; and that is regular in their speech, as أَبَانَ [below] إِسْتَرَآىٌ [697] أَخَافُ deemed tardy and sought protection: but, when the letter before the un. and [letter] is mobile, it is not altered, as إِحْتَارَ [706, 707]. إِنْضَافُ became accustomed, and إِنْفَاسُ was measurable (S). And, when the vowels are transferred to the letter before the ؤ and ى, then, (1) if the vowel be Fatha, the
and ی are converted into ی, as یُحَابُ and یُحَاقُ [728], because, when transformation of the deriv. in exactly the same way as the original is possible, it is more appropriate: (2) if the vowel be Kasra or یم, their conversion into ی is not possible, because ی follows only یث: so that they remain unaltered, as یقُومُ [above]; except the ی, pronounced with Kasr, which is converted into ی، as یضیع [below] and یقُيمُ [above]; orig. یقُومُ یضیع, because it becomes quiescent [and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)] (R). The ی [therefore], if homogeneous with the transferred vowel, [being a ی, when the vowel is یم, or a ی when the vowel is Kasra (Sn),] is not altered by more than quiescence after the transfer, as above exemplified [in یقُومُ and یَبِينُ (Sn)]: (2) if not homogeneous with the vowel, is changed into a letter homogeneous with it, as (a) یبَانَ [above], orig. یبَينَ and یبَينَ, where the ی, when the Fatha is transferred to the quiescent, remains not homogeneous with it; and is therefore converted into ی, because orig. یبَينَ, and [now (Sn)] preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha [684]: (b) یقُيمُ [above], orig. یقُومُ, where the ی, when the Kasra is transferred to the quiescent, remains not homogeneous with it; and is therefore converted into ی، because quiescent, and preceded by a
letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)] (A). Although the pret. is the o. f. of the aor., يَبِعِّيْم و يُقْرُوم and are not transformed in the same way as their pret., on the plea that the , and ك, being mobile, and preceded by a letter constructively pronounced with Fath from regard to the o. f., vid. the pret., should be converted into ٌ, as يَبِعِّيْم و يُقْرُوم, because, if so treated, they would be confounded with the conjug. of يَبِعِّيْم [above] (R). And مَعُون and مَفَعُول are similar (SH), as مَعُون and مَفَعُول [333] (Jrb); and so is مَفَعُول [697, 714], as مَعُون and مَفَعُول [347, 709] (SH). The n. conformable to the v. in this transfer is of two sorts, (1) the augmented tril. commensurable with the v. in the manner above mentioned under conversion of the , and ك into ٌ, while differing from the v. in an aug. letter [either] not used as an aug. in the v., like the م of مَقَام [712]; or used as an aug. in the v., [but] mobilized with a vowel not used as its vowel in the v., like [the ب of] مَقَام [712]: (a) مَفَعُول [above] is orig. مَفَعُول [347, 712], which is commensurable with يَبِعِّيْم [436]; and, but for that, it would not be transformed: (b) as for the rest of the pass. parts., they are commensurable with their pass. vs., while differing [from them] in the initial م [347]: (2) a regular inf. n. equal to its v. in keeping its augments in the same relative positions as those of the v., like 159a
connected with vs. [330], where the و and ی, when ی is, mobile, and the preceding letter is quiescent, [but] mobile in the ی. ی. [vid. the tril. pret.,] the vowel of the ی, even if it be Fatha, is transferred to the preceding letter for observance of the mode of formation [above] in the ی. or ی. connected with the ی. [not for distinction between the cats. of ی and ی.] because, in such [words], regard for the mode of formation is possible in those pronounced with Fath of the ی, as in those pronounced with Damm or Kasr; contrary to [those words which have] the [ی or ی] pronounced with Fath and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as یتّاَّبُ and یتّاوَل [705]. For here the ی is quiescent; so that, when it is mobilized with Fatha, and the ی is made quiescent, that [Fatha on the ی. is known to be the vowel of the ی: and here the distinction between the cats. of ی and ی is not observed at all, because that is observed only in case of inability to observe the mode of formation, as [will be] explained [705]; but in the pass. part. [709] that is observed. Do you not see یتّغیَّبُ [above], which, according to Khl, is orig. یتّغیَّبُ [704]? And you say یمِقَمَ and یمُهِبَ [above], یمِقَمَ and یمُهِبَ; and, in the cat. of ی, یبَّاَّغُ and یبَّیَّلِیُ [above], sleeps at midday and یبَّیَّلِیُ.
and sleeping at midday and مَغِيل [333]. Thus you see how, when they are obliged to transform the اٰ, because the words mentioned are conformable to their o. jār., i.e., the tril. pret., they intend, in both sorts, [v. and n.], to explain the mode of formation by transferring the Damma, Kasra, or Fatha to the preceding letter; and do not mind confusion of the cat. of و, with that of ا (R. on the Preterite). This transfer has conditions:— (1) that the quiescent, to which the vowel is transferred, be sound, there being no transfer to it if (a) an unsound letter, as in ٌعَرَق and بَيَّع [above], hindered and (b) a Hamza, as in ُيَأْسَ aor. of ُنَبِس despaired, because it is liable to transformation by conversion into [for alleviation; so that it is, as it were, an I, while I does not receive a vowel (Sn)]: (a) that is categorically declared in the Tashul by IM, who does not except the Hamza here, because he reckons it among the unsound letters [697], so that it is excluded by his saying "sound": (2) that the v. be not (a) a v. of wonder [707], as in مَأْتِيْن آلَشْي How plain the thing is! and. How upright it is!, and أَقْوَمْ يَه* أَقْوُمْ يَا! and أَقْوَمْ يَا! because they make it conform to the n. corresponding to it in measure and indication of excellence, vid. the فعل of superiority [351, 707] (A), which is not transformed, because it is a n. resembling the aor. in measure and
augment [712]: (a) the [v. of wonder] commensurable with the unaffected of superiority is only unaffected, not unaffected; but the latter is made to accord with unaffected: (b) Frd says "AH transmits from Ks that transfer is allowable in [the v. of] wonder, such as أَقَرُّ وَيْلُ إِنْفُلَلٌ, where you say إِنْفُلَلٌ وَيْلُ; but it is weak" (Sn): (b) reduplicated in the ل, as in اِبْيَضَ was white and إِسْوَهُ was black [707], which sort they do not transform, lest one paradigm be mistaken for another, because, if اِبْيَضَ were subjected to the transformation mentioned, باَيْضَ would be said, which one might suppose to be فَانَعْلَ [with Fath of the ع (Sn)] from بدَائِثُ delicaey of complexion: (c) unsound in the ل, as in أَهَوْيَ fell down, where transfer is not introduced, lest two transformations occur consecutively. And IM in the Tashil adds another condition, vid, that the v. do not agree [in sense (Sn)] with فَانَعْلَ [by indicating constitution or color (Sn)], as in غَيْرُ and بُصَيَّد, aor. of غَيْرَ and بُصَيَّد [707]; and similarly their variations, as أَعْوَةَ صَيِّدَةَ God blinded him of one eye: but here he dispenses with the mention of it, seemingly by reason of its previous mention [by implication, not explicitly (Sn).] in his saying "But the أَعْنَ بِلَّ and فَانَعْلَ, when possessed of فَانَعْلَ ..... is sounded true" [684 (conditions 7 and 8, a)].
since the cause [of the sounding true, both here and there (Sn),] is one (A), vid. conformity with ٌفُعَلٌ (Sn). The, and ی are elided (SH), (1) necessarily, in two positions, (а) where quiescence of the final happens to be necessitated by (α) attachment of the pron. (Jrb) in such as ُقُلُتْ I said and ُبِعْتُ I sold [403, 697] They [fem.] said and ُبِعْنَ They [fem.] sold: (α) the initial is pronounced with Kasr, if the ُع be [either] a ی, [as in ُبِعْتُ (Jrb):] or [a ُر (Jrb)] pronounced with Kasr, [as in ُعْفُتُ (Jrb):] and with Damm in other cases (SH), as in ُقُلُتْ [403, 484, 626, 705] (Jrb): (β) this, however, is not done by them in ُلَسْتُ I am not, [which, notwithstanding that it belongs to the conjug. of ُفَعَلَ with Kasr of the ُع (456, 707), does not have the ُل pronounced with Kasr (R),] because it resembles the p. [403] (SH) in aplasticity (Jrb): for, since it is aplastic [447], the Kasra is elided as forgotten, and is not transferred to the letter before the ی; so that ِلَسْتَ becomes like ِلَيْتَ [516, 538] (R): (γ) for the same reason they make the ی quiescent [707] (SH), i. e., do not convert it into ی because that is a variation, as is transfer of the vowel of the ی to the preceding letter; so that, since the ی is aplastic, it is not varied by conversion or transfer, but the vowel is elided as forgotten (R): (b) apocopation, as
in did not say and did not sell [697]; or quasi-apocopeation, as (Jrb) in َقَلَّ say and ِبَعَلُ sell [663, 697], because they are [deriv. (Jrb)] from ِبَعَلُ and َقَلَّ [428, 431] (SH), and therefore do not differ from them in َدَمَّامَة or َكَسَّرَة [of the ف] (Jrb): (b) in [such as (Jrb)] ِإِسْتَقَامَةٌ [above] (SH), orig. َإِصْرَأَمَ and ِإِسْتَقَامَ [697], where they convert the َع into ٍ for conformity with ِإِقَامَ and ِإِسْتَقَامَ [above]; and, since two ِس, the ٍ that is [converted from] the َع, and the aug. ٍ, then concurs, the first is elided (Jrb): (a) what IH mentions as to elision of the ٍ converted from the َع, or َي is the opinion of Akh [338]; while, according to Khl and S, the elided is the aug., as they say on the َع of َمَفْعُولٍ [709]: but the saying of Akh is more suitable, by analogy to other cases where two quiescents concur [663] (R): (b) some Commentators state that the mention of ِإِسْتَقَامَةٌ and ِإِسْتَقَامَةٌ is a repetition; but the answer is that they are mentioned above because of the conversion of the َع into ٍ, and here because of the lision (Jrb): (2) allowably, in such as (a) ُمَيْتََ سَيْلَ and ُمَيْتَ [251, 635 (case 7, a, α)] (SH), which then remain ُسَيْلَ and ُمَيْتَ, with a single ِى (MASH); the second ِى being elided from them for alleviation, because of the combination of two ِس and a Kasra (Jrb): the poet 'Adī Ibn
ArRā'ālā alGhassānī (Jsh) says, [combining مَيْتٌ and مَيْتٌ in one verse (Jh).]

(331) He that has died, and taken his rest, is not really dead: the really dead is only the dead of the living, i. e., is only he that is living, while his state is like that of the dead (Jsh): (b) كَيْنُونَةٌ and قُلُولَةٌ (SH), with Fath of the ع (MASH): (a) this requires consideration (R, Jrb), because elision is allowable in such as سَيِّئٌ, necessary in such as كَيْنُونَةٌ [below] (R); since ns. like قُلُولَةٌ and كَيْنُونَةٌ have no o. f. used, from which they might be abbreviated (Jrb); except [extraordinarily (Jrb)] in [poetic license, as (R)]

[below] (R, Jrb) O would that we and the beloved were so placed that a boat held us, to the end that union might return in being!, كَيْنُونَةٌ being in the acc. as a sp. (Jsh): (b) there is no dispute that كَيْنُونَةٌ is altered from its o. f., because there is no dispute [331] in their language, except extraordinarily, like صَيْفُونَة swerving, deflection, [an inf. n. of فَعْلُوْلَةٌ صَافُ السَّمِع عَنَّ الْتَّهْدِيْفَ The arrow swerved, or deflected, from the butt, aor. (Jh, KF)]: but the BB say that it is altered from كَيْنُونَةٌ [331], the ع being
elided, as is proved by its reversion in [above], and by the existence of like [398]; while the KK say that it is altered by changing the Damma of its initial into Fatha, being orig. [below], like nature, which is weak, because, if it were so, there would be no reason for changing the into ى, and the Damma into Fatha (Jrh); (c) according to S, such as ُسَيَّد ُمَيْت are ُقِيَّلٌ with Kasr of the ع [251, 373, 685, 716]; while ُكِيْلُوَةٌ ُكِرْبُوَةٌ are ُقِيَّلُوَةٌ ُكِرْبُوَةٌ, with Fath of the ع, on the measure of [old woman (KF)], except that the ْج is repeated, and the ُس inseparable: (d) since neither ُقِيَّلٌ with Kasr of the ع, nor the inf. n. ُقِيَّلُوَةٌ [331], is found in any formation other than the hollow, some judge ُسَيَّد ُمَيْت to be orig. ُقِيَّلٌ with Fath of the ع, like ُصَرَبَر [373]; but pronounced with Kasr irregularly, like ُبَصْرَيَّ with Kasr of the ف, and ُذَهْرِيَّ with Dam [311]: (e) S, however, says that, if they were [orig.] pronounced with Fath of the ع, they would not be altered; [but would be] like ُتَيْبَانٌ ُتَيْبَانٌ [390]: and the use of ُقِيَّلٌ would be commonly allowable, whereas no ُقِيَّلٌ has been heard from the hollow, except ُعَيْن, as ُمَا بَالَ ُعَيْن [251]: (e) Fr, also endeavouring to avoid the formation ُقِيَّلٌ with Kasr of the ع, says that ُجَيْدٌ [251] is
orig. ْطَيِّبٌ, like ْطَيِّبٌ [343]; but that, the ْوُصَٰلَةُ [pronounced with Kasr] being transferred to the position of the ْيُ, and the [quiescent] ْيُ to the position of the ْوُ, [as ْجُيِّرٌ, ] the ْوُ is converted into ْيُ, and [has the quiescent ْيُ] incorporated [into it]: (α) he says that ْطَيِّبٌ is anomalous, this transformation, says he, becoming regular in the assimilate ep., because it is like, and has the same government as, the v. ; whereas, if ْعِبَّلَ be not an ep., like ْعِبَّلَ a wailing, it is not subjected to this transformation: (f) he says that ْثَكَّرُةٌ and the like are orig. [as] ْثَكَّرُةٌ فَعْلُولَةٌ [above], like ْبُهْلَؤُ [252, 390] and صُنْدُوقيَّ chest, coffer: but that, since most of these inf. ns. are scions of ْيُ, as ْصَارَ became, inf. n. ْصَيَرَّةٌ [381], and ْسَارَ journeyed, inf. n. ْسَيِّرَةٌ, they pronounce the ف with Fath, so that the ْيُ may be preserved, because the cat. belongs to ْيُ [below]; and then make the scions of ْوُ conform to those of ْيُ, converting the [first] ْسَيِّرَةٌ into ْيُ in ْكُونُةٌ ْثَكَّرُةٌ ْثَكَّرُةٌ ْثَكَّرُةٌ ْثَكَّرُةٌ ْثَكَّرُةٌ, for conformity with ْسَيِّرَةٌ: (α) this is as he says that ْقَضَى [247] is orig. ْقَضَى, like ْغَرِى [247]; but that, deeming the double ْعُ heavy, they make it single, and put the ْى as a compensation for the elided letter: (g) the saying of S, in all of this, is more probable, vid. that some predicaments are peculiar to some cats.: so that there is nothing objectionable.
in peculiarity of قَيِّعَلْ with Kasr of the أ to the hollow, and of قَيِّعَلْ with Fath of the أ to [the n.] other than the hollow; and since, according to Fr, putting the أ [of the ep. قَيِّعَلْ] before the أ, and, according to those others, transfer of قَيِّعَلْ with Fath to قَيِّعَلْ with Kasr, may be peculiar to the hollow, there is nothing to prevent the formation قَيِّعَلْ from being peculiar to it: and similarly there is nothing objectionable in peculiarity of قَيِّعَلْة [331] to the inf. n. of the hollow, or قَيِّعَلْة [247] with Damm of the ل to the pl. of the defective; while the saying of Fr that they make أ predominate over أ, because the cat. belongs to أ [above], is of no account, since inf. ns. of this measure are rare, and, in those which occur, the scions of أ, like كِئُودَة [above], حَيَلَلة قَيِّدُودَة leading, and قَيِّدُودَة intervening, are near, or equal, in number to the scions of أ: (h) the reason why elision is necessary in such as سَيِّدَة and كِئُودَة, contrary to سِيِّد and مَيَت سِيِّد, is that the extreme number of letters reached by a n. through augmentation is seven [368], while these contain six, to which the أ of feminization is invariably attached; so that, since alleviation is allowable in what has fewer letters, like سِيِّد, it is necessary in what has many, like كِئُودَة: (s) rarely, \*sweet basil for رِيحَكْان, or رِيحَكْان, رِيحَكْان.
from ٍ (R). The ُ and ٍ are preserved in other cases, vid. where the causes of transformation and elision are (1) absent (M), as in ٍ َٰلْلُ and ٍ بٌع [above], and what resembles them (IY): (2) present, except that something intervenes, which prevents the execution of their behest, as in ٌصَرَي [684 (condition 11, d), 711] and ٌحِيْدَي [272, 684], ٌحُيْلَان [331, 684 (condition 11, a), 698, 711] and ٌحَيْكَان [inf. n. of حَفَلَ ٌحَيْكَان walked, swaying his shoulders, aor. ٌيَحُيِّكُ (IY)], ٌحِيْكَلَ ٌحَيْكَلَ and ٌحِيْكَل [273] (M).

Such as ٌحَيْرُوُن and ٌحِيْدَي [above], ٌحَيْرُوُن [684 (condition 10, a, b), 698] and ٌحَيْكَان [and ٌحَيْكَان], are [treated as] sound, (1) to notify, by their mobility, the mobility of what they signify; while ٌحَيْرُوُن is [conformable to ٌحَيْرُوُن (Jrb)], because it is its opp. [698] (SH): (a) this is marvellous: for the mobility of the word is not akin to the mobility of what it signifies, except by lit. homonymy, since the meaning of mobility in the word is that you put after the consonant something of ُ or ْ or ٍ [697], as is the well-known [theory]; and, the mobility of the signified being leagues away from this, how can one of them notify the other? (R): or (2) because they are not conformable [331] (SH), like ٍ إِسْتَقَامَةٌ and ٍ إِسْتَقَامَةٌ [above] (R), to the v. (R, Jrb), which is obvious (Jrb); nor agreeable (SH) with it in mobility and quiescence (Jrb), i. e., commensurable with it, like ٍ مَقَامٌ and ٍ مَقَامٌ
[above], بَكَبِّ and دَارِ [711] (R). Moreover جَوَالٌ and غَلْيَانٌ [331, 719], in which the unsound letter is [treated as] sound, though it is a ل, which is weak, susceptible of alteration; so that the غ, which is stronger than the ل, because protected [by the subsequent letters of the word], should a fortiori be [treated as] sound. Similarly خَيْلَةٌ قُرْبَانٌ and خَيْلَةٌ قُرْبَانٌ are not transformed, because of their remoteness from the formations of the v., by reason of the two لs of feminization at their end; and, even if no ل of feminization occurred at their end, their formation would still necessitate their being treated as sound, like رَجُلٌ سُوْلَةٌ [711] and an inquisitive man, because of its remoteness from the formations of the v. (IY).

§. 704. The tril. vs. unsound in the غ, (1) if the غ be و, are of three kinds فَعُلُ, فَعَلُّ, and فَعَلْ [482], like the sound: (2) if the غ be ي, are of two kinds, فَعَلُّ and فَعَلْ [705], as though they discarded this formation in this cat. [of the hollow], because of that conversion of the ي into و [686 (case 1)] which would ensue in the aor. (IY). One word of this conjug., however, does occur in the ي cat. of the hollow, vid. كَثِيَّةٌ الرَّجُلٌ meaning The man became possessed of goodly appearance [705, 707], the ي of which is not converted into ل in the pret., because, if it were, then transformation of the aor., by
transfer of the vowel of the ی to the letter before it and conversion of the ی into و, would be necessary, because the aor. follows the pret. in [undergoing] transformation; so that you would say يَعْتُر، aor. يَعُر، and thus transition from a lighter to a heavier [formation] would be produced (R on the Preterite). The formations of the v., (1) in the [cat. of] و, are on [the measure of] (a) [عُنُل], aor. يَعُر, as قال، aor. يَعُر [697, 703] (M); not with Kasr, as [sometimes] occurs in the sound [482], lest, the and becoming ی [685 (case 5)], the scions of be confounded with those of ی (IY): (b) فَعَل, aor. يَعُر, as حَان، aor. يَعُر [697, 703] (M); not with Kasr, except in two words, طَلَّ، aor. يَطْلُ, and تا، aor. يَتَيَّث [below] (IY): (c) فَعَل, aor. يَعُر, as طَلَّ، aor. يَطْلُ; and جَان، aor. يَجْرَن; i. e., became tall, and bountiful: (2) in the [cat. of] ی, are on [the measure of] (a) فَعَل, aor. يَعُر, as بَعَ، aor. يَبِعْ [697, 708]: (b) فَعَل، aor. يَعُر, as هَاب، aor. يَهَاب [703]. And with Kasr does not occur in the [cat. of] و, nor يَعُل in the [cat. of] ی [below]. But Khl asserts that طَلَّ, aor. يَطْلُ [703], and تا، aor. يَتَيَّث lost the way, aor. يَتَيَّث, are فَعَل, aor. يَعُر [above], like حَسَب، aor. يَحْسَب [482, 700]; both being from و, because they say I caused to
perish and I caused to lose the way, and He is more apt to perish than he and more apt to lose the way [below] (M). And [IY agrees that], since they are from their pret. is with Kasr of the, (1) because you say I perished and I lost the way, with Kasr of their ف; whereas, if their pret. were [below] and would be said, with Damm; and, since that is not said, they are proved to be of the class of جفت [403, 484]: (2) because the aor. of, in the cat. of, is only [above] with Damm; so that, since they say يطيع and what we have said is proved. The o. f. of يطيع and يثبتة [703] and يثبتة, the Kasra being transferred from the, to the preceding letter; so that, the, being quiescent, and the preceding letter pronounced with Kasr, the, is converted into ى [685 (case 5)] (IY). But, according to him that says ثبتة and ثبتة, they are [from ى (below), being فعل, aor. يفعل (IY),] like فاع, aor. يبيع [above] (M). IH says that (R) طاح, aor. يطع, and قتة, aor. يثبتة, according to those who say ثبتة and أطبخ, and أطبخ and أطبخ and [above], are anomalous (SH), on the ground that the pret. is فعل with
Fath of the ع, the aor. of which, in the hollow belonging to the cat. of ر, is pronounced only with دامم of the ع (R); or are intermixtures [of dial. vars.] (SH), as [is added] in some MSS of the SH, which seems to have been appended not by IH, but by somebody who, fancying, from regard to what is [stated] in the Jh, that طِلْح, aor. يُطِلْح, is said, takes the pret. from طِلْح, aor. يُطِلْح, belonging to the cat. of ر, and the aor. from طَلْح, aor. يُطِلْح, belonging to the cat. of ع [above]. But the طِلْح mentioned by Jh has not been heard: and, if it were authentic, طِلْح, aor. يُطِلْح, would not be compounded [of two dial. vars.]; but طَلْح, aor. يُطِلْح, would be like قال, aor. يقُول; and طَلْح, aor. يُطِلْح, like بَعْح, aor. يُبِيغ [above]. Nor is what IH says about anomalousness of any account, since, if طِلْح were like قال, then طَلْح [above], like قُلْت [403, 703, 705], would be said, with دامم of the ف, which has not been heard; and it is more proper that, so far as possible, the [form of a] word should not be charged to anomalousness (R on the Aorist). And [يفعُل with] دامم on the ع when a] ي occurs in aor. of عِلْبَر [above] (R on the Preterite).

§ 705. Upon attachment of the [mobile] pron. of the ag., [vid. the the 1st or 2nd pers., and the like
(IY),] they transmute فَعَلُّ; [when it is] from [the cat. of (IY)] و, into فَعَلُّ; and, [when it is] from [the cat. of (IY)] ی, into فَعَلُّ: and then the Damma and Kasra are transferred to the ف, [after removal of the vowel orig. belonging to it (IY); ] so that فَعَلُّ and فَعَلُّ [403, 703] are said (M). If you say “Why do you not assert that the o. f. of فَعَلُّ is with Damm of the ع, and dispense with the trouble of altering [the conjug.?],” one says [in reply] “That would not be correct, because فَعَلُّ occurs only intrans. [432, 484]; whereas you say عُدْتُ الْبَيْضَ I visited the sick and زَرَتْ الْصَّدِيقَ I visited the friend, so that you find فَعَلُّ to be [sometimes] trans.” (IY). IH’s saying about “the conjug. of سَدَّتْ” [484] is an answer to the objection that سَدَّتْ I ruled him and قَلَتْ I said it are orig. سَدَّتْ and قَلَتْ, with Damm of the ع, as is the opinion of Ks [below]; the Damma of the ع being transferred to the ف, and the ع [then] elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that فَعَلُّ does occur trans. : and the answer is a denial that they are orig. pronounced with Damm of the ع, because the unsound, when its case is dubious, is made to accord with the sound; while no فَعَلُّ with Damm occurs trans. in the sound, so that they are orig. with Fath of the ع.
The learned differ about the manner of the transition [from ُعَلَّلَتُ لْأَلْلَّادُو ] to that [form ُلْأَلْلَّادُو ]. Some say that ُعَلَّلَتُ and ُعَلَّلَتُ are orig. ُعَلَّلَتُ and ُعَلَّلَتُ, with Fath of the ُع; but that, since it is known that the ُع would be elided, because of the concurrence of two quiescents [663], upon its conversion into ١ [684, 703], and the ١ of ُع would [then] not be distinguishable from that of ١, [ُعَلَّلَتُ being, in either ١, reduced to ُعَلَّلَتُ, ] they transmute the former into ُعَلَّلَتُ with Damm, and the latter into ُعَلَّلَتُ with Kasr; and then the vowel of the unsound letter is transferred to the َ, and the ُع elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that ُعَلَّلَتُ and ُعَلَّلَتُ are said (Jrb on the Preterite). This is the opinion of many [described by ٌ in §. 484 as "S and the majority of the GG," and among them ٌs [above]; and is adopted by [Z in the M, and] IM in the Tashil (A). But IH refutes this by his saying "not because of transfer" [484], meaning "not because of transfer from the ُع, as some mention", since that would entail transfer from one conjug. to another differing from it in form, as is obvious; and in sense, because of the difference in the meanings [484] of the conjugs. [ُعَلَّلَتُ, ُعَلَّلَتُ, and ُعَلَّلَتُ]: and he points out that the Damm and Kasr are "for explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of the ُع", [484] and ١.
respectively (Jrb). What is meant by "scions of [or ی (Jrb)]" is (Jrb, Sn) its deriv. (Sn), [i.e.,] the unsound [words] belonging to the cat. of ی or ی (Jrb), [here] meaning the words whose ع is ی [or ی ] (Sn). His argument is that the ی and ی, being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, are converted into [684, 703] and elided [663]; and afterwards the ی is pronounced with Damm in the cat. of ی, and Kasr in that of ی, as an indication of them, so that no breach [of formation] may occur. The reason why the earlier [authorities] venture upon the objectionable [theory of transmutation above] mentioned is that, seeing the Arabs make no distinction, in َجوَتُ and َجوَتُ [403, 703], between the ی and ی, they say that, if the vowel were for explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of ی, Damm would be necessary in َجوَتُ: but, in reply to that, IH says that they pronounce [the ی] with Kasr in َجوَتُ for "explanation of the mode of formation" [484]. His argument is that indication of the mode of formation is more important than explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of ی or ی, because the first pertains to the sense, and the second to the form: but that, since indication of the mode of formation is not possible for them in َجوَتُ and َجوَتُ, from fear of missing the object altogether, because, if they pronounced the ی here with Fath, this would not indicate
the vowel of the \( \ddot{e} \), and moreover they would also omit the explanation [of the \( v. \) as one] of the scions of \( \dddot{y} \); contrary to \( \dot{h} \dddot{b} \dot{t} \) and \( \dot{h} \ddot{f} \dot{t} \), which the Kasra shows to be orig. pronounced with Kasr of the \( \dot{e} \), so that here they observe the explanation of the mode of formation (Jrb). And [what] we say [is this]: — The \( \dot{e} \), in \( \dot{v} \dddot{w} \), [403], \( \dot{t} \ddot{a} \dddot{l} \), and the \( \dddot{y} \) in \( \dddot{b} \dddot{y} \) and \( \dddot{h} \dot{r} \dot{f} \), being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is converted into \( \ddot{l} \) [684, 703]; so that they become \( \ddot{m} \ddot{a} \dddot{l} \), and \( \dddot{b} \ddot{a} \dot{g} \) and \( \dddot{h} \dot{a} \dddot{t} \); and, while the \( \ddot{l} \) remains, it is impossible to notify the mode of formation in these conjugs., and that they are orig. [on the measure of] \( \dddot{j} \dddot{\nu} \ddot{\z} \) [704], \( \dddot{\nu} \dddot{\nu} \), and \( \dddot{\nu} \ddot{\nu} \); because the \( \ddot{l} \) must be preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; but, when the mobile nom. prons. are attached to them, the \( \ddot{l} \) must be made quiescent, for the reason known [20, 403, 607, 692]; and, the \( \ddot{l} \) being then elided in all of them, because of the two quiescents [663], what prevented the notification of the measure, i. e., the \( \ddot{l} \), ceases to exist; so that, after its elision, they intend to notify the mode of formation in every one of them, because the formation of the \( v. \) is, as much as possible, to be retained and observed; and that is realized by vocalizing the \( \dot{f} \) with a vowel like what was on the \( \dot{e} \) in the o. f., because the variation in the measures of the tril. \( v. \) is only through the vowels of the \( \dot{e} \) [482, 704]: but,
This notification not being possible in ﷿  with Fatha of the ﺪ, as ﻮ  and ﺩ  ﺪ, where the vowels of the ﻮ and ﺪ are alike, they omit it; and notify the mode of formation in قَلِعٍ and قَلِعٍ only: so that in ﺊَفَ  جَفَّ and ﻮِبَ كَهَبَ [721], equalizing the cats. of ﺪ and ﺪ [in Kasr of the ﻮ], because the important object is to notify the mode of formation; and in ﻧْعَمٍ, as ﻧَمَّ, they say ﻧْعَمَ [721], the Damma being for explanation of the mode of formation, not for explanation of the [v. as a scion of] ﺪ, because of what we have [just] mentioned, and [because] in this conjug. no hollow [v.] belonging to the cat. of ﺪ occurs, which they might equalize with the cat. of ﺪ in Damm [of the ﻮ], as they equalize the two [cats. in Kasr] in [the conj. of] ﻧْعَمٍ and ﻧْعَمَ [above], except ﺪ [704], the ﺪ of which is not converted into 1, as we mentioned: and, since they have finished notifying the mode of formation in the conjugs. of قَلِعٍ and قَلِعٍ, while the like of that [notification] is not possible in قَلِعٍ, they intend in its case to notify the cats. of ﺪ and ﺪ, and the distinction between them, as the saying goes ﻮِبَ كَهَبَ ﻮِبَ كَهَبَ. If there be not any vinegar, then wine; so that, after elision of the 1 because of the two quiescents, they import Damma into قَلِعٍ, putting it in place of the Fatha [on the ﻮ], and similarly Kasra.
into ُبَعَ, in order that the first may indicate the ُبَعَ, and the second the ُبَعَ (R on the Preterite). Mz asserts that they transmute قُمُّ ُبَعَ and قَلَّم ُبَعَ and قُمُّ ُبَعَ, as they transmute in ُبَعَ and ُبَعَ [above]. (IY). And Akh told us that some of the Arabs say َكَيْدَ رِدَّتَ يَفْعَلُ مَا رِدَّتَ يَفْعَلُ ُدَاكَ Zaid was near doing and Zaid has not ceased doing that, meaning َكَانَ ُرَلَّ and ُكَانُ (S). But [Z says that] they do not transmute without the [mobile] pron. [of the ag.] (M), because ُبَعَ and قُمُّ ُبَعَ would be mistaken for the pass. in قُمُّ ُبَعَ Zaid was sold and قُمُّ ُبَعَ The saying was said, in the dial. of those who say that [436, 706] (IY); except in the sayings مَا رِدَّتَ يَفْعَلُ ُدَاكَ and َكَيْدَ يَفْعَلُ ُكَانُ [above] transmitted from some of the Arabs (M), whence

وَكَبِيدَ صِبْعَ الْقَفْفِ يَا كَلَّمٌ جَتْنِيَّ # وَكَبِيدَ خَرَشَ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ يَتَيَّمُ And the hyenas of the high ground, or of AlKuff [a valley of AlMadīna (Bk)], were near devouring my body, and Khirūsh was near being fatherless after that, which As says that he heard some one recite. For َكَانَ ُفَعَلْ [463, 626], and so is ُرَلَّ ُفَعَلْ, that being proved by the aor. َكَيْكَانُ [482] and َكَيْكَانُ [447]: but they transfer the Kasra from the ُعَ to the ُفَ, after eliding the vowel of the ُفَ, so that the word becomes ُكِيْدَ and ُرِيدَ; and
they do not fear its being mistaken for نُعِلَ، because both [vs.] are intrans. (IY).

§. 706. When the ع of the pret., [either] tril., like قَالَ [in the cat. of و (Tsr)] and بَاعَ [in that of ی (Tsr)], or on [the measure of (Tsr)] إِخْتَارَ or إِنْفَعَلَ, like chose [in the cat. of ی (Tsr)] and إِنْقَدَانَ submitted [in that of و (Tsr)], is unsound, then [in the pass.] you may pronounce the preceding letter with (1) Kasr, (a) pure, [which is the dial. of Kuraish and their neighbours (Tsr)]; (b) smacking of Damm, [which is the dial. of many of Kais and most of the Banu Asad (Tsr) : (a) the ۰ is then, in either case, converted into ی : (2) pure Damm, the ۰ being then converted into و, ۰لِئَدَ ۰رُهَّلَ [436], which [dial. (Tsr)] is rare; but [is found in the speech of Hudhail; and (Tsr)] is attributed to [all of (Tsr)] Faq′as and Dubair (Aud on the Pro-agent), who are among the chaste speakers of the Banu Asad; and is said by IUK in his commentary on the Taskil, and by RSht, to be transmitted from the Banu ۰بَابَة; and by IHsh to be transmitted from some of Tamim [Notes on pp. 122, 123] (Tsr): (a) it is asserted by Ibn ʻUdhra [and a band of the modern Westerns (Tsr)] to be disallowed in إِنْفَعَلَ إِحْتَارَ and إِنْقَدَانَ, which exceed
three [letters]; so that أَخْتُوْرَ and أَنْفُوْرَ are not said (Tsr): but [the well-known saying is (Tsr)] the first, [which (Tsr)] is the saying of IU, AlUbbadi, and IM (Aud). The cat. of قِبْلٍ and بِيعَ, [i. e., the tril. pret. pass. (Jrb),] has three dial. vars., (1) [pure (MASH)] يٰ (SH), which is the chastest of them (MASH): (a) بِيعَ is orig. بِيعَ: then they make the ي quiescent, from dislike to Kasra upon it after داَمَمِا; so that, a quiescent ي preceded by داَمَمِا being produced, the ف is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the ي may be sounded true: (b) then قِبْلٍ is made to conform to بِيعَ: (c) by this the saying of S is strengthened against that of Akh [710], since they alter the vowel, not the consonant [below] (Jrb): (2) Ishmām (SH), i. e., making the ف smack of داَمَمِا, for notification of the o. f.: (a) this dial. var. is chaste (Jrb): (3) [pure] قُول Blackjack (SH): (a) قُول Blackjack is orig. Qُول Blackjack: but, disliking Kasra upon the و after داَمَمِا, they elide it, so that قُول Blackjack becomes قُول Blackjack: (b) then they make بِيعَ conform to it: (c) this strengthens the saying of Akh [710]; but is a corrupt dial. var., not to be taken into account, because conformity of the heavy to the light is more suitable than conformity of the light to the heavy (Jrb). This [passage of the SH] is [more fully] explained in [the following extract from] the commentary on the IH [721] (R). They are orig. Qُول Blackjack and
but Kasra on the unsound letter is deemed heavy: so that, (1) according to IH, the Kasra is elided, not transferred to the preceding letter, because transfer [of a vowel] is only to a quiescent [697], not to a mobile; and then, بُيِعُ and قُرِّلُ remaining, (a) some convert the quiescent ی into ٌ, because of the Damma of the preceding letter, saying بُعِّ [436], which is the rarest of the dial. vars.: (b) the better [course] is to convert the Damma into Kasra in the cat. of ی, so that بَيْعُ remains, because alteration of a vowel is less [disturbing] than alteration of a consonant [above], and also because بَيْعُ is lighter than بُعِّ; and then to make قُرِّلٌ conform to بَيْعُ, because, like the latter, unsound in the ع; so that, its ف being pronounced with Kasr, the quiescent ٍ is converted into ی:

(2) according to Jz, (a) the Kasra is transferred to the preceding letter, because Kasra is lighter than the vowel of that letter, and their intention is to lighten [the formation] as much as possible; and, according to this [saying], transfer of a vowel to a mobile, after elision of its vowel, is allowable when the vowel transferred is lighter than the vowel of the [letter that it is] transferred to; so that, بَيْعُ and قُرِّلٌ remaining, the quiescent ٍ is converted into ی, because of the Kasra of the preceding letter, as in مِيْرَانٰ [685 (case 5)]: (b)
some of them, says he, make the ق quiescent, but do not transfer the Kasra to the preceding letter: so that the , remains in its [original] state; while the ې is converted into , because of [its quiescence and] the Damma of the preceding letter [636 (case 1)]: but this is the rarest of the dial. vars., because Damma and , are heavy; and the first is better, because Kasra and ې are light. The saying of Jz is more probable, because transformation of the word from regard to itself is more proper than conformity to another in transformation: and the reason why IH prefers elision of the Kasra is only that transfer of the vowel to a mobile is deemed strange; whereas there is no strangeness in it, as we have explained. And, as for Ishmām, it is chaste, though rare (R on IH upon the Passive). "Ishmām" here is not [used] in the sense mentioned at the beginning of [the chapter on] Pause [640] (Jrb). As to the manner of pronouncing with Ishmām, (1) Rṣḥt says "There are three ways, vid. compressing the lips (a) while pronouncing the ﺗ, so that its vowel is between the vowels of Dam and Kasr, which is the well-known, notorious [way], used in reading [the Kur]; (b) while making the Kasra of the ﺗ pure; (c) a little before pronouncing the Kasra of the ﺗ, because, the initial of the word being opposed to its final, [it follows that,] as Ishmām in finals is after finishing the quiescence of the 162a
letter [640], so Ishmām in initials is before pronouncing the Kasra of the letter”: (2) IUK says “The most probable [way] is what has been neatly described by one of the Moderns, who says that you pronounce the ك of the word with a complete vowel compounded of two vowels, separably, not indivisibly, a preceding portion of Damma, which is the smaller, followed immediately by a portion of Kasra, which is the larger, whence the ك becomes clear” [436] (Tsr). The essence of this Ishmām [436, 663, 697] is your directing the Kasra of the ك of the v. towards Damma, so that the subsequent quiescent ك may incline a little towards ك, since it imitates the vowel of the letter before it. This is what Fr and the GG mean by Ishmām in this position. Some say that Ishmām here is like Ishmām in the state of pause [640], i.e., compression of the lips only, together with pure Kasr of the ك; but this is contrary to the well-known [doctrine], according to both parties [of GG, the BB and the KK]. And some say that it is your putting a pure Damma followed by a quiescent ك; but this also is not well-known, according to them (R on IH). The majority term this vowel “Ishmām”; but really it is “Raum” [436, 668], because Raum is a light vowel, while Ishmām is preparing the organ for pronunciation of the vowel without [actually uttering] any sound [640] (IY). IH says “The object of Ishmām is to announce that the initials of these words are
orig. pronounced with Ťamm" (R on IH). But, if that [mobile nom. pron. (Jrb)] which makes the quiescent [403] be attached to the cat. of َتِلّل and َبِع , as َقُلْتْ يَا َكَوْل Thou wast sold, O slave and َبِعَتْ يَا َعَبْدُ Thou wast said, O saying [below], then [also three dial. vars. are allowable (Jrb),] Kasr [of the ُف (Jrb)], Ishmām, and Ťamm (SH). The َع is elided (R, Jrb), because of the concurrence of two quiescents (Jrb): while the ُف remains, as before the elision, pronounced with (1) pure Kasr, which is the best-known [dial. var.]; (2) Kasr smacking somewhat of Ťamm; (3) pure Ťamm (R). IM asserts that what is ambiguous, whether Kasr, as in ُعَقْتُ and َبِعَتْ, or Ťamm, as in ُعَقْتُ, or ُعَقْتُ and َبِعَتْ, or Ťamm, as in ُعَقْتُ, [when they are in the pass. (Tsr),] is disallowed (Aud), which he indicates by his saying "But, if ambiguity be feared in any form, it is avoided" (Tsr). The o. f. of the phrase [before the vs. are put into the pass. (Tsr)] is ُحَافِنِي ُزَيْد Zaid feared me and ُباَعِنِي لَسْرُ ُعَقْتُ sold me to 'Amr and ُعَقْتُ hindered me from doing such a thing: then you [suppress the ag., and (Tsr)] put the vs. into the pass., [substituting a ُس for the ُي of the 1st pers. (Tsr)]; so that, if you said ُعَقْتُ I was feared and ُعَقْتُ I was sold with Kasr [of the ُخ and ُب (Tsr)], and ُعَقْتُ I was hindered with Ťamm [of its initial (Tsr)], you
would convey the idea that they are v. and ag., [signifying I feared and sold and hindered,] and the [intended (Tsr)] meaning would be reversed: and therefore only Ishmām or Ḍamm must be allowed in the two first, [i.e., حَفْتُ (Tsr);] and Ishmām or Kasr in the third, [i.e., ُعَفْتُ (Tsr);] while the ambiguous mode [of vocalization], [vid. Kasr in the two first, and Ḍamm in the third (Tsr),] must be disallowed. But the Westerns hold it to be [merely] less approvable, not disallowed (Aud), saying that [in the pass.] the Arabs prefer Kasr of the ف when pronounced with Ḍamm in the act., and Ḍamm of the ف when pronounced with Kasr in the act., for distinction between the two [voices], which is obvious (Tsr). What IM mentions as to the necessity of avoiding the ambiguous form, according to what he apparently [below] says here, and expressly states in the CK, is not noticed by S, who seems to say that the three modes are allowable unrestrictedly (A). S does not regard ambiguity [in that (Tsr)], because [ambiguity is no preventive, since (Tsr)] it exists in [n. and v. (Tsr, Sn).] such as ُمُخْتَأَر choosing, or chosen, [an act. or pass. part, its ٌل being converted from a َى pronounced with Kasr or Fath, respectively (Tsr, Sn).] and تُضَارُّ (K, B), act. or pass., the first ِل being pronounced [before the incorporation (Sn)] with Kasr or Fath, respectively
(Tsr, Sn). Sf [also] appears to say that no distinction is necessary; but that the ambiguity is pardoned, because such [a form] seldom occurs (R on IH). [And] A says "apparently" because of the possibility that [by "avoided" (above)] "allowably", or "approvably", "avoided" should be meant (Su). Of course, avoidance is more proper and preponderant (A). When there exists some context indicating that what is meant is the act. or pass., as in [above] يَعْتَبَر وَقُلْتَ يَا عَبْدُ and خَفَتْ يَا عُرْوُل Thou wast feared, O terror, pure Ḟamm is allowable in the first, and pure Kasr in the two others, in reliance upon the context; but, if no [such] context exist, the more proper [pronunciation] is Kasr or Ishmām in the first, and Ḟamm [or Ishmām] in the two others (R on SH). And the cat. of إِخْتِيَرَ and إِنْقِيدَ, [i.e., of اْنْفِعَلَ and اْنْفَعَلَ from the hollow (R),] is like that of بِيْعَ and بَيْعُ [in allowability of the three modes (R)] in both (SH) cases mentioned under قِيلَ, i.e., absence, and attachment, of "that which makes the ج quiescent" [above], the sense being that, in both cases, إِخْتِيَرَ and إِنْقِيدَ, like قِيلَ and بِيْعَ, have three states, [vid. in the first case] pure ى, which is the chastest; and Ishmām; and [pure], like أُخْتُرَ and أُنْفَرَ [436]: and similarly [in the second case] pure
Kasr, which is the best known, like انْقُدِّنَ and إِخْتَرِنَ; and Ishmām; and [pure] Damm, like انْقُدِّنَ and إِخْتَرِنَ (MASH): contrary to the cat. of استَقِيمَ and استَقِيمَ (SH), because Damm and Ishmām are allowable only in consequence of the Damm of the letter before the، and ي; whereas in استَقِيمَ and استَقِيمَ، the letter before the unsound letter is not pronounced with Damm; so that only pure Kasr is allowable (R).

And [in the three states (MASH)] the [conj. (MASH)] Hamza is pronounced (A, Tsr, MASH) like the third letter (Tsr), [i.e.,] with a vowel (A), vid. Damm, Kasr, or Ishmām (Sn), like [that of (A)] the ت and ق [436, 668] (A, MASH): so says IM (Tsr); though the [same] author's language [in the IM on the Pro-Agent] suggests the necessity of Damm, absolutely, because he first lays down; unrestrictedly, that the initial of the [pass.] v. is pronounced with Damm [436], and here confines himself to the currency of the three modes [of vocalization] in the letter before the ع: so says RSht (Sn).

§ 707. The following cats. are [treated as] sound:

ما أَقُولُ (1) How well Zaid speaks! and أَقُولُ (R, Jrb),

ما أَبْيَعْ (Jrb),] because
transformation is principally in the v., on account of its heaviness; whereas the cat. of wonder, though, according to the soundest opinion, a v., resembles ns. by reason (R) of its aplasticity [477] (SH), so that it becomes like the ṣawṣūl of superiority [351, 703] and the ep. ṣawṣūl ʿānāʾīl (SH), i. e., the ṣawṣūl of superiority (R, Jrb), as ʿābīy Zaid is a better speaker than 'Amr and ʿābīy a better salesman [712] (Jrb), (a) because conformable to it [below] (SH), i. e., resembling the v. of wonder, since wonder at a thing is on account of its superiority in some sense to others, for which reason the v. of wonder and the n. of superiority are equal in many predicaments [351, 477] (R): or (b) because it might be mistaken for the v. (SH), since the forms of the pret. v. from ṣawṣūl imputing a saying and of the ṣawṣūl of superiority from ʿālūl saying, but for the transformation [in the former], would agree; so that they treat the n. as sound, and transform the v.: that being more proper than the converse, because transformation, in whichever of them it be, is explicable only by conformity to the tril. pret. v., as ʿālūl [703]; while the v., being more like the v., is more properly made conformable to it: (a) this [second] cause is the one assigned to the n. of superiority by S (Jrb), [who says that] they make ṣawṣūl, when a n., complete, in order to
distinguish it from the plastic \( v. \) \[ \text{أَفْعَل} ] \text{[703]} \) (S): but he makes the \( v. \) of wonder conform to it (Jrb), [saying that] the \( \text{مَا أَتْبِعَة} \) and \( \text{أَفْعَل} \) \[ \text{أَفْعَلُ مَنْكَ} \) is complete, because its sense is that of \( \text{أَفْعَلُ عِنْدَكَ} \) a greater doer than thou and \[ \text{أَفْعَلُ عِنْدَ النَّاسِ} \) the greatest doer of mankind; and similarly \( \text{أَفْعَلُ رَبّي} \), because i. q. \( \text{مَا أَفْعَلَةُ} \) (S): whereas IH first does the reverse, by making the \( n. \) of superiority conform to the \( v. \) of wonder; and then mentions for the \( n. \) of superiority this cause, which is mentioned by S (Jrb): \( b) \) there is no reason for his saying “because conformable to it” \[ \text{[above]}, \) since the \( 
\text{أَفْعَلُ} \) of superiority is a \( n. \); while the \( n. \) is generally not transformed in this way, \[ i. e., \) by transfer and conversion,\] as we have mentioned \[ \text{[703]}, \) and, though the \[ \text{[two]} \] kinds of \( n. \) \[ \text{[there]} \] described are \[ \text{[so]} \] transformed, as already explained, still the condition of the augmented kind commensurable with the \( v. \), when we intend its \( 
\text{ع} \) to be transformable, is that it should be different from the \( v. \) in some respect \[ \text{[703, 712]} \); whereas this \[ \text{[n.]} \] does not differ from the \( v. \) in anything: \( c) \) [if any excuse for the omission to transform were required,\] his \[ \text{[second]} \] saying “because it might be mistaken” would suffice \( \text{(13)} \); \[ \text{492, 684 (condition 9, a)}, \) because i. q. \( \text{كَتَعَامِلْ} \) \[ \text{[703]} \) (SH), i. e., \( \text{كَتَعَامِلْ} \) and \( 
\text{كَتَعَامِلْ} \) (Jrb): \( a) \) if the sense of \( 
\text{كَتَعَامِلْ} \) be
not intended in ِافتَعال, you transform [the ِع in] it, as ِإِرتَاد [sought out (M,A,R)] and ِإِخَتَار [670, 706]: (4) [the conjug. of ِإِعَّر [684 (conditions 7, 8, b)], ِإِسْوَد [703], and ِإِصْيَد [below], because the transformation of such as ِإِقَرَم and ِإِقَرَم [703], besides being contrary to the general rule, [since the ِ, is not preceded by a letter pronounced with ِفَتَحـ], is only for conformity with the transformed ِتَرِل. [ِقَام [5]]; whereas there is no transformed ِتَرِل. here (R): (5) the conjug. of ِإِعَّر ِإِسْوَد ِإِصْيَد became blind of one eye and ِإِعَّر ِإِسْوَد ِإِصْيَد became black [714], because of ambiguity [below] (SH), since, if the ِ, were converted into ِ, its vowel being transferred to the preceding letter, the conj. Hamza and one of the two ِs would be elided; so that ِعَّر and ِسْوَد would remain, which might be mistaken for the act. part. of the reduplicated: (a) there is no reason for his saying “because of ambiguity” [above], since non-transformation requires to be excused only where a cause [of transformation] exists, but no transformation takes place; while the cause of transformation, in the v. whose ِ, or ِ, is preceded by a quiescent, is its being a deriv. of a v. whose transformation is authorized, as in ِ إِقَرَم and ِإِقَرَم [703]; whereas ِعَّر and ِسْوَد are not transformed, so that ِعَّر and ِسْوَد might be made conformable to
them; nay, the case is reversed [below]: (b) if indeed it be asked "How is it that سَوَّأَلِّ إِعْرَأْرَ and إِعْرَأْرَ are not transformed, when they appear to be like أَقْمُ [703]?", the answer is that there is a distinction between them, vid. that the cause [of transformation] exists in أَقْمُ, not in إِعْرَأْرِ [or إِسْوَأَلِّ] (R): (6) the conj. of (MASH) عَيْزَ [became blind of one eye and سُوَّأَلِّ became black [and صَيدَ (S, Jh, M)], because i. q. إِعْرَأْرَ and إِسْوَأَلِّ (SH) and إِصْيَدَ [above] (Jh), since the original conjugs. for colors and external defects are إِفْعَالَ and إِفْعَالِ [493A]; so that, though the tril. is the original of the augmented in form, still, since these two conjugs. are original in sense the case is reversed [above], the tril. being treated like the augmented in respect of soundness, to notify the originality of the augmented in the sense mentioned [684 (conditions 7, 8, b)] (R): (a) لَيْسَ [447] is made quiescent [in the ع ] from لَيْسَ صَيدَ [456, 703], as they say عَلَمُ knew for عَلَمَ [482]: but they make it permanently quiescent, because, not being as plastic as its congener, it is not put into the form of [the v., like (IY), صَيدَ, [where the ع is sounded true (IY),] or هَابَ, [where the ع is transformed (IY);] but into the form of what is [a pure p. (IY),] not a v., as لَيْتَ: (b) for the same reason they do not transfer the vowel of the ع to
the proof that the ع [of نَمْسَّا] is [orig.] pronounced with Kasr is that Fatha of the ع is not elided, ضَرِّبَ not being said [for عَلَمَ], as عَلَمَ is said for نَعَلَ [Note on p. 246, l. 2]; and that the conjug. of نَعَلَ with ذَامَ [of the م] does not occur in the ي cat. of the hollow, except هِيَوَ [704], which is anomalous (R): (7) the variations of those [vs. (Jrb)] whose ع is sounded true, like (أَعْرَرتَهُ) I made him blind of one eye and إِسْتَقَرْرتُ (SH), if you were to form عُورَ (M), and أَصِيدَ اللَّهُ بِعِبَارَةٍ (S, M), because their o. f. [صَيَّدُ or عَرَرُ] is not transformed, so that they might be conformable to it in transformation (R); and [similarly (R)] (بَيَاغُ and مُقَايِلُ) (SH), act. parts. of قَاَرُ and بَاغُ [683 (case 1, a), 708] (Jrb), and عَوَرُ [683 (case 2), 708] (SH), because the transformation of such as قَأَرُ and بَاغُ is for conformity to its transformed v. [684, 703], whereas the vs. of these things are not transformed (R); and (أَعْسَدُ) [348, 712] (SH), the ep. أَنْفَلَ [above] from سَرَدَ (MASH). But sometimes the conjug. of فعل from [inf. ns. denoting] defects is transformed, as

فَسَأَلَنَّ بَأَبِي أَحَبَّ مِنْ رَأْهُ أَعَمَّرَتْ عَينَيْهِ أَمْ لِمْ كَعَارًا
She questions about Ibn Ahmar those who have seen him, whether his eye have become blind, or have indeed not become blind (R), as though it were لَا تَفْرَثُ، with the single corrob. في، for which the poet substitutes the 1 of pause [614, 649, 684] (IY). And he that says عَرَّاج says أعَّارَ and استعار and عَائِثُ (SH), its derivs. also being then transformed (R). Such [formations], however, as I made good (M), صَدَّرت أُطْرُطُت 338, whence 338, 685 IY, 685 IY استخزع [708] (case 6, c), 699 (M), as استثمر عليهم أَنْشَيْطْان LVIII.

20. The devil hath gotten the mastery over them (IY), وَانْثَبَت إِسْتَصْرَو. and إِسْتَنْظُرَ (IY),] and I found [IY] and أَطْبَتَ 및 استقر I found pleasant, أُغْيِبتَ أَحْيَلَتَ أَغْيِلتَ أَغْيِلتَ. أَحْيَلَتَ in HB's reading حَتَّى إِذَا أَحْذَبَ الْأَرْضَ زَحْرَهَا وَأَزْيَنَتَ X. 25. [Until when the earth taketh its garniture, and cometh possessed of adornment (K. B)] on the measure of استفيي (IY), and became like an elephant, deviate f. om analogy [703] (M). These words, which, though numerous, are few in comparison with what is transformed, occur as a notification of the o. f. of the conjug. (IY).

§. 708. The ِ, and ِِ, when near the end [of the word], and preceded by an aug. ِِ, are converted into ِِ, provided that, to the cause requiring conversion [684,
703]: another requirer be adjoined, because the cause is then weak through the separation of the د and ی from the Fatha by the ل, and their not being at the end. That [other] requirer is (1) either resemblance to the transformed ر [703], or conveyance of its sense, and exercise of its government [703], as in قاَتِم [343] and بَنْع [below]: (2) enclosure of the ل of the ultimate pl. by two unsound letters, so that the pl. is heavy on account of the two unsound letters, and of its being the farthest of the pls. [256], as in أَوْأَلْ [703, 715], and بَنْع, اَول, بَنْع, عِيَاَلْ, pls. of مَعَسَم, اَول, بَنْع, عِيَاَلْ (3) the د and ی's being in the ultimate pl. in whose sing. they are aug. lette:s of prolongation, as in اَعْجَابُر [717] and كَبَّارُ [661], because of the intention to distinguish the two aug. letters of prolongation from the د and ی that have a vowel in the sing, whether they be rad., as in مَقَوُم and مَعَيِّشَة, pls. of مَقَامٍ and مَعَيِّشة [717]; or aug., as in جَدَوْر [253], pls. of عِزَيْر and جَدَوْر [374]: since that ی or د which has an original vowel, being harder and stronger, is not converted. But, when the د and ی are far from the end, as in طَأَوْرِسَ [pl. of طَأَوْرِسَل peacock (KF)], they are not converted into د [715]. According to this, it is plain to you that the Hamza in such as سَرَف [683 (case 1), 723], كَاتِل and بَنْع.
[683 (case 2)], and [683 (case 4), 715], and [683 (case 3), 717], is orig. I converted from and ی. For, since mobilization of the I is needed, [in order to avoid a concurrence of two quiescents] while its conversion into ُ or ی is disallowed, because we have only just escaped from them, it is converted into a letter that, after ُ and ی, is most akin to it, vid. Hamza, because both are guttural [73:2]. The first I is not elided [723], for avoidance of] the two quiescents, as is necessary in the like [663], because the I of such as تَکْنَهُ is the sign of the act. part., and the I of such as ُلْوَرَا نَغَّرُ and ُمَغَّثِئْرُ is the sign of the ٰل.; while such as ٰدَا, if the I were elided, would be confounded with the abbreviated. But, as for the Hamza in such as [246, 683 (case 3, a), 717], it is a subst. for the I in the sing., not for the I converted from ُ or ی (R). The ُ и and ی are converted into Hamza [below] in [the act. part. of the unaugmented tril. (Jrb),] such as تَکْنَهُ and ُبَنَّع [683 (case 2), 703, 712], whose v. is transformed; contrary to ُغَرِّ and ُصَلَّیْنَ [below] (SH). The saying of the GG, in this cat., “The ُ и and ی are converted into Hamza” [above] is not in accordance with reality, because the ی is converted into I [683 (case 2, c)], which is then converted into Hamza; so that the ُ and
seem to be converted into Hamza (R). The o. fs. of َبَاعِسْنَع َقَوْلٍ َفَأْتَتُلَ, and َكَأَاٰذِلٍ, are meant to be transformed, because of the transformation of their vs.: but transformation by elision is not possible, because it would obliterate the shape of the act. part. [343], which would be reduced to the form of the v.; while inflection would not suffice for a distinctive, because it is removed by pause [640]. The ِعِ is therefore converted into ْل, either because they do not take the preceding ْل into account; so that the unsound letter, coming, as it were, immediately after the Fathâ, is converted into ْل, as being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 703]: or because they consider the ْل equivalent to Fathâ [697], as being an augmentation of the latter, and having the same essence and outlet. And, since two ْلا are then concur, while they dislike to elide either, as likewise to mobilize the first, because of what has been mentioned, [vid. that such elision or mobilization would obliterate the shape of the act. part.,] they mobilize the last, on account of the concurrence of two quiescents, by converting it into Hamza, because of the proximity of Hamza to ْل [732]. But to dot [the ٰ representing] the Hamza, as H dots it, in the "Speckled Epistle," in such as ٰكَأَاٰذِلٍ, where he says َكَأَاٰذِلٍ َفَأْتَتُلَ And the gift of his hands has been abundant, is a mistake (Jrb). As for ٰسَلِيدٍ ٰهَلَر [683 (case 2), 707]
[above], and the like, the ع [in them] is sounded true, not converted into Hamza, because sounded true in the v., as ضَرْعَرُ [707], since the act. part. is conformable to its v. in respect of sounding true and transformation [683 (case 2, b)]; and, for the same reason, the ع is sounded true in مَبَابِسٍ, مَقَاوِمٍ, and the like [707], because sounded true in نَارِمٍ and بَأَيْبِنَ [703] (IY). Some of the Arabs transpose the ع and ج in some act. parts. of the hollow, and then subject the act. part. to the same transformation as قَائِمٍ [16, 719], as لَا تَبَيَّنُ الْآبَسِِّ أَوَّلَا الْعَبْرِيُّ [by Al' Ajjāj (S), Wherein the things, and the lote-trees growing on the banks of the streams, are tangled (MAR)] and فَتْفَرَّقُونِي إِنْذَا أَاذَّكُمْ * هَٰذَا سَلَٰحِي فِي الْحَكَمَةِ مُعَلِّمٌ (R), by Ṭarīf Ibn Tamīm al' Ambarī (S, IAth) at Tamīmī (IAth), Then seek to know me: verily I, or that I, this one, am such that sharp is my weapon in mishaps, am a bearer of the cognizance, or badge, or device, of the valiant (MAR). This is what has beguiled Khl [below] into venturing upon transposition in the whole act. part. of the hollow whose ج is a Hamza. For he says that, since they transpose the [ع and ج of the hollow] sound in the ج, from fear of a single Hamza
after the ح, they are more inclined to escape from the combination of two Hamzas. And similarly, since he sees them say شًّع, by transposition, for شًّع p.l. شًّع dispersed, he says that in such as حَطْكَيَا and حَطْكَيَا [661, 726], and حَطْكَيَا and حَطْكَيَا [248, 726], transposition is more appropriate. But the answer is that they resort to transposition in حَطْكَيَا and حَطْكَيَا only from fear of Hamza after the ح; whereas, in such as جَاه, [below], one Hamza after the ح is inseparable, whether the ج and ه be transposed, or not (R). And [S says that (R)] most of the Arabs say شًّع and شًّع (S, R), by elision of the ه (R). But such as شًّع and شًّع are anomalous (SH). شًّع is from شًّع, i. e., vehement of prowess or valour (1Y, Jrb), and point or edge, and weapon (1Y); or [from] قُدّ شًّع أَلْمَجْلُ (Jh, KF), inf. n. شًّع, i. e., The man's vehement of prowess or valour, and his sharpness, have been displayed (Jrb). It has three forms [of act. part. (Jrb)]:—

(1) شًّع [276], with Hamza, according to rule (1Y, Jrb), like قَأَّع [above] (1Y): (2) شًّع [276, 278], by relegation of the ه to the position of the ح, [its measure being قَأَّع (Jrb), of the class of the defective (1Y),] like قَأَّع [16] (1Y, Jrb) and قَأَّع [685] (1Y): 164a
(a) similarly [278], from 

\[\text{He wound the turban upon his head, aor. } \text{يُلْوَثُ (IY, Jrb), inf. n. } \text{كَرَتُ (Jrb); and } \text{كَأْثَرُ (IY): } \text{كَأْثَرُ (IY)}\]

and [276, 278], by elision of the [above] (IY, Jrb). Z says in the K [on IX. 110.] (Jrb), 

\[\text{كَأْثَرُ (Jrb), i.e., cracked, on the point of being demolished and falling: but its measure is } \text{فَعُلُّ , abbreviated from } \text{فَعُلُّ [pregnant she-camels (Jh, KF)] from } \text{فَعُلُّ [Khalif]; while its counterparts are } \text{كَأْثَرُ [711] and } \text{صَأَتُ [loud of voice, for } \text{كَأْثَرُ and } \text{كَأْثَرُ : and its } \text{is not the } \text{of } \text{فَعُلُّ , the o.f. being } \text{كَأْثَرُ and } \text{كَأْثَرُ , and } \text{كَأْثَرُ [K, Jrb]. And } \text{[R says that] } \text{كَأْثَرُ and } \text{كَأْثَرُ may be orig. } \text{كَأْثَرُ and } \text{كَأْثَرُ , intensive forms of } \text{كَأْثَرُ and } \text{كَأْثَرُ [348], like } \text{كَأْثَرُ and } \text{كَأْثَرُ [312], in which case they are like } \text{كَأْثَرُ [708] and } \text{windy day (R). But this is contrary to what } \text{Z mentions in the M, about what has a rad. letter elided from it, and not restored in the dim. [276], which is confirmed by what } \text{IH mentions in the CM on this passage of the M, vid. that } \text{كَأْثَرُ may not be } \text{فَعُلُّ , because } \text{Z lays down that a letter is elided from it; nor transposed, because its predicament would be like [that of ] كَأْثَرُ}.

}
[above], where the 

I saw a little judge; so that it must be قاعل, its ـ being elided: while this [conclusion] is corroborated by what is mentioned in some of the Glosses (Jrb). The o. f. of ـ ام and is irregularly elided; the rule being to convert it into Hamza [above], as ـ شاءل, which also occur, on the measure of قاعل (Sn on the Diminutive): [or] it seems that they convert the ـ into ٰ, and then elide the ٰ because of the two quiescents; and do not mobilize [it], in order to escape from Hamza: the elided [ٰ] being apparently the second, because the first is the sign of the act. part. (R): [or] these [Arabs] slide the Hamza (S). Their measure is, therefore, ـ [by elision of the ـ, considered as ـ or ٰ or Hamza, from ـ قاعل]. Some say that the aug. ٰ is elided, and the ـ converted into ٰ, because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath. Their measure is then قاعل with quiescence of the ـ from regard to its state after conversion, and with Kasr of the ـ from regard to its state before conversion. But A proceeds on [the assumption] that the elided is the ـ, since he says "And ـُبـُيـُر by restoration of the elided is
anomalous" [276]; because the discussion is on restoration of the \textit{rad.}, not of the \textit{aug.}, elided (Sn). And about such as جآ [661] there are two sayings:—(1) Khl [above] says that it is transposed, like شالك: (2) it is said [by others] to be [formed] according to rule (SH). But قالك [247, 373] is treated as sound, like what is not a \textit{n.} [on the measure] of a \textit{v.} [703, 712]: you say قالك and بابك (S).

§. 709. When [the pass. part. (MKh)] مفعول is formed from the \textit{tril.} (MKh) \textit{v.} whose \textit{ع} is unsound, \textit{ى} or \textit{و}, the same transfer and elision are necessary as in استفعال [338, 697, 703, 714]; so that from <q>you say مفعول مييع and قالك [347, 703]. The o. f. is مفعول مييع: but the vowel of the \textit{ع} is transferred to the preceding quiescent; and, since two quiescents, the \textit{ع} and the \textit{و}, of مفعول, then concur, the \textit{و} of مفعول is elided (IA), according to S (MKh) مييع ought to be said for مييع (IA), like مييع موتين [686] (MKh); but they convert the \textbf{Damma into Kasra}, in order that the \textit{ى} may be sounded true (IA). The elided, (1) according to S, is the \textit{و} of مفعول [703] (SH): (a) S elides the second of the two quiescents, not the first, although the rule is to elide the first, when two quiescents are combined, and the first is a letter of prolongation [663]: (b)
he decides upon this because, seeing that, after the transformation, the ی in the pass. part. [of the hollow] belonging to the cat. of ی remains extant, as یبِیع, he opines that in it the ی [of مَمْعَرُ] is the [quiescent] elided, and then extends this decision to the hollow belonging to the cat. of ی: (c) the process of [avoiding] the concurrence of two quiescents is varied here, according to him, because the word becomes lighter than by elision of the first [quiescent]; and also in order that a distinction may be produced between the two pass. parts., in the cats. of ی and ی respectively, which, if the first [quiescent] were elided, would be liable to confusion, one with another: (d) when the ی of مَمْعَرُ is elided, the یَدَامَّا is pronounced as Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved, by analogy to the saying of S on such as ینیع from ینیع [710] (R): (2) according to Akh, is the ی [that is plain in the cat of ی (MASH)]; while [in the cat. of ی (MASH)] the ی of مَمْعَرُ is, according to him, converted into ی because of the Kasra [below] (SH) on the letter before it (MASH): (a) as for Akh, he elides the first quiescent in the cats. of ی, and ی, as is the rule in a concurrence of two quiescents: (b) it being said to him "Then, according to thee, یمَبَع ought to remain: so what is this ی in یمَبَع?", he said "When the یَدَامَّا is transferred to the preceding letter, it is
pronounced as Kasra, on account of the ی, before elision of the ی; then the ی is elided, because of the two quiescents; and then the ی is converted into ی, because of the Kasra” [above]: (e) this requires consideration, because it is only when the ی is going to remain that it is entitled to have the Damma of the preceding letter converted into Kasra, not when it is going to be elided: so that, according to his opinion, one should rather say “First the ی is elided; and then the Damma is converted into Kasra, and the ی converted into ی, for a distinction between the cats. of ی and ی” (R). Each [authority], therefore, contravenes his own rule (SH), ی because he elides the second of the two quiescents; whereas his rule, and that of others, is to elide the first [663]: and Akh because his rule is that the quiescent ی is converted into ی, on account of the preceding letter’s being pronounced with Damm [710], though the ی [so converted] is going to remain; whereas here he converts the Damma of the letter before the ی into Kasra, notwithstanding that the ی is going to be elided (R). The sound [opinion] is that the elided is the second [quiescent], because it is aug. [338], and near the end (Aud); but Akh holds that the elided is the ی of the word, because the ی is often exposed to elision in other positions than this [703] (Tsr). The [effect of the dispute appears in the (Tsr)] measure [of مَصْرَن preserved]
(A), which (Tsr), according to S, is مفعول [with Damm of the ف, and quiescence of the ع (Sn)]; and, according to Akh, is مفعول (A, Tsr). And the utility of the dispute is displayed in such as مَسْوَرٌ vexed, [orig. مَسْوَرٌ on the measure of مفعول (Sn),] when alleviated [658] (A), by changing its Hamza into َ, and then incorporating the َ of مفعول into it, according to the opinion of Akh; or by transferring the vowel of the Hamza to the َ, which is an ع, and then eliding it, according to the opinion of S [below] (Sn). IJ says, F having asked me about the alleviation of مَسْوَرٌ, I said "According to the saying of Akh, I say رأيت مساوًا I saw a vexed, as you say َرَأَيت مَسَوًا [658], because, according to him, the َ of مَسْوَرٌ is the َ of مَفْعُول; but, according to the opinion of S [above], I say رأيت مساوًا, as you say حَبُّ [by elision of the Hamza after transfer of its vowel to the ب (Sn)] for حَبُّ [658], the َ being mobile, because, in his opinion, it is the ع": and F then said "So it is" (A), i.e., the alleviation of مَسْوَرٌ, because the mobile Hamza, when the [quiescent] َ, before it is a non-co-ordinate َ, is converted into َ, and has the [preceding] َ incorporated into it; but, when the [quiescent], before it is a rad., has its vowel transferred to the َ, and is elided [658] (Sn). But مَشْوبُ for مَشْوَبُ mixed, [as
(Jh, IY), by AlMukhabbal or AsSulaik, *Flesh laid out in the court to dry, and water of cooking-pots in the bowls, mixed with seeds for seasoning and with sauces, will suffice thee for the sour milk of the people* (MAJh), from شَوْبُ aor. [inf. n. شَوْبَ mixing (MAR),] and مَنْيَلُ given, from نَالَ gave, aor. يَنْيُلُ, and مُلُومُ blamed, as though formed according to [the pass. (Jh)] شِيْبٌ was mixed [436, 706] نُبْلُ was given, and لَيْمَ was blamed, are anomalous; as likewise is مُهْوُبُ [for مَهْوُبِ] dreaded (Jh), as

وَتَأْدِى إِلَى زَغْبِ مَسَاكِينَ ذَوْنَهُمْ فَلَا لَّا تَحْطَأَ أَلْفَانِ مُهْوُبٍ (Jh, IY), by Humaid (IY), *And it (a sand-grouse) returns to poor downy young birds, before whom are deserts, that companies of travellers have not passed over, dreaded (MAJh), cited by Ks (Jh),* from فَتْيَةُ dread, as though formed according to [the dial. of those who say in (IY) the pass. (Jh, IY)] هُرْبُ [436, 706] (R). The Banû Tamîm treat the cat. of ي as sound; [but not the cat. of , because ي is lighter to them than , (Tsr):] so that they say مُبَيَّرُ sold and مَخْبَرُ sewn (Aud), as they say مُضْرُوبُ [347]; and that is regular,
(1503)

according to them (Tsr). A [Tamimi (MN, Tsr)] poet says, [describing wine (Tsr),]

وَكَانَتْ هَا تَفَاقُحَةٌ مُطْبِيْبَةٌ

(IY, Aud, A), which As says that he heard IAl recite (IY), And it is as though it were a scented apple (MN), by rule مَطْبِيْبَةٌ (Tsr), but pronounced according to the o. f. (MN, Tsr); and the poet [Al'Abbās Ibn Mirdās (MN, Tsr, Jsh) as Sulami (Jsh)] says

قد كان تقوم يَحْصِبَنُكُ سَيْدًا # إِحْلَالٌ أَنْذَكَ سَيْدٌ مُعَجِّبٌ

[below] (Aud, A) Thy people have been accounting thee to be a chief; but I fancy that thou art a chief smitten by the evil eye (MN, Jsh), by rule عِنْتُ الرِّجْلُ مَعِيْنٍ, from مَعِيْنٍ, act. part. عَآَثِئٌ, pass. part. مَعِيْنٍ according to rule, and مَعَيْنٍ according to the o. f. (MN, Tsr); and the poet ['Alkama (IY, MN, Jsh) Ibn 'Abada (MN, Jsh), describing a male ostrich (Jsh),] says

حتى تذكَرُ بِيْسَابٍ وَمِيْثَجَةٍ # يَوْمُ رَذَاكُ عَلَيْهِ الدَّجْنُ مُغَيْيُمُ

[below] (M, A) Until he remembered eggs (belonging to him); and a day of light rain, whereon was cloud covering the sky, overclouded, aroused him, by rule مَعِيْنٍ (MN, Jsh). The right way is to say مَيِّبِعٌ and مَعِيْبِ مَيِّبِعٌ

165a
upbraided, like their counterparts in the Kur. 44. [and a palace plastered with gypsum, or raised high (K, B)] and LXXIII. 14. [And the mountains shall be a sand-heap strewn (K, B), and made to run down (K), from هِيلَ, inf. n. هِيِلَ (K, B), orig. مَسْهِيْرُ and مَهْيُرُ: whereas a man indebted and مَعْيِرُ or مَعْيَنُ or مَعْيِنُ overlooked, i. e., that the evil eye has smitten, are anomalous; and hence

[below] I have been told that thy people assert thee to be a chief; but I fancy etc. [above] (D). But the case is not as H says: for مَعْيِرُ and مَعْيَنُ have been heard from the Arabs, contrary to rule; while the KF has مَعْيَرُ or مَعْيَرُ He is upbraided, and also مَعْيِرُ or مَعْيِرُ It is sold; and all of this is according to the o. f., so that what H mentions is only from crabbedness. And مَعْيِرُ or مَعْيِرُ is said, as [above] (CD). And they say مَعْيِرُ or مَعْيِرُ food dressed with olive-oil, [the like of] which is frequent (IV). Mb says that the pass. part. in the cat. of ی may be complete in poetry, citing the saying of 'Alkama مَعْيِرُ رَذَانَ الْحُ
[above] as an instance of that (CD). But this is a Tāmīmī dial. (A) ISh says "The Arabs differ about the pass. part. in the cat. of ی: for the Banū Tāmīm make
it complete, saying 멕 køl, ماًنخريط, ڇغیوَ, measured, and
ماًزربت; while the inhabitants of the Hijāz say ڇمیپب, ڇمیپب, ڇمیپب, ڇمیپب, and ڇمیپب [above]. But both parties
agree upon making it defective in the cat. of ی, except
what occurs anomalously, vid. ڇپپ مصرون [below],
لَبُظ مَقُروُل ڇوَ, and ڇقََُس مَقُروُل a word said;
where the better-known [form] is مَقُروُل, مَدَرُف, مَصِْرَن, and
ڇمیپب" (CD). Some of the Arabs treat a few pass.
parts. in the cat. of ی as sound, whence ڇپپ مصرون a
garment preserved, ہیچسن (Tsr); and
ڇسَک مَدَرُف (A, Tsr), i.e., moistened musk (Tsr, Sn);]
and ڇقََُس مَقُروُل a led horse (Aud, A), from ڇقََُس, aor.
یَبُقُد; and
ڇقََُس مَقُروُل a saying said, from ڇقََُس (Tsr); which have
been heard (Aud). And Mb allows completion of مَفْعَل From [the cat. of] ی, as ڇرِسَن مَفْعَل a sick man visited;
that, says he, not being heavier than ڇسَور inf. n. of I leaped and ڇغُرَز inf. n. of ڇغَ_deposit [683], because ڇسَور and
ڇغُرَز contain two ڇ, and two ڇثمَم; whereas ڇمَصرون
[above] contains, with two ڇ, only one ڇثمَم (IY).
But that is not regular, contrary to the opinion of Mb
(A).
§. 710. The opinion of [S (IY),] the author of the Book [11], in the case of every ی being a quiescent ع preceded by a letter pronounced with Դamm, is that the Դamma is converted into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved (M). But Akh differs from him in this rule, and substitutes ٌ for the ی (IY). S converts the Դamma into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved; and does not convert the ی into ٌ, because the first [method] involves less alteration [706]. But Akh reverses the matter, adducing as evidence their agreement upon conversion of the ی, when a َف , into ٌ because of Դamma on the preceding letter, as in مُسَر [686 (case 1, a), 699]. It is replied, however, that this is on account of the distance from the end, contrary to what happens when the ی is near the end, as in what we are discussing (R). Therefore, when such [اثْنَاء (IY)] as [the sing.] ْبُرُّ, a kind of striped garment is formed from [بَيْع] پیش, sale and (IY) عَنَبیش, S says [بَيْع] پیش, and (IY), but Akh says [بَوْع] پیش; and restricts conversion [of the Դamma] to the pl., such as یِبْيض, pl. of یِبْيض [686 (case 1, a, γ), 718 (M), where, the pl. being heavier than the sing. [below], he substitutes Kasra for Դamma, in order that the word may not increase in heaviness (IY). Similarly such [sings.] as سَيْعَنَسіل calling and دیک cock, according to S, may be َفَنُل or
but Akh differs from him in that, holding that their measure must be [فعل, ] according to the apparent [form] (BS). And [333, 686], (1) according to S, may be (a) مَفْعُولَةُ (M), in which case it contains transfer and conversion, transfer of the دَامَّة to the ف, and its conversion into كسرة, in order that the ي may be sounded true (IY); (b) مَفْعُولَةُ (M), in which case the vowel of the ع is transferred to the ف, nothing else [being done] (IY): (2) according to Akh, is [only (IY)] مَفْعُولَةُ ; while, if it were مَفْعُولَةُ, you would say مَعْوَشَةُ (M). But Akh contravenes this rule in such [pass. parts.] as مَبِيعُ [709], where the elided, according to him, is the ع of the word, because it is the first of the two quiescents [663]: so that [first] the دَامَّة [of the ي in مَبِيعُ] is transferred to the ع and مَيْبُوبُ [respectively], for transformation [697, 703]; then كسرة is substituted for it, in order that the ي may be preserved; and then the ي is elided, because of the two quiescents; so that the [quiescent] و, coming immediately after كسرة, is converted into ك [685 (case 5)]. Therefore the measure of the word, according to him, becomes مَفْعُول; and this demolishes what he sets up [above] as a rule (IY). And, when a [ن] like تَرْتُبُ [274, 678] is formed from بِيع, S says بِيعُ [709, 712];
but Akh says [712] (M), changing the ى into ۡوۡبَع, because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with دامم, as in مُوَسَّر [above] and مُوَسَّر ۡمُوَسَّر [686], because كسر is not substituted [by him] for دامم in what is a sing. [above]. And, but for the saying of the Arabs and مُيِّبِع [above], Akh's rule would be sound, strong; but hearsay furnishes cause for dissatisfaction with his rule (IY). And مَضْرَّة in the saying [of Abū Jundab alHudhali (DH, Jh, MN)]

[And I was wont, when my neighbour called me for a matter that was feared, to tuck up my waist-wrapper until it went half-way up the shank (MN), which contains a confirmation of Akh's opinion, because it conforms to his rule (IY),] is, according to S, [anomalous (IY),] like ۡكَرُونَ [684, 703, 711] and ۡأَلْفُضْرَى [685 (case 6, e), 725] (M), by rule مُضْرَّة (IY); but, according to Akh, regular (M). مَضْرَّة is from ۡضْرَتُ ۡمُلْجَلَ مَفْعَلَة [I alighted at the man's abode: as a guest (Jh), meaning a matter that has befallen him, and lighted on him, and distressed him (DH)]; or from ۡأَضْفَتْ مِنَ ۡاَلْاَمَرْ, i. e., I feared, or was cautious of, the matter, meaning a matter that one is afraid [or cautious] of: and in it they do
not convert the Ḍamūnna into Kasra, but the َى into ِ (Jrb). This verse, however, is [said by Skr to be (Jh)] related in three ways, with مُضِيْقَة [above], مَضْرَعَة, and مُضْاَفَة (Jh, Jrb).

§. 711. Transformation and alteration belong to vs. [667, 684 (condition 11, a), 703, 712], because of their plasticity in the variation of their shapes for indication of time and other meanings, such as command and prohibition, imported from them. And transformation of ns. is only by conformity to them (IV). Of unaugmented tril. ns., only those which are on the model of the v. [482] are transformed, as بَاب door and دَار house [684, 703], شَجَرَة شَاكِة thorny tree and رَجْل مَال [703], [and the like, which, being of the same formation as the v. (IV),] because on [the measure of] فعل فَعُل (M), بَاب and دَار on [the measure of] فعل [with Fāth of the ع], and شَجَرَة [708] and مَال on [that of] فعل with Kasr of the ع, have their ع converted [into ِ], because mobile and preceded by a Fāṭha; so that they become among ns. like قال and بَاب among vs. [684, 703]. What necessitates conversion in them is the combination of similars, because the soft letters resemble vowels [697]: so that the Arabs dislike their combination, and therefore convert [the soft letter in] such as قال and بَاب, and
, into a letter, vid. 1, with which one is absolutely safe from a vowel [703]; for which reason 1, according to them, is equivalent to a mobile letter, because it is incapable of receiving a vowel, as the mobile letter is incapable of receiving another vowel (IY). Such [trils.], however, sometimes remain sound, [as though serving to notify the o. f. (IY),] like (1) قُرَّت [684, 703], and قَرَّتْ and قَوْكَة [247, 684] and ُجَوْرَة [pl. of ُجَأَرَّ acting wrongfully (KF), which belong to the cat. of بَابٌ and دَارٌ (IY)]; (2) a timid man and حَوْل [below] (M), which belong to the cat. of مَال and شَاكَة (IY). Their sayings رَأَيَّ [684], [dependents, sing. خَآئِلُ (MAR),] and قُرَّت [above] are anomalous; and so are رَجَلٌ حَوَّل an artful man and رُؤَّ [above]. But ُفَعَّل with ذِمِّر of the َع does not occur in the hollow n., from the heaviness of ذِمِّر [upon the unsound letter] (R). Whatever is not on the model of the v. is treated as sound, [because it is not commensurable with the v. (IY),] like (1) لُومَة blaming much (IY), نَومَة [sleeping much (IY)], and ُعْبَة [703] (M) one that upbraids people much, where the formation becomes [a preventive of transformation.] like the augment in ُجَوْلَة and ُجَوْلَة [684, 703], what differs from the v. in mode of formation being treated like what differs therefrom in augment;
so that the formation of the n. necessitates its being treated as sound, because of its remoteness from resemblance to the v., as likewise does the augment at its end (IY) : عَرَض [684, 713], عَرْبَة [685, 713] (M), جَرْؤ [below], and طَوَّل tither, all of which are [treated as] sound because their formation differs from that of υ. : (a) moreover, if we transformed such [n.s.] as these, we should not arrive at a letter with which one is safe from a vowel [above], because we should arrive at and in such as لُمْثَة عَيْبَة, since the preceding letter is pronounced with Damm; and at ى in such as جَرْؤ and طَوَّل, since the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr; contrary to such as ٌمٌ and دَارٌ, where we arrive at ل which one is safe from a vowel (IY). They transform قَيْم [685, 713] only because it is an inf. n., i. q. قَيْمٌ; [though] used as an ep. in [the reading VI. 162. [368, 713] (M): and, but for that [quality of inf. n.], it would be [treated as] sound, like جَرْؤ [removal from one place to another, which is a simple substantive (Jh, KF) in لا يَبْنُون عَنْهَا جَرْؤا. XVIII. 108. Not seeking removal from them, because they do not make it conformable to a v. [331]; whereas, if it were conformable to the v., vid. حَالٌ, aor. يَحْرُقُ, you would say جَيْلٌ, because of the transformation of its
v. (IY). The inf. n. is transformed by reason of the v.'s being transformed (M), and [treated as] sound by reason of the v.'s being [treated as] sound, as لَيْبَ ُ inf. n. of لُيَجَ [713], and ُ inf. n. of لَزَة [685 (case 2, b), 699, 711], because of the connection between them (IY): while ُ inf. n. of حَالَ [685 (case 2, d), 713] is [explained] by Z as anomalous (IY),] like ُ [above] (M); though the [better] account is what we have premised, ُ vid. that ُ is a simple substantive, not an inf. n.,] because it is [then] regular (IY). And ُ , (1) if from [the cat. of ] , has its ُ made quiescent, because of the combination of two Dammas and the , as ُ نُورَ [712, 721] and ُ عُورَ , pl. of ُ نَوارُ and ُ عَورَان [246]; but in poetry is uncontracted, [according to the o. f. (IY),] as ُ زَيَّ أَخْمَة أَلْنِيَايَا آلِح [246, 712] (M) and آَلَّا كُبَ آلِمَعَبِ آلِح [246]: (a) the use of the o. f., vid. Damm [of the ُ ], here is a poetic license, according to S; but is allowable in prose, according to Mb, who says that, if you mean to substitute a Hamza for the , [683], that [substitution] is allowable, because the ُ is pronounced with Damm (IY): (2) if from [the cat. of ] , is like the sound: he that says ُ كُتِبَ and ُ رَسَّلُ says ُ غُيُرَ and ُ بَيِضَ in the pl. of ُ غَيْرُ [246, 348] and ُ بِيْضَ [246]; while he that says ُ كُتِبَ and ُ رَسَّلُ says ُ غُيُرَ and ُ بَيِضَ [246] (M), because, being
it is subject to the same [transformation] as the pl. of أَبيَّصَٰنٍ (686 (case 1, α, γ), 718) (IY).

§ 712. The condition of transformation of the ع in the n. [of more than three letters, like تَفْعَأْلُ and مَفْعَأٰلُ (Jrb),] not tril., [like بَأَبٍ and تَأَبٍ (MASH),] nor conformable [below] to the v., [like the inf. n. and act. and pass. parts (MASH),] but such as has not been [hitherto] mentioned [below], is agreement with the v. in vowel and quiescence, together with difference from it in an augment, [like the م of مَفْعَأٰلُ (MASH),] or a mode of formation, [like تَفْعَأٰلُ (MASH),] peculiar to the n. (SH). In the tril. [n.], together with commensurability with the v. [703, 711], no difference is prescribed. The reason why difference is not prescribed in the tril., but is prescribed in the augmented, is that [without difference] the augmented, if transformed, would, when used as a [proper] name [18], be confounded with the v., because of the omission of Kasra and Tanwin [17]; whereas the tril., even if a proper name, is distinguished from the v. by its Kasra and Tanwin. By "conformable" [248, 252, 331, 343, 349] IH means (1) the inf. n., such as إِقَامَةٌ and إِسْتِقَامَةٌ [703]: (2) the act. and pass. parts. from the tril. and non-tril. [703, 708, 709, 714]: (a) they may be said to contain commensurability, قَامَلٌ.
being on the measure of یفعلُ [343, 703, 714] in respect of vowels and quiescences; and the ٌ in مفعلُ being contrary to the o.f., which is مفعلٌ, like يفعلُ [347, 703, 714]. IH's saying "such as has not been [hitherto] mentioned" is not needed, because, for conversion of the ٣ into ١ [703], every ٌ, whether such as has, or such as has not, been [hitherto] mentioned, must possess the agreement specified [above], in the case of [both] the tril. [703, 711] and the augmented; together with the difference specified [above], in the case of the augmented: and similarly for transfer of the vowel from the ٣ of the augmented to the preceding quiescent, except in such as ٤٨٤٨ ٤٨٤٨ [697, 699, 703], which, notwithstanding [their] lack of the agreement specified, contain transfer and conversion, because of their perfect affinity to their ٌ; and except in the cat. of ٤٨٥٧٤٨٤٨ [703, 708, 715], which also, notwithstanding [its] lack of agreement, contains conversion, because of [its] extreme heaviness. In the augmented tril., then, together with commensurability with the ٌ, difference from it in some respect is prescribed, like the aug. letter (1) not used as an aug. in the ٌ, like the م of مَقَامٌ and مَقَامٌ [703]; for in the o.f. [مَقَومٌ and مِقَومٌ] they are like تُحَبَّد Thou praisest and Tُحَبَّد Thou art praised, but in the initials of the ٌ is not used as an augment: (2) used as an augment in the
v., but mobilized with a vowel not used as its vowel in
the v., as تَبْنَاءْ on the measure of تَفْعِيلٌ with Kasr of the
لا and Fath of the ـ; for it is commensurable with [the
imp.] إِلَّا. Know thou, but in the initial of the v. there
is no aug. ـ pronounced with Kasr, such [a formation]
as تَفْعِيلٌ being [merely] a dial. var. of some people [below],
and withal not being general [even among them, but
confined to particular classes of v.s.], as before explained
[404]. Sometimes the augmented tril. is transformed
because of a difference other than the two mentioned, as
قَاطِمٌ [683 (case 2), 703, 708]: for they are
commensurable with ُيَفْعِيلُ [above]; but their aug. is not
in the same place as, nor identical with, its aug. (R).
Therefore, if from ِبِنَغَتَ you formed [an augmented tril.
n.], (1) like مَفْضُرٍ [361] and مَحْتَلِي [372, 678], you would
say مَفْضَعٍ and مَفْضَعٍ, transformed (SH), because of their
agreement with the v. in vowel and quiescence, together
with [their] difference [from it] in مَفْضَعٍ through the
augment م, which is not used as an augment in v.s.; and
in مَفْضَعٍ [below] through the Kasr of the ـ, since ـ,
though used as an augment in the v., is not pronounced
there with Kasr together with Kasr of the ـ [404]: so
that no confusion [of the n. with the v.] results from
transformation (MASH): (2) like مَفْضِرٍ [678], you
would say ﺛَﺒَﺒِﯿَﯿٰٓ, treating [it] as sound (SH), lest, if transformed, it should be confounded with the v., since there would be no difference at all (MASH). The n. resembling the aor., [then,] i.e., agreeing with it in number of consonants and vowels, shares with the v. [703] in the necessity of transformation by the transfer mentioned, provided that it contain a mark distinguishing it from the v. (A), to avert its being mistaken for the v. (Sn). Two sorts [of augmented tril. n.] are included in that [cat.]:—(1) what agrees with the aor. in its measure, but not in its augment, like ﺛَﻨَﻔَﻠَلٰ, standing-place [above]: for it agrees with the v. in its measure only, [because orig. ﺛَﻔَﻠَﮭٰ, like ﺛَﻔَﻠَﻠٰ (Sn);] but contains an augment, vid. the م, announcing that it does not belong to the class of vs.; so that it is transformed: (a) similarly such as ﺛَﺒَﯿٰٓ إِمَٰٓٓ, setting upright and separating (b) if from ﺛَّﺒَﺒِٰٓ you formed ﺛَﺒَﺒِٰٓ, you would say مَبَاحٰٓ, if ﺛَﺒَﺒِٰٓ with Fath [of the ع], then you would say مَبَاحٰٓ; if ﺛَﺒَﺒِٰٓ with Kasr, then مَبَاحٰٓ; and if ﺛَﺒَﺒِٰٓ with Damm, then also مَبَاحٰٓ according to the opinion of S, but مَبَاحٰٓ according to the opinion of Akh [710] (A): (a) مَبَاحٰٓ is transformed on account of its resemblance to the aor. in measure, but not in augment; because the ی of femininization,
being virtually separate \[266\], does not prevent [agreement with] the measure (Sn): (c) such as (M) ـَةً مَكْوَزَةٍ \[Makwaza \[4, 716\] (M, R), مَرْيَمُ Mazyad, and [below] (M), among (R) proper names (IY, R) of human beings (IY), and مَدْيِنَة [below] (M), a name of a place (IY), and مَشْوَرة consultation, counsel, مَصْيَدْهُ snare, trap, net, [with Fath of the م (R), as اِلْفَكَةَةٌ [مقودة \[Mَقْوَدَةٍ \[The game fell into our trap (IY),] and [مقودة \[The jest is a means of leading to annoyance, [among ns. not proper names (IY),] are anomalous (M, R), by rule مكازة [Part I, Note on p. 8, l. 1]; مَقْلَم, مَنْدَان, مَرَّان, like مَقْلَم saying [366] and مَقْلَم \[above\]; and مَيَارَة, مَيَادِن, and ميَادِن, like ميَادِن \[سُؤْلَةٍ and سُؤْلَةٍ help (IY): and سؤلة II. 97. [591] is read (M), like سؤلة [above] (K, IY, B), by Katāda and Abu-sSimāk, by rule مثابة; while AZ transmits هُذَا شَيْء مُطْبِيْة لِلنَفْس This is a thing giving pleasure to the soul and هُذَا شَرب مَبَوْلِة This is a diuretic drink: (d) this in the n. is like [703, 707] in the v., as though they produced some of the unsound [formations] according to their o. fs., for a notification thereof, and for preservation of the altered o. fs. (IY):
(e) as for مَرْيَمُcribed [above] (R, A), if you make them فَعُيْلُ, there is no anomaly, since the ي is co-ordinate [703]; whereas, if you make them مَفْعُولُ, they are anomalous (R): [but] it has been already mentioned [674] that their measure is مَفْعُولُ; not مَفْعُولُ, otherwise transformation [by transfer and then conversion (Sn)] would be necessary; nor تَبَيَّعْ, because it is not found in the language: (2) what agrees with the aor. in its augment, but not in its measure, as when you form from تَرْلُ and بِيْعُ a n. on the model of بِيْعُلُ with Kasr of the تُ, in which case you say تَبَيَّعْ and تَبَيِّلَ [above] with two Kasras followed by a quiescent ي [original in تَبَيِّعُ, and converted from, in تَبَيَّعُ, the transformation of تَبَيِّعُ being by transfer only, and of تَبَيِّلَ by transfer and conversion (Sn): (a) when you form from بِيْعُ a n. on the paradigm of تَرْلُ, you say, according to the opinion of S, بِيْعُ with دَمَم and then كَسْر; but, according to the opinion of Akh, بِيْعُ [710]: (b) the mark distinguishing this sort [of augmented tril. n.] from the v. is its being on a measure peculiar to the n., because تَبَيِّلَ with كَسْر, or دَمَم, of the تُ [and ي together (Sn)] is not [found] in the v.; [so that its commensurable is not fancied to be a v. (Sn),] and is therefore transformed (A). According to مب, together
with the commensurability and difference mentioned, another condition is prescribed, vid. that the word should be one of the ns. connected with vs. [330]. Therefore مَدْيِنَ and مَرَّمَ [above] are not transformed; and, according to him, are not anomalous: nor are تَرْقِيَل and تَبِينُ transformed, according to him, since they do not contain the sense of the v. (R). As for what resembles the aor. in its measure and augment, or differs therefrom in both together, it must be treated as sound. The first [sort] is such as أسْوَدُ and أَبيضُ [348, 707] (A), which are eps. on the measure of أحَمِرُ [249, 372, 671, 672], but resemble [the aor.] I know in measure and augment (Sn); [and are therefore treated as sound.] because, if transformed, they would be fancied to be vs. (A). If the augmented [tril.] n. be not different from the v. in any respect, as أَدوْنٌ مَنْكِ, أسْوَدُ and أَبيضُ [above], أَدانَ مِنكَ, إِبيِعُ [707], أَبيِعُ on the measure of إِصْبُعَ [372], and إِبيِعُ on the measure of تَرْتَبُ [372, 678], it is in no case transformed, in order that ns. may be distinguished from vs., which one worthier of transformation, because it is principally [found] in them [703, 711] (R). And [similarly (R)] أَدْوَرُ and أَعْيَنُ [242] (M; SH), pls. of دَارَ and عَينَ (MASH), are [treated as] sound (Jrb), (1) because liable to confusion (SH) with the v. on being used as names, as above shown (R), [i. e.,] 167a
(a) with the pret. of turning making to turn round and reaching a spring in digging for water, if they were transformed by conversion of the and  into 1, because mobile and preceded by a letter virtually pronounced with Fath [703], as being so pronounced in their sing.; or (b) with the 1st pers. of the aor. from turned round and  [683 (case 2)], if and  were said (MASH): or (2) because not conformable [above] (SH) to the v. (Jrb, MASH), which is obvious (Jrb); nor different (SH) from it (MASH) in the prescribed mode, which means that, though their agreement with the v. [in measure] is realized, still the condition of its being taken into consideration is that they should be different from the v. in some respect, while in default of such difference the condition of transformation is missing (Jrb). And (M, R) and (R), pls. of table [713] and  [685, 713] (MAR), and  (M); pl. of  [246] (KF), where, though the  at the end, like the at the beginning, makes them different from the v., transfer is not employed, because the  , though necessary here [265], is constitutionally separable [266]; so that, being here like the  in fem. of serpent [685 (case 7, d)], it is [virtually] non-existent. Nor is transfer employed in such as the [prolonged] 1 of feminization,
being inseparable and like part of the word, excludes them from commensurability with the v., as the [abbreviated] ٍ does in جَلَّانُ طَيْرٍ and ُخَبَّدَةٌ ضَرَّي and the ُن in [684 (condition 11, a, d), 703]. Some of the Arabs transfer the Kasra of the ئِبَينَاءَ in أَبِينَاءَ [714], not because of resemblance to the v., otherwise they would also transfer [the Kasra of the ئِبَينَاءَ in أَهْبُنَاءَ]; but because of dislike to Kasra on ئِ, they being similars [697]; as the [second] Damma is elided in نَورُ [for نَورَ] pl. of نَورَانِ [246, 711, 721], because Damma on ئِ is deemed heavy: so that such as أَبِينَاءَ, exclusively, notwithstanding the lack of the commensurability mentioned, is transformed by transfer because of the extreme heaviness. But [even] in such as أَبِينَاءَ, non-transformation is more frequent: nay, transfer is anomalous, contrary to نُورُ [above], where quiescence is more frequent, because ئِ pronounced with Damm is heavier than ئِ pronounced with Kasr; so that the , and Damma in [246, 711] are anomalous (R). As for such as يَزِيدُ Yazīd [4, 18], when a proper name, [which resembles the aor. in measure and augment (Sn),] it was transformed when a v., and afterwards transferred to the cat. of proper name (A, MASH).

And [similarly (MASH)] أَبَنَ Abān (R, MASH),
when a proper name, if said to be ِنَعْلُ (MASH), according to those who decline it as a diptote, is transferred from a transformed v. (R); whereas, if said to be نَعْلُ, [according to those who decline it as a triptote (R),] it does not belong to what we are discussing (R, MASH). And the second [sort] is like مَخْيَت [366, 714] (A), which is different from the aor. in Kasr of its initial, and in its initial's being an aug. م (Sn). This is the obvious [conclusion] (A), i. e., that such as مَخْيَت is treated as sound because of its difference from the aor. in measure and augment, without regard to those who pronounce the aoristic letter with Kasr [404], because they are few (Sn). IM and his son say that such as مَخْيَت ought to be transformed, because its augment is peculiar to ns.; while it resembles مَخْلَم [404], i. e., with Kasr of the aoristic letter in the dial. of some people [above]; but that it is made to accord with مَخْيَات [366, 714], because of its resemblance thereto in form and sense. But it is sometimes said that, if what they say were correct, the paradigm of مَخْلَةٌ [above] would not be transformed, because it resembles مَخْسِبٌ [with Kasr of the ﺪ (Sn)] in its measure and augment (A); while the reply that Kasr of the ﺪ in مَخْسِبٌ [482] is anomalous is effective only in مَخْسِبٌ exclusively, not
in other aor. vs. regularly pronounced with Kasr of the 
\( \text{تُعَرِّف} \), \( \text{تَصْرِب} \), \( \text{تَجَلِّس} \), and which, according 
to the dial. of those who pronounce the aoristic letter 
with Kasr, \( \text{تَحْلِيَّ} \) is commensurable without any anomaly 
in respect of Kasr of the \( \text{ع} \) (Sn). And moreover, if it 
were admitted that transformation was obligatory because 
of what they mention [about the resemblance of \( \text{مَخْيَط} \) to \( \text{تَعَلُّم} \)], it would not be obligatory upon all [of the 
Arabs (Sn)], but only upon those who pronounce the 
aoristic letter with Kasr. IM indicates this second 
[sort], [which differs from the aor. in measure and 
augment, like \( \text{مَخْيَط} \) (Sn),] by his saying “But \( \text{مَفَعَال} \) is 
treated as sound, like \( \text{مَفَعَال} \)”, meaning that \( \text{مَفَعَال} \) being 
different from the v., i.e., not resembling it in measure 
or augment, is entitled to be treated as sound, like \( \text{مُسْوَّل} \) 
tooth-stick and \( \text{مُكِيَّال} \) corn-measure; and that \( \text{مَفَعَال} \) is 
made to accord with it in being treated as sound, because 
resembling it in sense, like \( \text{مَقْوَل} \) [252] and \( \text{مَقْوَل} \) loqua-
cious, eloquent [714], \( \text{مَخْيَط} \) and \( \text{مَخْيَط} \) [above] (A). By 
analogy, such as \( \text{مَقْوَل} \) and \( \text{مَخْيَط} \) should be transformed, 
since they are on the measure of \( \text{عَلَم} \) [above]: but Khl 
says that they are not transformed, because contracted 
from \( \text{مَفَعَال} \), which is incommensurable with the v.; the
proof that مَفْعَلُ is the o. f. of مَفْعُولٌ being that they are often associated, as مَخْيَاطُ and مَخْيَاطَةٌ and منَحْطَةٌ and منَحَتْ (R). The obvious [conclusion], however, is what I have mentioned before, vid. that the cause of مَخْيَاطُ's being treated as sound is that it differs from the v. in measure and augment, because, being contracted from مَخْيَاطَةٌ [366], it is [identical with] the latter; not that it is made to accord with مَخْيَاطَةٌ: and many etymologists are of this opinion (A). And such as جَذَّرُ [369], غُلْيَبُ [374], and غُلْيَبٌ [below] (SH) are [treated as] sound (Jrb), (1) for preservation of the co-ordination (SH), since the co-ordinated is not transformed by elision, or transfer, of a vowel, nor by elision of a consonant, lest it vary from the standard [form], in which case the object of co-ordination would be defeated: except when the transformation is in the final, which is transformable, because finals are the seat of alteration; and because elision of the vowel from the final, as in مَعْزَي [272, 375, 673], does not spoil the measure; while elision of the final consonant, on account of Tanwín [643, 683], as in مَعْزَي, اً like no elision, because Tanwín is not inseparable from the word [609, 731 (condition 1, f, b, α )]: (a) غُلْيَبٌ [374], according to Akh, is co-ordinated with جَذَّرَبٌ [392]:
and, according to S also, is due to co-ordination, like سُوْدَاء [331, 718]; although فَعَلُ [392], according to him, does not occur (R): or (2) because of pure quiescence (SH), since the quiescence before the unsound letter is permanent; and in that case the preceding letter is neither pronounced, nor virtually pronounced, with Fath [703] (Jrb): (a) this is the true excuse, not the first, because, and ى preceded by a quiescent are converted into ی only on account of that quiescent's being pronounced with Fath in the o.f. of that word [703]; whereas, in what we are discussing, no vowel exists in the o.f. (R).

§ 713. The mobile, preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr ought not to be converted into ی, except at the end of the word [301, 721], like رَآيَتُ الغَائِبِي I saw the raider [16, 685 (case 1), 720, 724], as the mobile ى preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm is not converted into ٌ [even at the end], like آلَترُامِيcompetition in shooting, [orig. عَيْلَمُ (MAR),] [686 (case 1, a, α), 714, 724], and عُيَبَةُ [703, 711, 724], because Kasra's requirement of ى after it is like Damma's requirement of ٍ after it; while, the, and ى being strengthened by the vowel, the Kasra and Damma, respectively, of the letter before them are not powerful enough to convert them. And, when they are doubled [716], they are
still stronger, as اِجْلَوْدَ [332, 685 (case 5, b), 716] and بَيْعَ [685, 716] is anomalous. But the non-final mobile ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr is sometimes liable to the intervention of what requires it to be converted into ی, vid. conformity to another [word], as ۱۷ كتاب inf. n. of تَالَم [below]. That does not occur in the non-final mobile ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, which therefore remains in its o. f. (R). The ی mentioned, then (R), preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is converted into ی in [three things (R),] (1) such inf. ns. as ۱۷ قَيَام [685 (case 2), 699, 724], ۱۷ عَيَانَ inf. n. of sought protection (R), ۱۷ قَيَام [685 (case 2, d, α), 711], [and ۱۷ اِقتِیَادَ inf. n. of led, attracted (R),] because their vs. are transformed (SH): (a) we do not mean that the v. is transformed in this way; but in some way, as the ی in ۱۷ عَيَانَ is converted into ی because عَادَ is transformed by conversion of the ی into ی: (b) if it be said "How is it that such [an inf. n.] as ۱۷ عَيَانَ is, and such as ۱۷ طَبْرَانَ [712] is not, transformed by reason of the transformation of its v., when neither of them is commensurable with its v., whereas, if the inf. n.'s being conformable to [331], and exercising the government of, the v. be sufficient for transformation in ۱۷ عَيَانَ,
it is so in طیْرْان ؟" I say that Kasra’s demand for conversion of ۍ, after it into ی is stronger than Fatha’s demand for conversion of ۍ, and ی after it into ۍ, since such as بیع and قُرْنٌ are frequent, while such as بیع is rare, and such as قُرْنٌ with Kasra of the ف and quiescence of the ۍ is not to be found [703]; so that, with the least resemblance between the inf. n. and its v., the inf. n. is transformed by conversion of its ۍ into ی, because of the preceding letter’s being pronounced with Kasr, since the incentive to such conversion is strong (R): (c) ۍ حُرفٌ (R: (c) inf. n. of حَالٌ [685 (case 2, d), 711] is [anomalous (R, Jrb)], like قَوْمٌ [703, 711] (SH), the regular form being حیَالٌ (Jrb); contrary to the inf. n. of such as قِرْنٌ [685 (case 2, b), 699] (SH) and قَوْمٌ [698], which have لَوُادٌ and قَوْمٌ (Jrb), because [the ۍ in (Jrb)] the v. is [treated as (R)] sound (R, Jrb), whence الَّذينَ یَتَسَلَّلونَ مَنْتَكِم لَوَادًا XXIV. 63. [Those of you who steal away from the congregation, covering themselves one by another K, B)]; whereas, if the v. were لَآنَ took refuge, لِیَاَذَا would be said [711] (Jrb): (d) [the ۍ of] such as عَوْفٌ [684, 711] is not converted, because it is not an inf. n.; while فِیْباٰ in VI. 162. [368, 711] is orig. an inf. n. (R): (2) such [pl. (R, Jrb)] as دیِلْبُ ۍ and [685 (case 3, a, and b, d, ۍ 168a]
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α), 724] and َبَح [below], َتِر, َدِيم, because [the َع of (R)] the sing. is transformed (SH) by its conversion into (a) َتَارَة َأ time, pl. َتِر [238]; (b) َي, as in َدِيَة, pl. َدِيم [238, 278, 685 (case 3, a)], and َرَح, pl. َح [237] (R): (a) the proof that the َي of َتِر is [orig.] is their saying َتَارَة َأ I returned to him time after time and َأَلَّاس َيَتَأْوِرَنَ The people return time after time; and [also] what A'B mentions, vid. that the َتَارَة is substituted for َي, its derivation being from َتَر, which is a messenger between people: but the [opinion] mentioned in the Jh is that it belongs to the [cat. of] َي [below] (b) similarly َدِيم is orig. َدَم, because it is from َدَمَ continued, aor. َيُدَم: this is mentioned by one of the learned in his commentary on the Taṣrīf of IM; and is implied by the words of IH and Z: but the [opinion] mentioned in the Jh is what we have stated in the chapter on the Plural (Jrb), [vid. that] it belongs to the cat. of َي, because of their saying َدِيمَتُ َأَلْسَمَ The sky rained continually; inf. n. َتَدِيم: so he mentions in the Jh; whereas the truth is that it belongs to the cat. of َي (Jrb on the Plural): (c) [pl. of طَبِيل (R) in َتَبَيَن لي َأَنَّ َأَلْحَم (Jrb)] is anomalous [246, 685 (case b, d, α)] (SH), by rule (Jrb), since [the َع of (R)] its sing. is not transformed (R, Jrb); and by usage also, since
the most frequent [form] is طَوْلُ (Jrb): (d) رَوْنَ [685 (case 3, b, d, β)], pl. of رَيْانُ, [notwithstanding that its sing. is transformed in the ع (R).] is [treated as] sound, [like طُرِيْعُ (R).] from dislike to [the combination of (Jrb)] two transformations [728]: and [so is (R, Jrb)] نَوْرٌ pl. of نَوْرٌ (SH), i.e., fat [camel (Jrb, MAR), from نَوْرُ meaning distance; though it is regular (Jrb)], because the ع of its sing. is not transformed (R, Jrb); while even if it were transformed, still transformation of the pl. would not be allowable, because two transformations would be combined (R): (3) such [pls. (R)] as رِيَّاهُ [685 (case 3, b), 724], فَيَابُ [242, 279, 724] (SH), and حِيَّاهُ [242, 685] (R), because the أ is quiescent in the sing., and followed by an l [in the pl.]; contrary to عَرْنَ [685 (case 3, b, c), 711] and كُرْرُ, [because the l is missing (Jrb)]: whereas فُيُّرُ [685, 724] is anomalous (SH), by rule فُرْرُ [below], because the l is missing; but, like فُرْرُ [703, 707], it is anomalous [only] by rule, not by usage (Jrb): (a) this is the weakest of the three things; and therefore needs another condition, vid. that the أ occurring after Kasra should be followed by l; because the أ of the sing. is not transformed, but [merely] contains a quasi-transformation, vid. its quiescence, which makes it dead, so that it is, as it were,
transformed: (b) the condition mentioned is effective because, between Kasra and i is like a combination of three unsound letters [697]; so that the heaviest of them, i.e., the ی, is converted into what is homogeneous with the preceding vowel, vid. ی: (c) although this condition is not prescribed for the two first [things], as in [the inf. n.] تُبَر [above], and [the p.l.s.] تُبَر [below] and دَبَر [above], still it strengthens them; and therefore جُرَل [above], though an inf. n. of a transformed v., may be treated as sound: (d) ثَيَر, together with دَبَر [above], is allowable, for conformity with 685 (case 3, b, c, 8): (e) 712 and 685 (case 5) are [treated as] sound, because they are not p.l.s. (R). But [Jh says that] تُبَر [238] is contracted from ثَيَار; and is [so] altered only on account of the unsound letter, [which he holds to be ی (above)]; while, but for that, it would not be altered, since they say رَحْب, and not رَحْب, as p.l. of رَحْب [238, 254] (Jh).

§. 714. The [augmented tril.] n., when not like إِسْتِقَامَة and إِتِمَامُ [below], which are transformed by reason of the transformation of their vs., is debarred from transformation by [the fact] that the letter before, or after, its ی, or ی is quiescent (M); so that, if the, and ی were made quiescent, two quiescents would
concur, and elision or mobilization [of one of them] would be necessary, in which case the formation would be obliterated (IY). That \[n. (IY)\] is [of three kinds, being treated as sound because of the quiescence of (IY)] (1) [the letter before the ع, like (IY)] خُلْد and مايِش [717] (M), as in the saying of AlAkhtal

And verily I am wont to stand in places wherein Jarîr is not, nor the patron of Jarîr, one to stand and أَرْجَعَنا لْكَمْ نِبِهَا مَعَاَيِشَ VII. 9. And have made for you therein means of subsistence [717] (IY); and أَبْنَى اَلْأَهْرَى [251, 712]: (2) [the letter after the ع, like (IY)] سُرْقَة [242, 688], and [242, 688]; [239, 242] طَوْيرُ, [348, 683-685]; [686, 713]; and as جَبَّر جَبَّر مِنْ قَوْمِ [686, 713] جَبَّر أَيْ ضِعْفَ جَبَّر. A good man, come of good people (IY)] : (3) the letter before, and the letter after, the ع, like (IY)

[ophthalmia and great seller (IY)]; [مَشْوَر], [place where beasts are exhibited and copious, excellent, in speech (IY)]; and [مَقْوَال] تَجَوَّال from قَوَّال [489] and قَوَّال I said much, like [332, 334], denoting multiplication: (a) the preventive of transformation here is the unsound letter's being enclosed by two quiescents [below]; so that, if it were converted
into 1, three quiescents would concur, which would be a sort of impossibility [663]. Moreover these ns. have not the same formations as vs., while only what is on the measure of the v. is transformed [703, 711, 712]; so that these ns. are [treated as] sound from their lack of resemblance to vs., since they are not on the measure of vs., nor conformable to them. In أَبْنِيَهُم, أَهْرَنُهُم, however, the ّ is sounded true because they are on the measure of the v., and the augment at their beginning is like the augment in the v. [712], أُضْرِبَ being like I should strike; while the ّ of feminization is not accounted a distinctive, because it is quasi-separate, since, if you formed a dim. from what contains it, you would form the dim. from the first part [of the n.], and afterwards put the ّ, as حَمْرَأ, حَمْرِيْسَة, حَمْرَآء, حُنَّيْفَة, حُمْرِآء, حُمْرِيْسَة, حُمْرَآء, حُنَّيْفَة [274, 282, 283]: although they do say أَعْبَايْهُم and أَعْبَيْبَآءُ [728] and أَعْبَيْبَآءُ [712], the Kasra of the ّ being thrown upon the preceding [quiescent] letter. As for إِسْتِقَامَة٠ إِقَامَة٠ [699, 703], we transform them, as we transform their vs., because إنْفَعَلُ and إِسْتَفْعَالٌ are as inseparable from [the inf. ns. of] إنْفَعَلُ and إِسْتَفْعَالٌ [332] as يُفْعَلُ and يُسْتَفْعَالٌ from their aors. [404]; whereas, if they differed [from their vs.], as the unaugmented trils. differ from their inf. ns., of which various
kinds occur [331], they would be [treated as] sound, as َفَعُولُ [above], is (IY). Such [ns.] as ُكُوْلَ gift and ُسِيْلَαλُ a species of mimosa or acacia, ُكَرْبِلُ [above], ُكُوْلُ [348, 684, 685] and ُقُوْلُ eloquent [730. A], ُكَوْلُ and ُقُوْلُ [above], are not transformed, (1) because of their incommensurability with the v. [712]: (2) as is said, because of ambiguity [below], since, if they were transformed, elision would ensue; or mobilization by conversion into Hamza, as in ُقُنْتِلُ and ُبَنْثُ [708]: but this is reputed by [the fact] that transformation is proper if its cause be existing, as in the exs. mentioned (R). ُقُوْلُ and ُقُوْلُ, [though inf. ns. of transformed vs. (R, MASH), i.e., ُقَالُ said and ُسَارُ journeyed (MASH),] are [treated as] sound, because of ambiguity [above] (SH); and are not made to conform to their vs., as ُإِقَامُ and ُإِسْتَقَامهُ are made to conform to ُإِقَامُ and ُإِسْتَقَامهُ [703, 712], lest, after transformation, they be mistaken for ُفَعَلَ [below] (R). The generality of Commentators say that, if the ُعُ here were converted into ُل, after mobilization of the ُفُ, two š's would be combined; and, after elision of one of them, ُتَسَّأَرُ and ُتَقَالُ would remain, which might be mistaken for the pass. of ُتَقُولُ and ُتَسِيرُ: but this is [unsatisfactory,] as you see, since the ُعُ here is pronounced with Fath; so that one is reduced either to
[the hypothesis] that ambiguity in appearance, [not in sound.] is meant; or to what R says, that they might be mistaken for [above], the ب being fancied to be rad. (MASH). This [suggestion of ambiguity as the cause] is the saying of IH (R): but [R says that (MASH)] the [true] reason is what has been mentioned before, vid. that the ع of the inf. n. is not transformed in this way unless the inf. n. be regular, equal to its v. in keeping its augment in the same relative position as that of the v., like استفادة and إقامة [699, 703]; whereas مقول and تقول are not so (R, MASH). And [above] and مرضية [366, 712], (1) because of ambiguity (SH), since, if they were transformed, مكتا and مقال would be said; so that one would not know whether they were مفعل or مفعل (Jrb): (a) IH means that, being instrumental ns. [366] conformable to the v. [331], they would [naturally] be treated, as regards transformation, in the same way as the v. [703]; but that they are not transformed, because they might be mistaken for [فعل or فعل]: whereas the truth is that, since the cause of transformation, vid. commensurability with the v., does not exist in them, they are not transformable; and that every v. connected with the v. [330] is not subject to this transformation (R): (2) because they are not on the pattern of the v., from which they are differentiated
by the 之后的 未经校正: (3) because the unsound letter here is enclosed by two quiescents [above]: while that necessitates sounding [it] true [even] in the v., as إسْوَانَ [707]; and a fortiori, therefore, in the n. (Jrb). And مَقْوْلٍ [252, 712] and مَحْيَيْتَ [366, 712] are contracted from, or syn. with, them (SH); and therefore not transformed (Jrb). These need excuse, because, being commensurable with the v., as إِسْحَبْنُ Praise thou and إِدْهَبْنُ [428, 667], and containing the [prescribed] difference [712] by the َبَعْلَمِ at the beginning, they ought properly to be transformed. And the excuse is that, being contracted from مَفْعَالُ, they are treated like their o. f.: or we may say that, though they are not derivs., but o. fs., مَفْعَالُ is made to conform, in omission of transformation, to َمَفْعَالُ, because syn. with it; and this is more appropriate, since agreement of َمَفْعَالُ in meaning does not prove it to be a deriv. thereof (R). But such [pass. parts. (Jrb)] as مَقْرَمٌ إِنْ [constructively مَقْرَمٌ undertaken (Jrb)] and مَبَاغُ are transformed by another [process] (SH), not by conversion of their ِعَ into ِهَ (R, Jrb, MASH), as in their o. fs. (R), on account of its being mobile and preceded by a letter virtually pronounced with Fath [703] (MASH), in which case مَبَاغُ would be said, for conformity with ُتَلَّم and ُبَاغُ; but by quiescence 169a
of their _gs, and transfer of its vowel (Jrb), because of ambiguity (SH), since, if ступа_ and مقام were said, no one would know whether they were مَفْعُولٌ [697, 703, 709] or مَفْعُولٌ [703, 712] (MASH). And such [formations] as غَيْرٌ [246] جواز, and غَيْرٌ (SH), notwithstanding the unsound letter's being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (MASH), are [treated as] sound (Jrb), (1) because [after conversion of the unsound letter into ] two quiescents would be combined, the first of them an ! : so that, if the second were mobilized, and طَيْلٌ, جَذَّبٌ, and were said (MASH), they might be mistaken for َفعل; or [if the first were elided, and غَيْرٌ, جَذَّبٌ, and remained, they might be mistaken (MASH) for َفعل (SH), with the ُاء mobile in جَذَّب, and quiescent in the two last: while, if the second quiescent were elided, then َاء, جَذَّب, and would remain, which might be mistaken for َفعل mobile in the ُاء; or for the pret. of جَذَّب was liberal, aor. طَالٌ, يُجِبْرُ (MASH): or (2) because they (a) are not conformable to the v. [712] (SH), since the [eps.] conformable to it are the act. and pass. parts., which agree with it in shape, and in indication of coming newly into existence [343, 347], for which reason Z says in the M, in explanation of the act. and pass. parts., that they are “what
is conformable" [in its vowels and quiescences (IY on §§ 343, 347), and the number of its letters (IY on §. 347),] "to the يَفْعَلْ and "يَفْعَلُ", respectively, ["of its v." (M on §§ 343, 347)]; and, in explanation of the assimilate ep., that it is "not [one of the eps. (M on §. 348)] conformable" to the v. (Jrb): and (b) do not agree with it (SH) in vowel and quiescence [712], which is obvious (Jrb). But the truth is that they are not transformed because they do not belong to the sorts of n. mentioned by us [703] as transformed (R).

§. 715. When the l of [the pl. belonging to] the cat. of مَسْلَحُ [18, 256] is enclosed by two unsound letters, the second is converted into l, because of (1) its nearness to the end (R) of the word, for which reason it is assimilated to the ُل of سُمَّا [246, 683 (case 1, k, b) ], as they say a صَمَّ [below], treating it like ُعِتْى [684, 685, 722] (S); and (2) the combination of two unsound letters having between them a weak separative (R), not an insuperable barrier, but only l, which is so faint that [for قُوَّلٍ] you seem to say قُوَّل (S). And afterwards the second [ l] is converted into Hamza, as in قَاتَلٌ and بَاتَع [683 (case 2), 708], whether each of the two [enclosing letters] be a و, as in اَوْرَآتِيل [357, 683 (case 4, b), 708, 726] (R), or a َو, as in بَيَانَع pl. of بَيْنَم seller,
chafferer [730. A.]: or the first be a ى, and the second a ى, as in بِرَائَتُهُ, [on the measure of] بِرَائُتُهُ pl. of بِرَائَتْهُنَّ from بِعَلَهُ; or the converse, as in عَيْنٌ pl. of عَيْنِينِ [below], orig. عَيْنُ, because from عَالَ [had many dependents to support (MAR)], aor. يَعَوُّلُ (R), inf. n. يَعَوُّلُ (MAR). And, as for ضِيَارَانِ, [by rule ضِيَائِينِ with Hamza (R),] it it anomalous (R, A) in the pl., as [ضِيَائِينِ is] in the sing. [685 (case 7, c, b, α, and d, δ)] (R): but, since the ى is sounded true in the sing., it is sounded true in the pl.; so that they say ضِيَارَانِ, as they say ضِيَائِينِ, by rule ضِئِائِينِ [685, 716] (A). That [conformity of the pl. to the sing. in lack of alteration] is, however, not universal, since you say بَنَاتٌ أَلْبَبٍ [veins in the heart, whence comes tenderness (Jh, MAR)], with dissolution of incorporation, anomalously, [as an Arab woman of the desert, reproving a son of hers, on being asked “What ails thee that thou dost not curse him?”], said

كَأَنَّى لَهُ دَاكَ بَنَاتٌ أَلْبَبٍ

My heart-strings forbid, or My tenderness forbids, that for him (Jh, MAR)]; and, in the pl. [256], incorporated (R): though it is stated in the Sahih that (MAR), in the pl. and dim. of أَلْبَبٍ, you say أَلْبَبٌ and أَلْبَبٌ, which [statement] is more probable than the saying of those who transform them (Jh MAR) by...
incorporation of the нем into its like (MAJh). And the
correct [opinion] is that noteworthy is not to be taken as a
precedent (A) for sounding the , true, whenever a pl. is
found resembling it in soundness of [the , in] the sing.;
though some people make a precedent of it: so in [the
commentary of] IU.K (Sn). Out of all those [four cases]
the [only one actually] heard is where the ꞌ of the pl. is
enclosed by two ꞌ s; while S constructs the remaining
three by analogy to it, because two ꞌ s, or ꞌ ꞌ, and ꞌ , are
deemed heavy like two ꞌ s (R). What is mentioned [in
§. 683 (case 4)] as to there being no difference, in the
two soft letters, between two ꞌ s, two ꞌ s, and ꞌ ꞌ, ꞌ ,
is the opinion of S and Khl and those who agree with
them (Tsr). But Akh holds [that Hamza is only in the
case of two ꞌ s: and (Tsr)] that [by analogy (R)] there
is no Hamza in the case of two ꞌ s, or of ꞌ ꞌ, and ꞌ [716]
(R, Tsr), because their combination is not like that of
two ꞌ s [in degree of heaviness] (R); so that you say
،سْيَبَّانِدٌ، and سْيَبَّانِدٌ، according to the o.f.
(Tsr); while ꞌ p.l. of ꞌ بَأَتْعَ [247] is pronounced with
Hamza only because it is ꞌ p.l. of what has its ꞌ ꞌ converted
into Hamza [708], [an argument which applies equally
to ꞌ سْوَاذُدٌ ]. Therefore, when you form the act. part.
from ꞌ حَيِّي [697, 728] and ꞌ شَرَى roasted, saying حَيِّي with.
and ꞌ شَارِبٌ [685 (case 10, b, a)], like ꞌ نَمِّى [16], you say,
in its pl. for irrational objects [247], (1) according to S and حَوَاِی [726], because the ٰ of the pl. occurs between ٰ and ی in the pl. of حَوَی, and between two ٰ in the pl. of شَارٰی: (a) you do not make the pl. of شَارٰی ْ‌ٰ imitate its sing., as you do in the pl. of ْ‌ٰ إِدَارٰی [281], since, if you did, you would say شَوارٰی [726], which would be a flight [back] to what has been fled from: (2) according to the opinion of Akh, حَوَّانی with ی : (a) as for شَوارٰی, there is no dispute about it, because of the combination of two ٰ (R). Akh's doubt is that the substitution in the case of two ٰ is only because of their heaviness; while there is a precedent for that, vid. [in] the combination of two ٰ at the beginning of the word [683, 699]; whereas, when two ی s, or and ی, are combined at the beginning of the word, there is no [substitution of] Hamza, as یَبَن and ُیَبَن [698]. But the sound [opinion] is what S holds, vid. that the substitution is unrestricted, because of (1) analogy, since the substitution in [the penultimate of] وِلآْْ یٰٰ is only by conformity to [the final of] ۡكِسْآ ۡدَآٰ and ۡكِسْآ ۡدَآٰ [683 (case 1), 728], because of its resemblance to the latter in respect of its nearness to the end; while in ۡكِسْآ ۡدَآٰ there is no difference between ی and ۡدَآٰ, and so therefore here: (2) hearsay, because AZ transmits ۡسِیٰائٰنی with Hamza, as pl. of
stalking-animal, which is from drove, aor. یَسُوُى (Jh) with Hamza, as pl. of یَجِیَد (Jh). Mz says "I asked As how the Arabs form the broken pl. of یَعِیل [below], and he said 'They pronounce with Hamza, as in the case of two ی s'"; and this is an authority in support of Khl and S (1Y). When the unsound letter after the ی of the pl. is far from the end, you do not convert it into ی, whether the two enclosing letters be both ی, as in یَبِیْعِیس [708]; or both ی, as in یَبِیْعِیس pl. of یَبِیْع [714, 730. A]; or different, as in یَقِیَمُ pl. of یَقِیَم [384, 716], and یَبِیْع pl. of یَبِیْع [685 (case 7), 716] on the measure of یَبِیْع [377], from یَبِیْع, if you give these [broken] pls. to the ns. mentioned [252]. As for یَمَر [252] pl. of یَمَر [714] meaning mote, as

وَکَحَل الْعَيْنِیِّی بالعَوِیر [253], [the ی in (MAR)] it is [sounded true (MAR)] because its o. f. is یَعِویر, the ی being elided because sufficiently represented by the Kasra: while یَعِیائِل, as

[287], is [pronounced] with Hamza because its o. f. is یَعِیائِل, the Kasra being implected (R), since it is pl. of
(1542)

[708] (R, Aud, A), with Kasr of the ی (Aud), like سید [251], meaning poor (R) [or dependent], sing. of dependents (Aud, A). یثاثل یثاثل having thus two pls. یثاثل یثاثل (Sn); [for] Sgh says "The sing. of یثاثل is یثاثل, یثاثل, pl. یثاثل یثاثل, like یثاثل, یثاثل and یثاثل, pl. یثاثل یثاثل" (A): so that in both pls. [عور و and عور] the o. f. is observed (R). And hence the transformation of صیم [above] and قیم [247], [by conversion of the ی into ی (IY)], because of [its (IY)] nearness to the end; [contrasted] with the treatment of قوم and قوم [384] as sound, [when the unsound letter is far from the end (IY)]; while فلکن من صبایة قوم [Such a one is of the choice, or best, set of his people, transmitted by Fr (IY),] and نما أرق أئله الماع [685 (case 10, b, b), 716, 722] are anomalous (M). All of this is in the pl.: but, if the like [enclosure of an antepenultimate ی by two unsound letters] occur in the non-pl., then also S converts the second into ی, and afterwards into Hamza; while Akh and Zj do not alter it [683 (case 4, b)] (R).

§. 716. The ی, whether [it be (MASH)] an ی, or a ی [722], or anything else, [i. e., an aug., like the ی of مفعول and the ی of the pl. (MASH)], when it is combined with ی, and the first [of them, whichever it be (MASH)], is quiescent [below], is converted into ی; and
[the first ی (MASH)] is incorporated [into the second (MASH)]; while the preceding [vowel], if Դamma, is converted into Kasra [below]: as, (1) [when the ں is an ع (R).] (a) ستین [251, 747] (SH) and میت (Jrb), orig. ستین (MASH) and میت (Jh), on the measure of قیعل (685 (case 7, a, a), 703) (Jrb): (b) ایام [747] (SH), orig. ایام (R, Jrb): (c) دیار [322, 499] (SH), orig. دیار, being قیعل from I went round (Jrb); and قیام [384, 715] (SH), orig. قیام (R), being قیعال (R, Jrb) from قلم, aor. قیوم (Jrb): whereas, if قیام and (Jrb) قیام were [on the measure of (Jrb)] قیام (R, Jrb), because they are from [vs. whose ع is] (Jrb): (d) قیوم [377] (SH), orig. قیوم, being قیوم (R, Jrb) from قیام [713] (Jrb); whereas, if it were [on the measure of (Jrb)] قیوم, then قیوم would be said (R, Jrb): (e) طی [278, 302, 685 (case 7, a, b)] (SH), orig. طی, inf. n. of طیت (Jrb): (2) [when the ں is a ل (R).] (SH), orig. دلیتا (R, Jrb), because dim. of دلیتا bucket [280], the ں being put because دلیتا is masc. and fem. [282] (Jrb): (3) [when the ں is anything else (R).] (a) مرمی [294, 347] (SH), orig. مرمی (Jrb), the ں being the مفعول (R), because it is مفعول from مفعول [685 (case 7), 728, 730], when a nom. (SH), orig. مفعول (MASH)
(Jrb), the, being the, of the pl. (R): (a) IH says "when a nom." [above], because, and, are not combined in مَسْلِيَيْن when an acc. or gen. [129]: (b) مرَّتِي and مَسْلِيَيْن, though not belonging to this chapter, [which treats of the unsound letters as rads.,] are mentioned here, because they happen to be included in the predicament (Jrb). Although, and, are not so approximate in outlet [732] that one should be incorporated into the other, as in ذَكْرُ and أَفْغِر grew his front teeth [756], still, since their combination is deemed heavy, a very slight affinity between them, vid. their being letters of prolongation and softness, is considered sufficient [cause] for alleviating them by inco-poration (R). The, and, are treated as likes [731], because they join in prolongation [of the preceding vowel]; and for the same reason they are combined in the backed rhyme, as in the saying [of 'Amr Ibn Kulthum atTaghlibi (EM)]

تركنا النَّاصِبَ عَائِدَةً عَليّةً # مُقَلِّدة أُعْتِبَتْ صَفْرًا

after

وسِئِد مَعَكَّرَ قد نُوجَرْهُ # يُتَّاجِل اللَّبَك يُخَبِّى الْمُجَهَّرَيْنَا

(IY) And (many) a chief of a clan, whom they have crowned with the diadem of sovereignty, who defends the refugees, have we left (our) horses biding over, having their reins hung upon them, standing upon three legs and the point of the toe of the fourth! (EM). And
incorporative alleviation is encouraged in their case by the fact that their first is quiescent [above]; for the condition of incorporation is quiescence of the first [731]. Although the rule, in incorporating two approximates, is to convert the first into the second [735], the whether it precede or follow, is converted into اَل in order that the intended alleviation may be realized, because و and اَل are not heavier than double اَل [715]. You do not incorporate, however, in سُويّر (1) [685 (case 7, b, b, ب), 730] and تُبرِعُ, (a) because, says Khl, the اَل is not inseparable; but its predicament is that of the اَل, for which it is a subst., since their o. f. is سَاَيَر and [703]; and therefore, as اَل, which is the o. f. of this اَل, is not incorporated into anything [739], so likewise the اَل, which is a subst. for it: (a) for the same reason you do not incorporate in such as تُقرِّرُل [730, 731] and تُقرِّرُل : (b) because, if you did incorporate in such as سُويّر and تُبرِعُ and تُقرِّرُل and تُقرِّرُل, they might be mistaken for وَفَعَّل and وَفَعَّل : (a) the omission of incorporation here is not on account of the mere prolongation, because this prevents incorporation only when it is at the end of the word, as in تَقَلُّوا وَأَقْبَلُوا XII 71. They said (and came forward) and فيَّ يومٍ XIV. 21. On a day [731]; not in a single word, as مَّغَرِّبٍ [301, 685 (case 8, b), 722], and مَّرَضُيّ
(above): (2) such as إِجْلِيْرَانَانِ [332, 685, 713], because the conversion [of the first into ي] supervenes irregularly; and ceases in the pl. and dim. of إِجْلِيْرَانِ [685]: while for إِجْلِيْرَانِ you more often say إِجْلِيْرَانِ [332, 685 (case 5, b), 713]:

(a) if were فيَعَالِ [377], conversion of the into ي and incorporation of the [first] ي [into it] would be necessary, as in أَيْمُ [384], the [first] و being irregularly converted into ي, as in تُغَرَّط، pl. [278, 332, 685], زَوْيَيْ [3], [685 (case 7, b, b, b)], when you alleviate زَوْيَيْ and زَوْيَيْ by converting the Hamza into و [658]. Some of the Arabs convert [this into ي], and incorporate [it into the second ي], saying زَوْيَيْ [685 (case 7, c, a), 702]. That is nowise allowable in سُوْيَر [above], because confusion with the conjug. of فَعَل would be produced, contrary to such as زَوْيَيْ [above]. But, by analogy to it, some of the GG say تُقَى [685 (case 7, b, b, γ) (R). As for خَايْةٌ [685, 715], خَايْةٌ [below], and خَايْةٌ [686], they are anomalous (SH). The second ي of [o. f. of (Part I, p. 7 A)] خَايْةٌ [4, 685, 689, 698] is converted into , in the proper name
exclusively, because proper names are often altered to a form different from that which the word must assume, like مَكْرَة [4, 712], for a notification of their exclusion from their original application; but, according to Mz, the of حبكة is original, as we mentioned in the case of حبكة [698] (R). The ةلما is changed into كسر in مُسْلِمِي and مُرْمَي [above], lest a quiescent ى preceded by ةلما should occur (Jrb). But ىُلُع with كسر and ةلما occurs in the pl. of أَلْوَي [728] (SH) violent in altercation; contrary to the inf. n. ىُلُع [278, 685 (case 7, a, b)], where كسر and ةلما are not allowable (Jrb). And, when you alleviate such as ىُرْنَى [above] and ىُنَرُى trench dug round a tent, to keep out rain-water [by converting the Hamza into ى], and [then convert this ى into ى], and incorporate [it into the second ى], ةلما and كسر are allowable [in ىُرْنَى and ىُرْنَى], as in ىُلُع [above]: and so, when you form ىُنَفَّلُ from ىُرَأَيْت I promised [699], and alleviate the Hamza by conversion [into ى], you say ىُرَى; and similarly ىُؤُي for ىُنَفَّلُ from ىُرَأَيْت I roasted (R). But ىُصْيَم and ىُقَيِّم and ىُقَيِّم IY on §. 715),] are anomalous [247, 685 (case 10), 715, 722] (SH), because they convert the ى into ى notwithstanding the lack of motive (Jrb). IH means
that the property of ٓ is to be converted into ٌ when it is combined with ٍ, and the first of them is quiescent [above]: whereas here two ٍs are combined, the first of which is quiescent; and are then converted into ٌ, which [conversion] is therefore anomalous. Such anomalies, however, should rather be mentioned after the section on ٌ ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠_٠٠٠٠٠٠_٠٠٠_٠٠٠_٠٠٠_٠٠٠_٠٠٠_٠٠_٠٠_٠٠_٠_٠_٠_٠_
aug., as in [246, 683 (case 3, a-d), 703, 708], is converted into Hamza, for distinction from the rad., the aug. being fitter for alteration (Jrb): [or, more accurately,] (1) if not an aug. letter of prolongation [in the sing.], whether it be rad., as in مَرَابِثُ and مَيقَامُ, or aug., as in جَدَالُ and جَدَئُ [253, 374, 708], [pl. جَدَارُ and جَدَاءُ], remains unaltered, the rad. because of its originality; and the mobile aug. because of its strength through the vowel, and of its co-ordination with a rad. letter: (2) if an aug. letter of prolongation in the sing., is converted into ل, and then into Hamza, as in رَسَأَكْلِ [pl. of كِبَأَرُ (MAR)], [661, 708], and [above] (R). But [sometimes (R)] مَعاَكْسُ with Hamza [246, 683 (case 3, e, b, d)] occurs (SH), by assimilation to فِعْلَة (R); and Ibn 'Āmir (K), [like] Nāfi' [683] (B), is reported to have pronounced it in VII. 9. [714] with Hamza, by assimilation to [the pl. where the ي is aug., like (B)] صَحَائِفُ [above] (K, B): though it is weak (SH); and Hamza is ofter eschewed. And similarly pl. of مَنَأَرُ [683 (case 3, e, b, α)], by assimilation to عَلَا; though the chaste [form] is مَنَأَرُ (R). And مِصْأَبُ [683] is constantly pronounced with Hamza
(SH), (1) by assimilation of مِسِيلُ, فَعِيلَةٌ مُصيِبةٌ to مُسِيلُ, فَعِيلَةٌ [pl. مُسَائِلَ (Jh)], has [also (Jh)] for its pl. [مُسَائِلَ, مُسَائِلَة, مُسَائِلَ] [irregularly (Jh)], by assimilation to فَعِيلَ (R), like رَفْفَ, رَغْفَ, pl. رُفْفَةُ, رُفْفَةٌ, رُفْفَانُ [246] (Jh); or (2) by imagination (R). As for مُصَائِبٍ [above], it is a blunder of theirs, because they imagine that مُفَعْلَةٌ is فَعِيلَة, whereas it is only مُفَعْلَةٌ; but they do say مَصَارِبٌ [683] (S). Jh says that all the Arabs pronounce it with Hamza, (1) because they imagine that مُفَعْلَةٌ is فَعِيلَةٌ; so that they pronounce it with Hamza, when they pluralize it, as they pronounce the pl. of سَفِينَةٌ with Hamza, saying سَفَائِنُ [246]: or (2) [because] they assimilate the [rad. (Jh)] ى in مُصيِبةٌ to the [aug. (Jh)] ى of صيِبةٌ, since it is substituted for ى, and is not original, as the ى of صيِبةٌ is not original.
But the regular form is مَصَارِبٌ, [which also is used (Jh),] because the ى, [of the sing.] is mobile in the o. f. [below]. And Zj used to hold the Hamza in مَصَائِبٍ to be converted from the, pronounced with كسر in مَصَائِبٌ, as in ىشَاحٌ [683, 699], which [opinion] is not free
from weakness, because the ك pronounced with Kasr
does not become Hamza when it is medial, that being
allowable only when it is initial (IY). IH means that,
by rule, the ك here should not be converted into Hamza
because it is the ١ of the word, and there is no ١ or ١ befo.e the ! [715]; for which reason the rule requires it
to remain, as in مَقاَمٌ [above]; but that they constantly
pronounce this pl. with Hamza, irregularly, for a notifi-
cation that it is not pl. of مَقَايِمٍ or مَقْعِلَةٌ, like مَقَايِمٍ and
مَضْرِعٌ, مَقْعِلَةٌ, مَعَايِشٌ; but of مَقْعِلَةٌ, since the o. f. [above] is مَضْرِعٌ,
the vowel of the ك being transferred to the ص, and the
ك [then] converted into ١ because quiescent and preceded
by a letter pronounced with Kasr. This notification is
needed because, by ru'e, the pl. of such an act. part.
should be sound, as مُصْبِباتٍ, since, in such as مَكْرُومٍ [252],
the sound pl. is considered sufficient, and the broken
pl. is dispensed with: so that, when this [act. part.] has
a broken pl., the idea naturally suggests itself that it is
not pl. of مَقْعِلَةٌ, but of مَقْعِلَةٌ or مَقْعِلَةٌ, with Fath of the
ك, and Fath or Kasr of the ١; and therefore the ك is
converted into Hamza, for a notification that it is pl. of
مَقْعِلَةٌ with Damm of the ك, and Kasr of the ١, contrary
to the general rule that the pl. of the latter should be
sound (Jrb). But مَعَايِشٌ, مَصْبِباتٍ, مَقَايِمٌ, and مَعَايِشٌ with
Hamza are anomalous (R).
§ 718. The ي ع (FY) serving as the ع (FY), when a substantive, is converted into و (M, SH), because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm [686 (case 1)] (FY), as كُوْسَى  طَرُّبٍ (FY), SH, orig. كُيْسَى  طَرُّبٍ (FY). كُيْسَى  طَرُّبٍ is either an vnf. n., like رَجَعٍ [248, 272], as in XIII. 28. [686 (case 4, a, α)], i. e., قَتْنَعْا لَهُمْ شِيْبًا XLVII. 9. [62]: or fem. of أَلْطُربُ, in which case it ought to be أَلْطَرَبَ with the art. [356]. But [even in the latter case] its predicament is that of substantives [686 (case 4, b, e, B), 725], as S says "This is the cat. of what has its converted into و , vid. فَعْلَى when it is a substantive" (R), as أَلْطُربَ and كُيْسَى shrewdness (M). The author of the CHd mentions that كُيْسَى  طَرُّبٍ and كُوْسَى are fems. of أَطْرَبُ and أَكْيَسُ happiness and shrewdness (M). The reason why without the art. is not a qual. is that it is not used with مِن, as is known [356]: while, with prothesis, the post. explains the qualified, because the فَعْلُ of superiority is part of the post. [118]; so that you do not say عَنْانِي حَبِّي جَارِيَةً حُسَنَى أَلْطَرَبَى In my possession is a girl, the most beautiful of the girls [with the intention
of making an ep. of حَسْنِي, because [the ep. would then be pre. to its qualified (121), since] indicates the qualified. And, since لَعْلَى without an art. is not an ep., nor is it so freely employed in qualification as the rest of the eps., it is treated as a substantive. And, because of the small sense of qualification in the أَنْفُلُ of superiority, this أَنْفُلُ divested of مِن is triptote, by common consent, when made indet. after being a proper name, contrary to the cat. of أَحْمَرٌ [18], as to which there is a dispute (R). In the ep., however, the ي is not converted; [but the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, so that the ي is preserved (SH),] as قَسْمَة ضَيْرُى and مِشْيَة حَيْكَى [686 (case 4, b, c)] (M, SH), which are [judged to be (Jrb)] فَٰلِى (R, Jrb1, orig. ضَيْرُى حَيْكَى (IY, Jrb), with Damm, [not فَٰلِى (R, Jrb) with Kasr (Jrb)], because, [says S (R),] there is no فَٰلِى [with Kasr (IY)] among eps. (IY, R, J1b), except عرَشٌ [272] (Jrb), while is with س [272]; though some authorize رُجُل كِيَضُى [272], which may, however, be فَٰلِى with Damm, co-ordinated with جَعْلُ [392], like سُوْدَن [331, 712] and عَفْطٌ [said by Ks to be (Jh) pl. of عَفْطٌ (Jh, KF, MAR), i.e., a she-camel that does not conceive for some years, without being
barren (MAR), but held by some, says AUd, to be an inf. n., not a pl. (Jh), the co-ordination not being marred by alteration of the Đamma [into Kasra], because the object of co-ordination, vid. correctness of metre, rhythm, and the like, is not lost thereby (R); whereas there [often (Jrb)] is ْنُعْلِي (IY, Jrb) and ْفُضُلْي [272] (Jrb). They do not convert the َي into َه here (IY, Jrb), as they do in ُطَرَبَي and ُكُسَي [above] (IY); but convert the Đamma into Kasra, in order that the َي may be preserved (Jrb), to distinguish the ep. from the substantive (IY, Jrb); and do not reverse [the procedure], because the substantive, on account of its lightness, is more fit for conversion of the َي into َة (Jrb). And so in the cat. of َبِيْضْ [686 (case: 1, a, γ), 710, 711, 728] (SH), i. e., the pl. ْنُعْلِ، from the heaviness of the pl. (R). َبِيْضْ is orig. َبِيْضُ with Đamm of the َب, because pl. of أَحْمَرُ, like ُخُمْر pl. of أَحْمْرَ [249]. They convert the Đamma into Kasra, in order that the َي may be preserved, because the pl. is deemed heavy; so that, if they converted the َي into َة, the heaviness would be excessive (Jrb). But sometimes the Đamma is left unaltered in the cat. of َبِيْضْ pl. of أَبْيَضْ, and the َي then converted into َة, because of the lightness of the measure [ْنُعْلِ] (R).
§. 719. The ُ and ٌ, when َs, are more unsound, and weaker in state, than when ِs, because (1) they are consonants of inflection, which become altered by the vowels of inflection [16, 404, 720]; (2) the َ of prothesis [129], which causes the preceding letter to be pronounced with Kasr, is affixed to them; and (3) the َ of relation [294] and the sign of the ُ. [228] are affixed to them: while all of that necessitates their alteration. Therefore, when َs, they are weaker than when ِs [703]; and when ِs, are weaker than when ًs [699]: so that the further they are from the end, the stronger they are; and the nearer they are to the end, the more inseparable is transformation from them. Transformation contains a kind of alleviation [697], and is therefore lighter than the use of the o. f. (IY). Their predicament, [when they occur as finals, last (IY),] is to be (1) transformed (M), by (a) alteration of [their] vowels [into quiescences]; (b) conversion into another letter (IY): (2) elided (M), (a) because of a quiescent that meets them [663]; (b) for a kind of alleviation [697] (IY): (3) preserved (M), and sounded true (IY). Their transformation is [effected] by (1) conversion (a) of both into ل [684]; (b) of one of them into its fellow [685, 686]: (2) quiescence (M). They are converted into ل, when
they are mobile [below], and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, if they be not followed by any cause necessitating Fath [of the ج (Jrb)], as رَمْيَا قُرْرِي [403, 663, 673, 684], يَبْحِيًا لَيْوَس [728, 730: A], رَحْيًا عُصَا [16, 300, 328, 673]; contrary to (1) رَمْيَا قُرْرِي [403, 697, 698], and يَأْتِبَيْنَ (SH), where the, and ی are quiescent. (R): (a) يَتُّخَفْيَيْنَ and يَأْتِبَيْنَ are [2nd or 3rd pers. pl. fem., their measure being يَتُّخَفْيَيْنَ [406]: or يَتُّخَفْيَيْنَ [663] and are 2nd pers. sing. fem., orig. يَتُّخَفْيَيْنَ and كَأْبِيَيْنَ, like يَتُّخَفْيَيْنَ [405], their ج being converted into ج, because mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; and then elided, because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that their measure is يَتُّخَفْيَيْنَ: while the ی [before the ۱, whether this ی be the ج of the ج, as in the two pl. fem., or the pron. of the ج, as in the sing. fem.,] is not converted into ج, because it is quiescent (Jrb): (2) عَرْوُ [684 (condition 5), 698] (SH), where the, and ی are preceded by a quiescent (R): (3) رَمْيَا قُرْرِي [663, 684 (condition 6, b)]—with which [يَغَزَّيَيْنَ (R),] يَغَزَّيَيْنَ and عُصَوَانَ (SH) are made to accord—because of ambiguity [684 (condition 6, g, a), (727)] (SH), unrestrictedly in the [pret.].
v., and on [elision of the ن for inflection or] prothesis [405, 228] in [the aor. v. and] the n., [respectively,] since the й converted [from the й or ی] would inevitably be elided, on account of the concurrence of two йs: (a) the attached pron. and the й of the du. are, each of them, the "cause necessitating Fath" [of the й] (MASH): (b) these affixes, as [will be] mentioned, necessitate return of the йs [converted in the sing. from й and ی] to their o. fs. [below], lest ambiguity be produced; and, after restoration to the o. f., the й and ی are not converted into й, lest such conversion be a return to that [ambiguity] which has been escaped (R): [663], because it belongs to the cat. of گ ی ن تَخْشَیَا. *Ye two shall not dread* (SH), since the imp. is derived from the aor., and in [each of] them the й is followed by the й of the pron.; so that, since the й is not transformed in [the subj.,] such as گ ی ن تَخْشَیَا, lest it be elided, and the du. be [then] mistaken for the sing., it is not transformed in [the imp.] ِی ِخْشَا. also, although ambiguity would not be produced [by its elision], because ِی ِخْشَا with й would then be said, and in the sing. ِی ِخْشَا without й [428, 431] (Jrb): ِی ِخْشَا (5), because of its resemblance to that, [which means that the ن affixed to the v., without intervention of a pron. between them, is like the й; so that ِی ِخْشَا is
like (R), contrary to (below) and [610, 663] (SH), orig. and (below) and , where the l is converted into l, and elided, because elision of the l does not produce ambiguity here, as it would in [663], where the l is therefore not elided; while [above] is made to accord with the latter, because it is a deriv. thereof, though ambiguity would not be produced; and [also], because the \( ن \) in such [a position] resembles the l [of \( ل \)]. But, [in the chapter on the Corroborative \( ن \)] at the end of the commentary on the IH, we have mentioned [in the following terms] the objection to this language (R):—IH says that the [double or single (MAIH)] \( ن \), when it is after the prominent pron., [as in \( ل \) and \( ب \)], becomes like a separate word, because the pron. is a separative; but, when there is no prominent pron. [before it, as in \( ل \)], is like an attached [nom.] pron.: this is the gist of his language, which is open to the objection that the attached [nom. pron.] is not only the l [in \( ل \) and \( ب \); but also the \( ر \) and \( ی \) in \( ر \) and \( ی \) [663], with which you do not retain
the ج, as you do with the ل; so that his saying "like an attached [nom.] pron.", unrestrictedly, is not true (R on IH). And the better [opinion] is that the non-conversion, (1) in ج لِیَخَصیٰٰ and (R on IH) لِیَخَصیٰٰ [like ِرَضیٰٰ and ِرَضیٰٰ below,] is because the ج is restored [to its place], on account of what we mentioned there (R), [vid. that] its elision [in ج لِیَخَص and ج لِیَخَص] was [a substitute] for apocopation [404] or quiescence [428, 431]; whereas, when the v. is intended to be nninfl. upon Fath [402, 406, 610, 663, 664], because compounded [with the corrob. ن ], there is no apocopation or quiescence (R on IH): and, if it were then converted, its elision would be necessary; so that its restoration would not be evident: (2) in ج لِیَخَصیٰٰ, is because it is a deriv. of ج تَیَخَشیٰٰ [668]. And we do not maintain that [in these formations the non-conversion is because] the vowel is accidental; since, if the vowel in such [a position] were not taken into account, the ج would not be restored in ج حَاشیٰٰ and ج حَاشیٰٰ [663]. We have mentioned the predicament of such as ج لِیَخَشیٰٰ and ج لِیَخَشیٰٰ [above] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents [668]. And in such as ج لِیَخَشیٰٰ and ج لِیَخَشیٰٰ [above] the ج and لی are not converted, (1) because each of them is an entire word, which must not be totally altered; (2) because their vowels are accidental [684 (condition 2)].
arising from the [concurrence of] two quiescents; (3) because the vowel of the preceding letter belongs to another word [684 (condition 4)], as mentioned [below under إرضع and إرضي] (R). IH's saying "[when] they are mobile" [above] means "with a permanent vowel" [684 (condition 2)], to exclude such as خزنا and إرضي and [above], رحيان, [and إرضع] and [below]: while, in such as آلصا and إرضي, although the inflectional vowel is accidental, the ى and ى are converted, because, though its sort is accidental, [being regulated by the op.] its genus is permanent, since every n. infl. with vowels, whether nom., acc., or gen., must have some [inflectional] vowel [16] (R on the , and ى as ع s). The ى and ى, when ج s, are converted into ل when they are mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, even if they be in a n. not conformable to, nor commensurable with, the v., as نا, gain and لبى [pl. of زبن a kind of small beast or reptile (MAR)]; or in a n. commensurable with, but not differing from, the v., as أحوي black (MAR) and أشقر more wretched: for the conformability, or the affinity mentioned, is prescribed only in the ع [703, 711, 712], not in the ج, because the ج is the seat of alteration; so that the weak cause, i. e., its being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [703], is effective in converting it
And the reason why such as ٌةٌ and ُةٌ [331] are not transformed is only that the ٌ and ُ، being inseparable [from the word], exclude the ُ from the end; so that the ُ and ُ become [medial.] as in ُةٌٌ and ُةٌ ٌةٌ [684 (condition 11, a), 703]. If it be said "Why does not the inseparable ُ in such as ُةٌ [247] and ُةٌ ُةٌ [689] prevent transformation of the ُ [into ُ] as the inseparable ُ in such as ُةٌ ُةٌ and ُةٌ ُةٌ [721] prevents conversion of the ُ into ُ؟"; I say "Because ُ, preceded by a letter pronounced with ِ, is not converted into ُ in any position except when final, contrary to the conversion of ُ and ُ into ُ, which is often found in the medial also, as in ُةٌ [684, 703] and ُةٌ ُةٌ [712]; so that the ُ, which is orig. not inseparable [266], is not taken into account; contrary to the ُ and ُ, which are constitutionally inseparable". And, from the affinity of conversion to the end of the word, the ُ and ُ, when final, are subject to this transformation, even if they be preceded by ُ, provided that the ُ be ُةٌةٌ, because then it is virtually non-existent, as ُةٌةٌ and ُةٌةٌ [683 (case 1), 720, 723]; whereas, when it is ُةٌةٌ, as in ُةٌةٌ ُةٌةٌ and ُةٌةٌ ُةٌةٌ [728], they are not transformed, because the ُ intervening as a separative [between the mobile ُ or ُ and the preceding Fatha] is strong by reason of [its] originality. But, from the
weakness of this cause—I mean mobility of the ٰ or ی, and precedence of a letter pronounced with Fath [703]—in necessitating conversion, the ٰ is restored to its o. f. [above] of ٰ or ی, and admits of being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, when omission of restoration would lead to ambiguity in the v. or n., vid. when the ٰ is met by a subsequent quiescent letter, with which the ٰ, if retained unaltered, would be elided, and so ambiguity would be produced. The v. is such as ٰ فَرَا (1) and رَمَيَا [above], where the ٰ of the pron. is attached to the transformed ٰ فَرَا and رَمَيَا [above]: so that, if the ٰ [converted from the ٰ or ی] were not restored to its o. f., it would be elided because of the two quiescents; and [then] the [v.] attributed to the pron. of the du. might be mistaken for the [v.] attributed to the pron. of the sing., or to the explicit n. [21]: (2) يُؤْرِيُّ یَبِيْسَ [and above], because the ٰ would be elided in the [subj. and] apoc. [405]: (3) إِخْشَٰیَٰ [or] قُرْسَبٰی [or تعصّمیای] [above], because it is a deriv. of [above]. And the n. is such as ٰ صَلَواتٰ (1) prayers [726] and ٰ دَمِسَالٰی [234], where, if the ٰ [converted from the ٰ and ی] were elided because of the two quiescents, the pl. might be mistaken for the sing.: ٰ عَصّرٰوَی [2] two staves [above] and ٰ فَتْیَبْ [two youths [684 (condition 6, b)]]
where, if it were not restored, the *du* might, on prefixation, be mistaken for the *sing.;* while [عَصْرَة] and [نَمَيْتَ] are derivs. of [عَصْرَة] and [نَمَيْتَ] [above]. And, with the ی of relation, the ٰ elided in [عَصْا] and [عَصِى] [643, 683, 697], when pronounced with Tanwin, is restored [to its place], because the [concurrency of] two quiescents, the ٰ and Tanwin, ceases to exist; and, after its restoration, you convert it into ٰ on account of the ی of relation [300], as you convert the ٰ in [the synarthrous (MAR) ḥāل الفصا] [above] when you form a *rel. n.* from them: but you do not say that the elided ٰ is restored to its *o.f.* ی; and, for the reason mentioned by us in the chapter on the Relative Noun [300], the [restored] ٰ is not elided, on account of the quiescent ی [of relation] affixed to it. And, after restoration and mobilization of all the letters mentioned, you do not convert them into ٰ, notwithstanding their mobility and their being preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, (1) because their vowel is accidental [300, 684 (condition 2)]; (2) because, having fled from the ٰ, lest, after [its] elision, ambiguity be produced, one cannot revert to what one has fled from. But, as for the restoration of the ٰ to its *o.f.* in such as ۰ُ فَرْزَنِ and ۰ُ فَرْزَنِ, *orig.* and ۰ُ فَرْزَنِ, it is not from fear of ambiguity, but for conformity to ۰ُ فَرْزَنِ and
The ل is restored [to its place] in such as أَغْرَّنَّ َلَا تَرَضَيْنَ [above], and similarly لَا تَرَضَيْنَ أَغْرَّنَّ and لَا تَرَضَيْنَ اِرْضَيْنَ, and لَا تَرَضَيْنَ أَغْرَّنَّ and لَا تَرَضَيْنَ, because with the ن the v. is not quiescent [in the final] nor apocopated; while elision of the ل is only [a substitute] for apocapation [404] or quiescence [428, 431]. And, after restoration of the ل [to its place], the ی in لَا تَرَضَيْنَ اِرْضَيْنَ [above] is not converted into ل, lest elision of the ل be entailed thereby, which would lead to what one has fled from, [vid. elision of the ل without apocapation or quiescence] (R on the ی and ی as ی). But, in the dial. of Ṭayyi, according to what Fr transmit from them, the ی that is a ل is elided in the sing. masc., after Kasr or Fath, in the infl., [i. e., aor. (AKB),] and uninf., [i. e., imp., the Kasra or Fatha remaining unaltered (AKB),] as زَالُ اللَّهُ کَیْرُمْنَ زُیدُ By God, assuredly. Zaid shall shoot and یَا زَیدُ Do thou surely shoot, O Zaid, لَیْخَسَنَ زُیدُ assuredly Zaid shall dread and اِخْسَنَ یَا زَیدُ Do thou surely dread, O Zaid: and hence [119] (R on IH), where there is another version meant to be with the single ی, which, says IV, is suppressed by poetic license [614]; and

زَابِکَنَ عِیِّشَاءٍ تَقْضَیْ بَعْضٍ جَلِیْه‌یِ # طابُتُ أَصَائِلُهُ یِنِ دَلِیْلُ اِلْبَلَدِ
which also is an address to a male, And do thou weep, O 'Amr, for a life that has passed away after its newness, whose evenings were pleasant in that country; and the Prophet's saying in tradition Assuredly the rights shall indeed be rendered to their owners on the day of resurrection (AKB). And so in [above], the  and  are not converted, (1) because the vowel is accidental [684 (condition 2)], as we mentioned [under ] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents [663]; (2) because the  and  [here] are independent nouns; (3) because  and  are not converted into  except when the preceding letter pronounced with Fatha is part of their own word [684 (condition 4)], while here the  [or ] is another word; (4) because, if altered by conversion, they would be elided without any indication of them, such as is [provided] in  [663, 664] and  (R on the  and  as  ), where the indication of the elision is the Damm and Kasr, respectively [610] (MAR); [since  and  would both be reduced to  ]. But IM says that elision of the  of the pron. after Fatha, as  from  [663], is a Ta'i dialectic variation (R on IH). If, however, elision of the  on account of two quiescents, do not lead to ambiguity, the  is not restored, as
They are pleased They are raided, and
\( \text{iyyazun} \), \( \text{T'ionu} \) art pleased [663], and
\( \text{mustafon} \), [234] They raided and \( \text{ramaw} \) They shot, \( \text{fart} \) [607, 663] (\( R \) on the and \( \text{y} \) as \( \text{s} \)). The, and \( \text{y} \) are made quiescent in the cat. of (1) raids and \( \text{yirmiy} \) shoots [404, 720], in the ind.; (2) the raider [below] and \( \text{alra'yi} \) the shooter [720] in the nom. and gen. (SH). The, in \( \text{iyyaz} \) —and this [termination] is peculiar to the \( v. \), not being [found] in the n. [721]—is made quiescent, because \( \text{y} \) pronounced with \( \text{Damm} \) after \( \text{Damma} \) [below] is deemed too heavy, since the \( v. \), together with its own heaviness, has two heavy things combined at its end; so that the last, vid. the \( \text{Damma} \) [on the \( \text{y} \)], because the vowel is after the consonant [667, 697], is elided. Similarly \( \text{y} \) pronounced with \( \text{Damm} \) after Kasra is made quiescent: but this [combination] is less heavy than the first; and is [found] in n. and \( v. \), as \( \text{yirmiy} \) The shooter came. IH mentions [685 (case 1, a), 724] and \( \text{ar'yi} \) in order to explain that the \( \text{y} \) whose o. f. is \( \text{y} \) is like the original. And similarly \( \text{y} \) pronounced with Kasr after Kasra is made quiescent, because of the combination of likes, as in \( \text{y} \) pronounced with Damm after \( \text{Damma} \) [above], which is heavier:
and this [combination] is [found] in the n. as آلْرَمَيْى [in the gen.]; and in the v. as إِرْمَيْى [663], orig. إِرْمَيْى (R). The ñ and ñ are elided in such as (M, SH) لا تَفْغَرُ (1) Raid not and لا تَرَمُّ Shot not [404, 697], أَغْزُرُ [2] RAID and SHOOT [428, 431, 697] (M) : They [masc.] raid and They shoot (SH) : (a) يَفْغَرُون (2) is orig. يَفْغَرُون, to which the ñ, of the pl. is affixed; so that the first ñ is elided, because of the two quiescents; (b) يَرَمُّون (2) is orig. يَرَمُّون, to which the ñ of the pl. is affixed; so that the ñ is elided, because of the two quiescents; and the ñ is then pronounced with دامع, in order that the ñ may be preserved, since it is a complete word, which must not be altered (R) : أَغْزُرُ [above], أَغْزُرُ [663], and أَغْزُرُ [above], أَغْزُرُ [663], and أَغْزُرُ (SH) : (a) is orig. أَغْزُرُ [663], to which the double ñ is attached; so that the ñ is elided, because of the two quiescents; and أَغْزُرُ is similar [mutatis mutandis] : (b) إِرْمُسُ [663, 664] are like إِرْمُسُ and إِرْمُسُ, because orig. إِرْمُسُ and إِرْمُسُ [663] (R) : ñ and ñ (M). But such as كُمْ يَدُ [687, 697, 698, 697, 697, 698], ñ and ñ [260, 307, 689], are not regular (SH), which means that the elision of the ñ in these nst. is not for any regular cause; but for bare alleviation, on which account the inflection 173a
rests on the final of what remains (R). Analogy requires retention [of the ِل] in some of them, like ُنْ and ُنْ ِإْسَمْ, because the letter before the unsound letter is quiescent, as in ُنَبْيٌ [643, 720] and [667]; and change [of the ِل into ِل] in others, like ُبْنٌ and ُبْنٌ ِأَخٌ, because the unsound letter is mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha, as in ُعَصْا [above]: but they are docked [of the ِل], contrary to analogy, because frequent in their speech (Jrb). As for ُخْتٌ, however, it is not docked of the ِل; but the ُبْنٌ is a subst. for its ِل [689] (R). The ُن and ُن are preserved in such as (1) ُنْ ِرَمْيَنٌ and ُنْ ِٛغْرَنٌى (2) (M), where the ُن and ُن are preceded by a letter pronounced with Damma and Kasra, respectively [684 (condition 3)] (IY); (3) ُنْ ِٛغْرَنٌ and ُنْ ِٛمَيَا (M).

§ 720. As regards bearing the vowels of inflection, the ُن and ُن, (1) when preceded by a quiescent, proceed like sound letters, as in (a) ُنْ ِدْلَرٌ [16. 302, 643, 728] (M), because the origin of their unsoundness is their resemblance to ِل, which they are like only when quiescent, and preceded, the ُن by Kasra, and the ُن by Damma, in which case they become like ِل, because quiescent and preceded by a vowel homogeneous with them, as likewise is ِل, since it is quiescent and preceded by Fatha, which is homogeneous with it; so that, when
preceded by a quiescent, they are excluded from resemblance to " because I is preceded only by a letter pronounced with Fath (IY): (b) غدو [643, 780] and علی [299] (M), because the first and ی here are quiescent, like the ع of [above] and the ح of نخی [85] (IY): (c) ژو and ژی [683 (case 1, c), 723], and یی [302, 683, 723, 728] (M), because ی and ی, when final, are transformed only after an aug. I, as in یسآ and یسآ [683, 719, 723], not after an I converted from a rad. letter, lest two transformations, of the ی and the J, occur consecutively in the word (IY): (2) when I preceded by a mobile [below], bear only [Fatha (IY),] the sign of the subj. or acc., [because Fatha is light (IY),] as in (a) لن يغزو. He shall not raid and لن يرمي shall not shoot, أريد أن تستنى I desire that thou shouldst draw water and shouldst summon; (b) رايت الرامي I saw the shooter and the blind (man) and the shouter (M): (a) by "mobile" [above] Z means "with the vowel permissible", vid. (α) Damma before ی, which [combination] is [found] only in vs., as یغزو [404; 719] and یدعو calls [727]; not in ns. [721]: (β) Kasra before ی, which [combination] occurs in ns., as the judge [16, 294, 724] and الرامي [719]; and vs., as يسيقى [404, 719] and يسيقى waters: (b) when preceded by
a letter pronounced with Fath, و, and ى are converted into ل [684], as when preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, ى is converted into ى [686]; and, when preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, و is converted into ى [685]: while only Damma occurs before و, and only Kasra before ى (IY). But [some of the Arabs assimilate the و and ى to ل, because of their affinity to it: so that (IY)] quiescence occurs [in the subj. or acc., which is then uniform with the ind. or nom. (IY)], (1) [among vs.,] in the saying [of ‘Amir Ibn Atţufail (IY, MN) al‘Amir alJa‘di, the chief of the Banu ‘Amir in heathenism (MN),]

Yet clan ‘Amir has not made me chief by inheritance, (but for mine own nobility and valor): God forbade that I should rise through mother or father, properly ى (MN)]; and [hence (IY)] the saying of AlA‘shâ [Maimûn Ibn Kais, praising the Prophet (Jsh).]

(M) Then I swore that I would not be merciful to her for any weariness, nor for any soreness of foot, until she should meet Muhammad, by rule تلاغي (Jsh): (a) some make that a dialectic variation; and some a poetic license, which, says Mb, is one of the approved poetic licenses [below] (IY); (2) [among ns. (IY),] in the saying of the poet, [one of the Sa‘dis (S).]
أَذُّ اِبْنِ هِنْدِ عَقَبَةَ إِلَّا أَنْ أَناَبِيَهَا

O dwelling of Hind, that hast been effaced, save its stones used to support the cooking-pot (M), where [properly *أَناَبِيَهَا*] is an acc., because an exc. from an aff. [88]; and hence [333] (IY); and the prov. أَغْطِي آلِقَرْسَ بَارِبَهَا Give the bow to its maker (M), meaning Seek aid for thy work from the possessors of knowledge and skill therein (Md), where [properly *بَارِبَهَا*] is obj. of *أَغْطِي* (a) ISh says "Mb says that this is one of the most beautiful poetic licenses [above], because they co-ordinate one case [of the n.] with [the other] two, meaning that they make the acc. like the gen. and nom.; while quiescence is lighter than vowels; for which [reasons] they determine upon making the quiescent in such comps. as مَعْدَىٰ جُرِبٍ [below] and كَانَ أَوْيِدِهِنَّ آلَهٌ [215] فَالَّذِي فَلَّ (AKB on [below]).

Kab's saying [444] with quiescence [of the ] admits of two explanations, (1) that he makes the infinitival inop., as in إذاَ كَانَ أَمْرُ النَّاسِ عِندَ عُجْوِرُهُمْ * فَلاَ بَدُّ أَنْ يَلْقَوْنَ كُلْ فَتْرًا When the business of the people is in the hands of their old woman, there is no escape from this, that they encounter every loss, and in Mujahid's reading *يَتِيمُ in
II. 233. [525, 572]: (a) so they say: though the latter may be explained on [the supposition] that, ُنَّ is op.; but that the o. f. is ِضْمُونَ with the, of the pl., by concord with the sense of ِضُمْنَ, like X. 43. [182, 581]; and that the ُن is afterwards elided [405] because of the subjunctival [410], and the, because of the two quiescents [663]: (2) that he treats Fatha on, like Damma, by poetic license, which, says Mb., is one of the most beautiful poetic licenses [above]: (a) that occurs even in the case of a [letter] lighter than ُن, vid. ٌى, as in AIAs' saying تَلْتِي آخُ [above]: though َتُلْتِي thou shouldst meet may be orig. َتُلْتَي ِن, an enallage from the 3rd to the 2nd pers. [1], which is attested by [the fact] that he addresses her in the following verse مَتَّى مَأ نَتْنَحْي ْ آخُ [565]. Quiescence of ُن occurs in prose, as in the reading of one of the ancients أَو يَقُفُو عِلْدَى وَيَدُ يُقَدِّدُ the الكَلِّي II. 233. Or he in whose hand is the bond of marriage, [i.e., the husband, the master of binding and loosing it (B),] should remit: nay, quiescence of ِي in the n., notwithstanding that ِي is lighter than ُن, and the n. lighter than the v., occurs in prose, as in the reading of Ja'far Ibn Muḥammad َيِنُمْ أَوْتِسْطَ مَا تَطْعِمُونَ ٌأَهْلِيكُمْ V. 91. [543] (BS), according to the dial. of those who make it quiescent in the three cases, like ٌ
by assimilation of ی is ی (K); and also in the readings
XIX. 5. [And verily I have feared the action of the next of kin, who will administer
affairs after me, i.e., after my death (K, B),] and
XXII. 37. Therefore mention the name of God over them, when pure, this
being with a quiescent ی, pl. of صائِفیة, i.e., exclusively
belonging to God (BS). In [the position of (IV)] the
ind. or nom., the ی, and ی are quiescent (M), because
Damma upon them is deemed heavy; so that you say
[in the v.] هو يَغَرُّ He raids and بَرَمَي shoots [719], and
in the n. هَذَا الْمَرَّي This is the shooter and الْمُبْطِرُ the blind
man) and the shouter. But some of the
Arabs treat this ی like the sound [letter], mobilizing it
with the vowels of inflection, as هَذَا قَاضِي This is a
judge, مَرَّت بِقاضِي 643, and زِيَّت قاضِي I passed by a
judge (IV). Mobilization [of the ی (SH)] is anomalous
(M, SH) in the nom. and gen. [below] (SH), as
قد كاه يَنْدَهِبُ بَالْدُنْيا وَلَدِیَهَا كَبَاشْ الْعَرْسِ سَحَاحُ
(M, R, Jrb) Plump darlings, like the rams of the breed
of sheep called عَرْسٍ, have-wellnigh taken away (the life
of) the world and its pleasure (Jsh), and
مَا إِن رَأَیْتَ آلاَم
[below] (IY, R, Jrb): like (1) quiescence [of the, and ى (R, Jrb)] in the subj. or acc. (SH), as (a) قَمَا سُوُّدَتْي (R, Jrb) [above] (R, Jrb): (b) فَلَوْ أَنَّ رَآئِي آلهِم [333]; the saying

كان آيدهين بِإلقام القدر * أيدي جوار يتضايقين الورق (R), attributed by IR in the 'Umda to Ru'ba Ibn Al'Ajjaj, though I have not seen it in his Diwan, As though their (the camels') forelegs in the level plain were arms of maidens taking silver dirhams, one from another (AKB); and the prov. ى يِوَيْرَى (Jrb): (2) retention of both [و and (R, Jrb)], and of ل, in the apoc. (SH), as (a) هَدَجَتْ آلهِم (R, Jrb), i. e., (b) الْمُ نَأَيْبِيِلُ آلهِم (Jrb): (R): and, in some readings, (a) أرسله ممنا عذاب يَرَيْتِي وَيَلْعَبُ XII. 12. Send him with us to-morrow: he will feed, and play [from ارتعى, aor. يَرَتَّى (K, B)], where يَرَتَّى being the correl. of the command, is governed in the apoc. [420] (Jrb); while Nafi reads [يرتقى] with Kasr, and يَلْعَبُ (B); and Ya'la Ibn Siyaba reads يَلْعَبُ with Kasr of the أ, and يَلْعَبُ And he will play in the ind. by inception [423] (K): and (b) إِذَا مَنَ (b) يَتَقَنِي آلهِم XII. 90. [below] (Jrb): (α) ذمام is then
supplied on the ى, and ى, in order that it may be elided [404] by the apocopative, because the apocopative must govern [419]; but more frequently and properly on the ى, because ذّمма on ى is heavier than on ى (R): (c) ُلا ﴿بِّئْسَهَا أَلْحَم﴾ [below] (Jrb), and ُسَانِسَ لا ۚ ۚ أَنْسَاهُ أَلْحَم﴾ [below]: (a) to supply ذّمма on the ى is more strange, because ى does not bear a vowel (R). In the gen. only ى occurs, because [the gen. is only in decl. ns., while (IV)] among decl. ns. there is none whose final is ى, preceded by a vowel [721]. And the predicament of the ى in the gen. is the same as in the nom. [above]. But

فِي هَٰذَا يَحْجَرُونَ الْهُوَى غَيْرَ مَّاسِيُّ ۗ وَدَوَّاً كُرُّى مُنْهِئٌ ۗ غُوَّلًا تَقَغُّلُ

by Jarir, [And one day they reward love with an ineffective (meeting), and another day thou seest in them a she-devil that destroys (man), orig. تَقَغَّلُ (MN),] is cited; and [‘Ubaid Allâh (Dw)] Ibn [Kais (Dw)] ArRu’kayyât says لا ۚ بُذِرَ إِلَّا ۡأَنَّ اللَّهُ ۖ حِيِّ ۗ ۢاَلْغَزَّادِيَّ أَلْحَمَ ۖ مَا إِنْ رَآَيْتُ ۢوَلَا ۢأَرَى فِي مَدْتِي ۗ كَجَٰبِرٍ يَلَعِّبُنَّ فِي ۢالصَّحْرَاءَ

[above] (M) I have not seen, إنْ ۜبُذِرَ إِلَّا ۢأَرَى فِي مَدْتِي ۗ كَجَٰبِرٍ يَلَعِّبُنَّ فِي ۢالصَّحْرَاءَ [563], nor shall I see in my period of life, aught in beauty like maids that play in the meadow (Jsh). Some of them make that a poetic license; and, according to this, the poet [in the last verse] combines two licenses, كَٰسِر of the ى in the gen. [16], and triptote declension [17, 18] (IV). But [R says that] the ى and ى are treated like 174a
the sound [letter], in a case of choice, by some of the Arabs, who mobilize the ى of الْرَبِّيِّ [719] in the nom. and gen., and of الْرَبِّيِّ [404, 719] in the ind.; and similarly the ى of يُغَرُّ [404, 719] in the ind. (R). In the apoc. they are elided [404, 697, 719] (M), because they are regarded as equivalent to Damma, inasmuch as their quiescence is the sign of the ind. [above]; so that they are elided for apocopation (IY), as the vowel [Damma (IY)] is elided [404]. But they are retained in the saying

[Thou didst satirize Zabbūn; then thou camest, apologizing for satirizing Zabbūn: thou didst not satirize (him), nor let (him) alone (MN, Jsh), by rule تَهْجُّ (Jsh)]; and in أَلْلَهُ يَأْتِبْكَ الْمَعْنَى [508] (M), properly يَأْتِبْكَ (Jsh); while one version reported from Ibn Kathīr is إِنَّهُ مَنْ يَتَقَيَّرْ رَيْضٌ. XII. 90. Verily the case is this, whoso feareth etc. [404]. As for the ى [above], it is retained, always quiescent; except in the apoc. mood [404, 697], where it is elided, like the ى and الَّمِ يَخَشَى [above], as لم يَخَشَى did not dread and لم يَدْعَ was not called. But it is retained in the saying [of ‘Abd Yaghūth (IY, Jsh) Ibn Waḳḳās alḤārithī (Jsh)]
And an 'Abshami [309] old dame laughs at me, as though she had not seen a Yamnỳ [311] captive before me, by rule (Jsh); and [similarly (IV)] in

ما أنس لا أنسة آجر عيشتي م ما لاح بالعزة ربع سراب

[above] (M) Whatever I forget, I shall not forget him to the end of my life, so long as there appears on the rugged ground a quivering of mirage, properly ل أنسة (Jsh): and hence

إذا العجر عصبت نطقى و لا ترضه و لا تملق

[above] (M), by Ru'ba. Ibn Al'Ajjâj, When the old woman is angry, then divorce (her); and seek not to pacify her, nor coax (her) (MN), cited by AZ (IV); though IJ says that there is a version ٨ل ترضه, according to the more recognized form (MN).

§. 721. Among decl. نس. there is none whose final is ٩ preceded by a vowel [719, 720], because the vowel, if Fatha, makes the ٩ become ٣، as in عصا [684, 719]; and, if Kasra, converts it into ٣، as in أغالرى [685, 719, 724] (IV on § 720); while there is no [decl. (Jrb)] n. whose final is ٩ preceded by Damma [686 (case 2, c, a)], that being [found] only in vs., as in يَغزر [727] (IV, Jrb), and indecl. ns., as ٨ هو [below] and ٩ which [176] (Jrb). The cause of that will [now] be explained (IV). When ٩ after an
original ذَمْمَة occurs as a ﱐ, final, as in ءَذْرُ [243], or virtually final, as when followed by a separable letter, like the س of feminization, when separable [266], as in تَفْلِيق [336, 686 (case 2, b)], or an 旮 of dualization [228], as in ﱐ ذَمْمَيْن ﱐ تَفْلِيق [727], and that [combination] is in a decl. n., the ﱐ, must be converted into ﱐ, and the ذَمْمَة before it into كَسْرَة, because ﱐ preceded by a letter pronounced with ذَمْمَة is a heavy [thing] super-added to a heavy; and, above all, when it is final; and especially in the decl. n., where it is the foot-rest of the different vowels of inflection (R). They say ﱐ أَذْرُ [243, 685, 727] and ﱐ أَحْقَرُ (IY), [by analogy أَذْرُ and أَحْقَرُ (IY),] for the pl. [of paucity (IY)] on [the measure of] أَنْفُلُ, from دُكْرُ ﱐ حَقر and ﱐ قِلْتِّنْسِ for the pl. of دُكْرُ [248, 723] and ﱐ قِلْتِّنْسِ [254, 390, 729], [by elision of the س (IY),] on the principle of تَمْرَة and ﱐ تمْر [254], as

لا صبر حتى تلكثيبي عسي * أهل الرياط البيض والقانس

[There will be no patience until thou reach 'Ans (a clan of AlYaman), the wearers of white mantles and of caps, cited by As on the authority of IIU (IY)): substituting كَسْرَة for the ذَمْمَة before the ﱐ, in order that the ﱐ may be converted into ﱐ, as in ﱐ مَيْقَات and ﱐ مَيْرَان [685 (case 5), 699] (M); so that the word becomes of the
class of the defective, like قاثي [16] (T). [According to R, however, first] the و is converted into ی; and afterwards the دامم into كسر: and one does not begin by converting the دامم into كسر, because alleviation of the final is more appropriate. The ۵ is not converted into ی, (1) when it is not a ج, whether it be pronounced with (a) فتح, as in قُولَيْكُمْ [273, 385]: (b) دامم, in which case, (a) if followed by a quiescent, as in حَلَلَ علَيْهِ الْكُرْوُل The year passed over him (KF, MAR),] it may be retained, or be converted into حامز [683] (R), [as] حُرْوُل (KF); (b) if followed by a mobile, it must be made quiescent, as ذِرُور [orig. ذُرْوُر (MAR),] pl. of ذِروُر [711, 712]: or (c) كسر, in which case it remains unaltered, as يُنْتُر on [the measure of] أَكْرُم from و, affection: (a) as for قِبَلس, orig. قِلس [436], it is because of what has been mentioned in the Commentary on the IH [706]: (2) when it is a ج, but is followed by an inseparable letter, like the د of feminization in عَنَصِرَة and تَعْبَدَة [385, 399, 719, 724], and the nondualistic ل and ن in فُنْعَان and فُنْعَان [274, 390, 724]: except when the دامم before it is upon another و, in which case it is converted into ی, because of the excessive heavity, even if it be immediately followed by an inseparable letter, as in قُرْيَة and قُرْيَة [730. A] on [the
measure of] سَمْرَة [254 and سَمْرَة [335, 686 (case 2, c)]; and is not subjected to incorporation, because transformation comes before incorporation [684 (condition 10, b, b, γ), 728]: (3) when the Ḍamma [before it] is not permanent, as in (a) أَخْرُوكُ ابْنُكُ thy father, فَرَّكُ thy mouth and فَرَّكُ thy brother [16]: (b) خَطْوَاتٌ steps [238, 240]; for, though the ٰ and ٰ [284] are separable, like the ٰ [336] of تُقَافُيْةٌ [above], still the Ḍamma of the ط is accidental in the pl., where the ط may be made quiescent: (4) when the ِ is in a v., like سَرَّرُ was liberal [729], aor. يُسَرَّرُ [730], and [like] يَدْعُرُ [720], because, though the v. is heavier than the n., so that alleviation is more appropriate and suitable for it, still the word becomes a v. only through the measure, since the o. f. of the v. is the inf. n. [331], which is transferred to the cat. of the v. through the formation only, the inf. n. being like the material, and the v. like a compound of the material and the form; and, since the quality of v. comes into existence through the formation only [724], while the formations of the tril. v. vary, and are distinguishable, one from another, only through the vowel of the ع [482, 704, 730. A], the Arabs take care to preserve that vowel, which is therefore not elided, except when the formation is not distinguishable by transfer [of that vowel] to the preceding letter, as in بَعْتْ قُلْتُ and بَعْتْ حَفِيتْ and هَبْتْ.
and يَبْعِثُ وَيَحْفَظُ and يَقُولُ [697, 703], as before explained: (a) similarly they say رَمُّوٍ How well the man shoots! [476, 686 (case 2, a), 724], contrary to such as آل الرَّجُل [713]. (b) thus it is established that the Damma of سَرَرُ and يَدْعُو [above] may not be converted into Kasra, lest one formation be mistaken for another: (5) when it is in a n., and Fatha is inseparable from it, as in هُوَ he [161, 724]: (a) only this [instance] occurs: (b) here that [retention of the ] is pardonable, because the word has little heaviness, by reason of its being bil., and of Fatha's being inseparable from its , ; and because it might be mistaken for the fem. [۶۶۶ she], if the و were converted. And IH, notwithstanding that he is discussing the و preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, mentions خِبَال [273] together with قُرْبَا [above], to demonstrate the predicament of the و preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, as respects the fact that with the و conversion of the Damma into Kasra is necessary where it is necessary before the و, و as تَرَّمُ [332] and تَرَّمُيّة [336, 686 (case 2, b)], according to what we have mentioned [in connection with and تَفَارِزُ and تَفَارَزٍ]; and unnecessary where it is not necessary with the و [above]. Fr says that سَبِيرَا [273, 385] is orig. فَعَالَة with Damm, being
pronounced with Kasr on account of the nu'ut and ṣīf and ṣīwān [242], [274, 686] are said in the pl. and dim.; and, says Sf, what he says is not improbable, because we do not see any n. on [the measure of] فَعَّلَهُ with Kasr of the ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan, except the hollow whose is a ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan; but Khl says that no فَعَّلَهُ with Kasr of the ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan occurs in the language, except ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan i. q. ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan and حَوْلَاهُ membrane enclosing the fetus in the womb of the she-camel (R), which have no fourth (KF, MAR). They say ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan [283, 389, 685 (case 1, b, c), 724], where the ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan is not final. And the counterpart of that is the transformation in such as ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan [683, 723], and its omission in such as ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan (1) and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan [266, 683 (case 1, d), 723]; ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan paternity and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan fraternity [722] (M), inf. ns. on [the measure of] فَعَّلَهُ [381], from which the ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan is inseparable in the first state of their formation in this shape [265 (case 10)] (IV); and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan (3) [228-230, 683 (case 1, f), 723, 727]. S asked Khl about their saying ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan [683 (case 1, e), 723], ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan; and he said "They only pronounce the n. un. [254] conformably to ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan [723], ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan and ِنَفَّلَهُ فِي الْجِلْد caravan (M); as they
say مَرْضِيّةٌ مَسْنَىٰ and مَرْضِيّةٌ مَسْنَىٰ [685 (case 8), 722]" (S, IY); meaning that صَلَةٌ عَبَاءةٌ and عَبَاءةٌ نِهَايَةٌ [above] and إِذَا [281, 683 (case 1, d)], because the ا is affixed to صَلَةٌ and عَبَاءةٌ after the conversion [of their ] into Hamza has become necessary in them (IY): “but, as for those who say صَلَةٌ and عَبَاءةٌ [266], they do not pronounce the n. un. conformably to صَلَةٌ and عَبَاءةٌ; as those who say حُصْيَانٍ [228] do not form the du. conformably to the sing. used in speech (M), whereas, if they meant that, they would say حُصْيَانٍ” (S).

§. 722. They say جَبْهَةٌ عَقْبَةٌ [act of] kneeling upright [728], and عُصِّ [with Kasr of the ا and ص, or with Damm of the ف (IY)], doing to the final , after Damma in فُعُولٍ , notwithstanding that the letter of prolongation is a barrier between them, what they do to it in أَوُلٍ and تَلْنِسٍ [721], as they do in كُسَآءٍ [683, 723] the like of what they do in عُصَا [684, 719] (M). The ، is converted into for alleviation, because of two matters, (1) that the word is a pl. [below], the pl. being deemed heavy: (2) that the first ، , being an aug. letter of prolongation, is not taken into account as a barrier; so that the ، , which is the of the word, comes, as it 175 a
were, immediately after the Ḍamma, ُعصرُ ; and is therefore converted into ی, as in َأَذْلِ and َأَحْقَي [721]. Then, this ی being combined with [the preceding] و, the ی, is converted into ی [685 (case 7)]. And they pronounce the ی with Kasr in such as َعصرُ, as they do in َأَذْلِ and َأَحْقَي [721] (IY). This process is invariable in what is a pl. [above], except in such an anomaly as إنَّكَ تَتَظَرَّرِي فِي نَصْحٍ كَبِيرٍ Verily thou lookest in many directions [685 (case 9, a, a)] ; but not in what is [a sing. n. (IY),] not a pl. (M), because the sing. [below] is light (IY). They say َعَتَرُ and َمَغْرِبُ (M), as XXV. 23. [685 (case 9, b)] (IY); but they do say َعَتَرُ and َمَغْرِبُ, as

وَقَدْ عَلِيَتُ عَرْسٍ مُّليَّةَ أَنْثَيِ # أَنَا أَلْبَيْتُ مَعْدِيًا عَلَيْهِ # عَادِيًا [685 (case 8, b, a, γ)] : and they say َأَرضٌ مَسْطِيَّة َسُوَّتُ الْأَرْضِ I watered the land (IY), and َمَرْضِي [685 (case 8), 721]; or َمَرْضِي [below], according to rule. S says "The proper letter in this sort", [i. e., what is a sing. (IY),] "is ی; but the other is [good] Arabic, [and] frequent: while the proper letter in the pl. is ی" (M). The final ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Ḍamm, in the decl. n., is, if doubled, rather strong. Conversion is then (1) necessary, notwithstanding that [strength], in two things, (a) that
[sing.] in which the Đamma is on another \( \text{ضُر} \), as \( \text{غَرُّ} \) on the measure of \( \text{عَدْنَسُر} \) [396] from \( \text{غَرُّ} \) [728, 730. A]; and hence \( \text{مَقُوى} \) pass. part. from \( \text{قُوَّة} \) [685 (case 8), 730. A]:

(b) a pl. on [the measure of] \( \text{فُرُّول} \) [243, 685 (case 9)], like \( \text{جُعُبُ} \) pl. of \( \text{جَعَ} \) kneeing upright, and \( \text{عُصَّا} \) pl. of \( \text{عُصَّ} \) [above]; and hence \( \text{نَسِيَ} \) after transposition [243]: (a) \( \text{نَنْصُرُ} \) pl. of \( \text{نَنْصُرُ} \), as \( \text{جِبَّرُ} \) \( \text{نُنْصُرُ} \) Verily he looks etc. [above] is anomalous; and so are \( \text{نَنْصُرُ} \) pl. of \( \text{نَنْصُرُ} \) cloud, \( \text{بَهْرُ} \) pl. of \( \text{بَهْرُ} \) chest, and \( \text{عُقُو} \) pl. of \( \text{عُقُو} \) \( \text{أَحْوَ} \) and \( \text{أَحْوَ} \), pl. of \( \text{أَحْوَ} \) [685 (case 9, a, a)] (R): (b) the author of the CHd says that (Jrb) those all occur anomalously, [as though (IY)] notifying the o. f., like \( \text{قُرْنِ (IY, Jrb) and} \) 

\[ \text{حُوَّة} \] [684, 711] (IY): (c) they are not to be copied, contrary to the opinion of Fr: (2) proper, though it may be omitted, in every pass. part. in which the Đamma is not on [another], but which belongs to the conjug. of \( \text{فَعَل} \) with Kasr [of the \( \text{ع} \)], as \( \text{مَرْصَد} \) [685 (case 8)], which is more frequent than \( \text{مَرْصَد} \) [above], for imitation of the pret. v.: (3) properly omitted, in every inf. n. on [the measure of] \( \text{فُرُّول} \), like \( \text{جُعُبُ} \) [act of] kneeing upright and \( \text{عُنَّو} \) [685 (case 9, b)]; while those who convert [the, into \( \text{i} \)] do so because of the transformation of [the, into \( \text{i} \)] the v. [\( \text{عَنَّا} \) and \( \text{حَمَا} \). If not final, the \( \text{و} \) is not converted, as \( \text{أَحْوَرَ} \) and \( \text{أَحْوَرَ} \) [721].
Conversion is extraordinary in أَفْعَلَ (1) ṣafful, like أَغُزِرْ and أَغْزِرْ: but أَعْمَلْ or أَعِمَّلْ riddle occurs; and hence أَذْحَى أَفْعَلْ from I expanded (Jh), and أَذْحَى or أَذْحَة, the place where the ostrich lays eggs in the sand (KF, MAR), because she expands it with her foot, and then lays eggs in it, the ostrich having no nest (Jh)] : (2) فَعْلُ al-ʿilāqāʾ oath, which may be فَعْلُ or فَعِلْ while its ل is a , because they say أَلْرَ in the same sense : (3) the pass. part. in which the Damma is not on [another] , , and which does not belong to the conj. of Kasr, like مَغْرِب، 685 (case 8, b) : but مَسْنُوة or مَسْنُوَة [above] is said; and the poet says

أَنَا اللَّيْتَ مَعْدِيًا عَلَيْهِ وَعَانِيًا [above] (R). The saying أَنَا اللَّيْتَ الَّيْتَ is recited in both ways 685 (case 8, b, α, α). The cause of the transformation is disputed, being said to be (1) conformity to the pass. v. [عِدِّيٍ (Sn)]: (a) this is the saying of Fr, who is followed by IM; but it is objected that conversion is found in the inf. n., which is not formed according to the pass. v. : (2) assimilation to the cat. of أُذْرِلِ أَذِنِّ and أَجِرِ [243, 721], because the first, [of مَعْتُدُ (Sn)], being quiescent, aug, [and] fit for incorporation, is not taken into account as a barrier; so that
the, which is the ل of the word, is, as it were, immediately after the Damma; and is therefore converted into ی, as in أَذِلَّ and أَجَرَ [above] (A). The pass. part. whose ل is a Hamza is sometimes subjected to this transformation, like مَخْبَرُ, orig. مَخْبِر, hidden [658]. And نَثُر occurs anomalously as pl. of فَتَّى youth, notwithstanding that its ل is a ی, as نَحْر is anomalous, except that the anomaly in نَمْر is conversion of the ی into [243]. and in نَمْر is non-conversion of the ی into [above]. After conversion of the ی into ی [and of the Damma into Kasra], you may make the في of فعلُ, whether a pl. or otherwise, imitate, or not imitate, the ع [in its vowel], as عَطَى [68٤, 68٥ (case 9, b, a), 7٣٠. A] and دَلِى [2٤٣, 6٨٥ (case 9)]. And in فعلُ, when a pl. of the hollow whose ع is, as ضَمِّرُ fasters [2٤٩] and ضَمِّرُ sayers [7٣٠. A], you may convert the ی into ی, as ضَمِّرُ قَبَّلَ [6٨٥ (case 10), ٧١٥, ٧١٦], though it should rather be sounded true. That is allowable only because it is a pl. [above], and the ی is near the end; while حُرُل [٧١٤] is not allowable, because it is a sing. [above]. IH has previously adjudged this conversion to be anomalous [٧١٦]: whereas the language of S notifies that it is regular. But, as for مَثَّا أَرَقُ آئِلِيَّ اذْهَبْ [6٨٥, ٧١٥, ٧١٦], it is anomalous, because of the remoteness from the end (R).
§ 723. The  and  are converted [into ] and afterwards (R)] into Hamza [688 (case 1, k, b)], when they occur as a final [below] after an aug. \( \ddot{i} \), [because, the \( \ddot{i} \) being then like the non-existent, the mobile , and \( \ddot{i} \) occur, as it were, after Fatha (R),] as فُنَّفَ and ّ ّ[328, 688, 708, 719] (SH), which are فُنَّفَ and ّ ّ فِكِّ نَّعُوْمٍ such a one is good in the fashion of wearing the cloak (Jrb); contrary to رَأَي and قاَّي [719] (SH), where the \( \ddot{i} \), being converted from a rad. letter, [\( \ddot{i} \) in the former ex., and \( \ddot{i} \) in the latter,] is taken into account (R). It is mentioned, in the commentary ascribed to IH, that رَأَي and قاَّي are pls. of رَأَي and قاَّي: but this requires consideration; and it should rather be said that رَأَي and قاَّي [301, 302, 305], قاَّي and قاَّي [305, 684], are [collective generic ns. and ns. un., respectively,] on the principle of ثُمَّة and ثُمَّة [254] (Jrb). The , and  mentioned are converted into \( \ddot{i} \) because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha [684, 719]. Then, two quiescents being combined, the first is not elided [708], notwithstanding that it is a letter of prolongation [663], lest one formation be confounded with another, [vid. the prolonged with the abbreviated]; but the second is converted into a letter susceptible of a vowel, [and] akin to \( \ddot{i} \), vid. Hamza, both being guttural [732]: [and such conversion of the
second is necessary,] since the first is a letter of prolongation having no share in a vowel; while there is no way to conversion of the second into ھ, or ای, because one has only just escaped from them (R). It is stipulated, in the case of the [ھ, or ای (IY)] converted after that the ی should be aug. [374, 673], as in ك س آ and رآ [above]: whereas, if it be rad., the ھ, or ای is not converted, as ئیژ [683 (case 1, a), 697, 698, 720] and ایژ [below], كیژ, ھیژ, and كیئا [684 (condition 10, b, a)] (M).

That is because of two matters, (1) that the letter, when aug., may be assumed to be elided: so that the unsound letter comes, as it were, immediately after the فatha; and is therefore treated, in respect of conversion and transformation, in the same way as in غس and حخمی [719]: whereas, when the ی is rad., this assumption is not permissible: (2) that the ی, when rad., is converted from another [letter]; so that, when you proceed to convert the ھ, or ای, which is a ی, you make two transformations consecutively, which is a catachresis. And Mz exaggerates in precaution by stipulating that the ی, with which the ھ, or ای is converted into Hamza, should be [not only] aug., [but] third, to guard against یز [below] and ایآ [720]; for, though "aug." is sufficient as a safeguard, he corroborates it by "third" (IY).

As for یز [321, 720], its ی is converted from a ھ, and
its \( j \) is a \( i \), because it is from the crude-form of \( \text{زـبیت} \), meaning \( \text{جـبـعت} \) \text{I collected}, except that its \( \text{ع} \) is transformed, and its \( j \) preserved. The general rule is that the \( j \) should be transformed, and the \( \text{ع} \) sounded true, as \( \text{هـوی} \) [683, 684 (condition 10, a, a, \( \gamma \))] and \( \text{نـوی} \) [683, 713]; but \( \text{زـبـیة} \) is co-ordinated, in anomalousness, with \( \text{زـبـیة} \) [above] and \( \text{غـبـیة} \) [684 (condition 10, b)]. And, as for \( \text{تـای} \) [above], the [fold or] nightly resting-place of camels, [sheep, or goats (Jh),] it is from \( \text{ضـبیئ} \) \text{I abode. Similarly, if the} \( \text{،} \) \text{and} \( \text{ی} \) \text{be followed by the [inseparable]} \( s \) of feminization [below], as in \( \text{سـفـیة} \) and \( \text{شـفـار} \) [266, 683 (case 1, \( d \))], then being considered not quasi-final, but quasi-medial, because the \( s \) of feminization is [permanently] attached to the word, they are not converted into Hamza (Jrb). Since the \( \text{،} \) \text{and} \( \text{ی} \) 's being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha is a weak cause for their conversion [703], and, above all, when an \( l \) separates them from the Fatha, it is prevented from taking effect by the occurrence of an inseparable letter after the \( \text{،} \) \text{and} \( \text{ی} \), because their conversion into \( l \) is produced not only by the cause, but also by their being final [above], since the final is the seat of alteration. That letter is (1) the \( s \) of feminization [above], when inseparable from the word [683 (case 1, \( d \))], as in \( \text{نـقـار} \) choice part and \( \text{نـفتـا} \) [266, 721];
(2) the 1 of dualization, when inseparable, as in [228, 230, 683 (case 1, f), 721], since ُنْ for the sing. does not occur; (3) the non-dualistic 1 and َن, as in ُغرَوَان ُسَلَامان [390], from ُغَرَأ and ُرَمَيْان, on the measure of ُسَلَامان, whereas, (a) if the ُن be separable, which is (a) the ُن distinguishing the fem. from the masc. in eps. [265], as ُسَقَةٌ [682, 683 (case 1, e)] and ُغَرَأ, because they say ُسَقَةٌ [282] and ُغَرَأ great raider, and (b) the regular ُن of un. [336], as in ُعَسَيْفُةٍ a drawing of water and ُعَسَيْفُةٍ a choice, an election, or, (b) if the 1 of dualization be separable, as in ُرَدآهَان ُكَسَآهَان [230, 683 (case 1, f)], the ُن and ُه are converted, because quasi-final. And the reason why ُعَطَايَةٍ or ُعَطَايَةٍ ُعَطَايَةٍ [266, 683 (case 1, e), 721], ُعَبْاَيَةٍ or ُعَبْاَيَةٍ ُعَبْاَيَةٍ, and ُسَلَّاَيَةٍ or ُسَلَّاَيَةٍ ُسَلَّاَيَةٍ, with Hamza or ُه, are allowable, although in them also the ُن denotes unity, as in ُعَسَيْفُةٍ and ُعَسَيْفُةٍ [above], is only that, in the inf. n. [336], the ُه of un. is regular, frequent, so that its adventitiousness is obvious; contrary to the concrete n. [3], where those [specimens] whose n. un. is distinguished from their generic n. by the ُه [254, 265] are rare, whether they be [denotative of] created things, like ُتَّفَاح أ and ُتَّفَاح أ, or [of] others, like ُلَيْنَةٌ [254]: so that, in the three ns. [under discussion], Hamza is allowable from regard to the
separability of the ِ, since ِعَطَاُّ [721], and are said for the generic ِ, while ِ is allowable, because the ِ [in the concrete ِ], being generally inseparable, since, as we said, it is not regular, becomes like the ِ of ِشَفَأَة and ِنِهَايَة ِشَفَأَة [229, 266]. And, since the ِ of ِun. in the concrete ِ is quasi-inseparable, ِعَطَاُّ ِقَلْنِسُوُة and ِعَطَاُّ ِقَلْنِسُوُة are allowable, although the generic ِ is ِعَطَاُّ ِقَلْنِسُوُة and ِعَطَاُّ ِقَلْنِسُوُة [721]. But [the inf. ns.] ِشَفَأَة and ِشَفَأَة are not like [the concrete ns.] ِعَطَاُّ ِعَطَاُّ [above], since ِشَفَأَة does not denote the individual, and ِشَفَأَة the genus; nay, the ِ. ِun. would by rule be ِشَفَأَة a misery [336]: so that ِشَفَأَة is not orig. ِشَفَأَة augmented by the ِ; and for this reason the ِ, is permanent, as ِغَبَرُ, not ِغَبَرُ [266]. The reason why the occurrence of an inseparable letter [after the ِ and ِ] prevents conversion in the cat. of ِشَفَأَة [above] and ِحَرَايَة being ashamed [below], and in the cat. of ِشَفَأَة [719, 721], but not in the cat. of ِعَطَاُّ ِعَطَاُّ and ِغَرِيْنَان ِغَرِيْنَان and ِغَرِيْنَان, respectively, with Kasr of the ِ, even if we hold the ِ [and ِ] and the ِ in them to be inseparable, is only that the cause of conversion is strong in the last [cat.], not in the two first. And for the same reason you convert the letter [ِ, into ِ], notwithstanding that it is separated from the Kasra by a sound letter, in
such as دَرْجَة [724]. The Hamza in such co-ordinates as حَرْبَة ٍ عَلَبَة [248, 273, 385] is orig. I converted from the ی added for co-ordination [683 (case 1)], as is proved by their fem. analogues, like دَمِكْاَيَة [282] and بِرْجِلَايَة [short, fat (IY on §. 683), fleshy, whether tall or short KF, MAR], where, the ی being inseparable, as in حَرْبَبَة [above], the ی is not converted, contrary to female chameleon (R).

§. 724. The [final (Jrb)] ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr is [unavoidably (M)] converted (M, SH) into ی (IY, SH), as ْدَعِيَ and ْرَضَيَ [below], and ٌأَلْفَارِي [685 (case 1, a), 719, 721] (SH); [and] as مَعْقِلَة ْحَارِيَة [below] and مَعْقِلَة ْحَنَثَت ْمَعْقِلَة (BS). For the ی, in addition to being preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is a ی, while the ی is weak as being at the end [719]; and, since they convert the ی in the like of ْقَبْرَة ْنَبْرَة ْقَبْرَة ْنَبْرَة pl. of ْئُبْرَر [685 (case 3, b, c, α), 713], and ْقَيَّام ْقَيَّم ْقَيَّام [685 (cases 2, 3), 713], notwithstanding that the ی is stronger than the ی, much more should the ی, which is weaker, be converted because of the Kasra before it (IY). The mobile ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, being strengthened by the vowel,
s not converted into ی, except on [one of] two conditions, (1) that it be a ٓ, because the final is the seat of alteration: (a) it is then converted into ی, whether it be in (a) a n., as رأیت ألفائی [713]; or (b) a v., act., like ٓزمنا [685 (case 1, a)], or pass., like was called [629]: and whether it (a) become virtually medial, through the occurrence of a subsequent letter inseparable from the word, as in ٓطیان upon [the measure of] فعلان [685 (case 1, d), 686 (case 2, c, α), 723] from ٓغزو, and ٓغزو upon [the measure of] فعلة [723] from the same, with inseparability of the ی, as in عنصرة [385, 721]; or (b) do not become [so], as in عاریة [265 (case 1, a, α), 685 (case 1, b)]: (b) مقاتوی pl. of مقاتو [685 (case 1, b, c)]] is anomalous, being treated as sound for conformity to مقاترون: (c) they say ٓجنترو [overtopping peak of a mountain (M.A.R.)], with ٓج, lest the rare ٓجعلو be confounded with the frequent ٓفعلیا, as نفیّة [385], نفیّة an all. seq. of عیّة (KF, M.A.R), عیّة [385], and the like: (d) if you contract ٓرضی [above] and ٓرّذت was raided, you say ٓرّذت ٓرّذت and ٓرّذت, as you say علم for علم [482, 685 (case 7, b, b, γ)], and علم for علم was pressed, squeezed; and the ی is not restored to its o. f. of ی, notwithstanding the removal
of the Kasra in contraction, because its removal is accidental: (e) they say ḍasīrīa. They were pleased and ḍūzūra. They were raided, taking the supplied Kasra into account as respects conversion of the ʿ into ʿ, but not as respects retention of the Damma on the ʿ: whereas, if they took it into account in every respect, ṭerais ʿ and ḍūzērīa would be said, because Damma on the ʿ is deemed heavy after Kasra; and then the ʿ's being affixed to the contracted ṭērā and ḍūzērī would not be plain: (2) that it be an ʿ in a n. made conformable to something else, as in ṭēyām [above], and ḍīkār ṭēesā and [685 (case 3, a, b)]}, as before explained [713]. As for the mobile ʿ preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, (1) if it do not occur as a ʿ, then, (a) if it be not pronounced with Kasr, as ṭēyām and ʿīyēn [713], and ʿīyēn pl. of ʿīyān [246], it is not converted into ʿ because it is strengthened by the vowel, and is also medial; (b) if it be pronounced with Kasr, as in ʿīyēn [436], its predicament has been explained [706]: (2) if it occur as a ʿ, then, (a) if Fath be inseparable from it, the ʿ is converted into ʿ on account of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Damm, because the final is the seat of alteration; while, through the inseparability of Fath, a ʿ preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm is not deemed heavy at the end, as it is not so deemed in ʿūr [161, 721]: that is [found]
in \( \textit{a} \) the \( \textit{v.} \), as \( \text{زَمَيْلُ الرَّجُل} \). Most excellent in shooting is the man, \( \text{زَمَيْلُ} \) [468, 686 (case 2, a), 721] from \( \text{زَمَيْلُ} \):  
(\( \alpha \)) if you contract [\( \text{نَعْلُ} \) by eliding] the Ḍamma of the \( \text{ع} \), the \( \text{ع} \) is not altered, because the contraction is accidental, as \( \text{زَمَيْلُ الرَّجُل} \), like for \( \text{ظَرَفْ} \) \( \text{ظَرَفْ} \) [368, 476]:  
(b) the \( \text{n.} \), but only when the \( \text{ع} \) is followed by an inseparable \( \text{aug.} \) necessitating Fath of what is before it, [i.e., of the \( \text{ع} \)] like [the \( \text{l} \) and \( \text{n} \) in \( \text{نُرُمَيْمُ} \) on the measure of \( \text{أَشْحَانُ} \) \( \text{[a kind of tree (KF, MAR)]} \) from \( \text{زَمَيْلُ} \), where \( \text{ع} \) is not deemed heavy, as it is not so deemed in \( \text{عَنْفَوَانُ} \) and \( \text{عَنْفَوَانُ} \) \( \text{[389, 390, 399, 721]} \), because the \( \text{ع} \) is, as it were, not a \( \text{l} \): and like [the \( \text{s} \) in] \( \text{زَمَيْلُ} \) on the measure of \( \text{فَعَلَةُ} \) from \( \text{زَمَيْلُ} \), when the \( \text{s} \) is inseparable [686 (case 2, b)]: whereas, if it be not inseparable, you say \( \text{زَمَيْلُ} \) \( \text{[686 (case 2, c, a)]} \), by conversion of the Ḍamma into Kasra [721]:  
(\( \alpha \)) the reason why Kasra is inseparable from the letter followed immediately by the \( \text{ى} \) in such as \( \text{طَوْيِانُ} \) with Kasr of the \( \text{ع} \), \( \text{[orig.} \text{طَوْيِانُ}] \) on the measure of with Damm of the \( \text{ع} \), from \( \text{طَوْيِانُ} \) \( \text{[hungered (MAR)]} \), and \( \text{طَوْيِانُ} \), \( \text{[orig.} \text{طَوْيِانُ}] \) on the measure of \( \text{مَطَرَّيْنُ} \) [362], from the same, is only that, the last \( \text{ى} \) of such as \( \text{قَرْيٍ} \) being always converted into \( \text{ى} \) [685 (case 1, a, a), 728], the \( \text{ى} \) of \( \text{طَوْيِانُ} \) \( \text{[or} \text{طَوْيِانُ}] \) cannot
possibly be converted into: (b) if Fathʾ be not inseparable from it, as in أَلْتَجَارِيَةٌ rivalry, competition and أَلْتَبْرِيَة disputing, one with another, the Damma is converted into Kasra [700]; and not the ی into ُ, because the heaviest of the unsound letters, i. e. ُ, preceded by the heaviest of the vowels, i. e. Damma, is deemed too heavy to be a seat of inflection: (a) as for بَعْرُ أَلْجَلُ, aor. i. q. بَعِرُ, بَعِرُ, بَعِرُ, meaning [The man] became handsome, its [original] ی, notwithstanding its being a seat of inflection [in the aor.], is converted into ُ because of what we have mentioned (R), [i. e.] on account of the Damma [in ذُلُل], because in vs. the formations are observed, never confused one with another, since the quality of ُ comes into existence only by means of the formation and measure [721]; the o. f. of the ُ being the inf. n. [331], which is a n., but, on being invaded by the measures, becomes a ُ (R on the Preterite): (b) similarly the Damma is converted into Kasra, when the ی that is the seat of inflection is doubled, as in رُسُمِ فَنُدُّ [375, 730. A] from رُسُمِ (R). But [acquiring for oneself, not for traffic (Jh)] and [هُوَ أَبُو عَبْدِيَةٍ] دَنِيَا هُوَ أَبُو عَبْدِيَةٍ in (Jr) [Dِنِيَا] He is the son of my paternal uncle, closely related [723] are anomalous (SH), by rule دُنِىَةٌ and دُنِىَة (Jrb); because you convert the ُ that is a ل into ی, notwithstanding its separation
from the preceding Kasra by the quiescent. The reason of that, besides its anomalousness, is that the is a ل, and the quiescent like the non-existent. [on this hypothesis] belongs to [the cat. of] the, because you say قِرْطِب I acquired for myself, not for traffic (Jh): but it should rather be said to belong to قِرْطِب, because its ل is biform; and hence مَل [تْنْيَان] property acquired for oneself, not for traffic (Jh, MAR), with ذم of the ق (R). And [similarly] صَبْر [246, 257, 685] is from صَبْر, aor. صَبْر; and ذِنَب [above] from ذَنَو nearness (IY). Tayyi convert the i in the cat. of ذُنَو and دُعّا and دُعّا and بَقَى into ا (SH), saying رَمَنا and بَقَى and بَقَى [349, 482], because, deeming Kasra before the i to be heavy, they convert it into Fatha; so that the i becomes converted into ٌ (Jrb), as before explained [703]. This is a universal rule, according to theirm, whether the i be orig. و, as in رَمَنا and دُعّا [above]; or not, as in بَقَى (R). But that is peculiar to us., to the exclusion of as., like ذَنَو [16, 294, 720] (Jrb).

§. 725. When the ل of فَلَٰعَلِي, with Fatha of the ف, is unsound, then, (1) if a و, it is preserved in the substantive, as دَخْوَى [248, 272]; and ep., as دَخْوَى [fer. of دَخْوَى tipsy (MAZ, Sn)]: (a) they make no distinction
between the substantive and *ep.* in the *cat.* of the، [below] (A): (b) its، is not converted into ی، either in the substantive, as شَهْرَى [above], or *ep.*, as شَهْرَى یُهْرَى، because the beginning and the end of the word are moderate [in weight] through [the lightness of] the فَثَا and [the heaviness of] the، whereas, if the، were converted into ی، both ends of the word would become light (R): (2) if a ی، it is preserved in the *ep.*, as صِدَّٰیَا and خَرْبَیَا، 686 (case 3, a)، *fems.* of صِدَّٰیَا and خَرْبَیَا، and converted into، in the substantive، as ُتَقْرَی، شَرْفَی، 686 (case 3)، ُقْرَی، ُشَرْفَی، to distinguish the substantive from the *ep.*: (a) the substantive is selected for this transformation，because，being lighter [than the *ep.*，since the sense of the latter is composite (142، 313، 331) (Sn)]]，it is more tolerant of heaviness (A): (b) as for the *cat.* of the ی، moderation is intended in it: so that first [the excessive lightness of] the substantivo，which is anterior to the *ep.*，is moderated by conversion of its ی into، and then the *ep.*، when it is reached، is left without conversion，for the sake of distinction (R): (c) this change occurs in most cases (IM): (d) IM says “in most cases” to exclude َزَبٰی، صِعْبَیَا، طِفَّیَا، 686 (case 3، a)، as he expressly states in the CK: but the exclusion of these requires consideration [for reasons here assigned by A، identical with those given in §. 686]. What IM mentions here
and in the CK, is agreeable with the opinion of S. [Z., I. H.,] and most of the GG: I mean that, in the substantive ٰیبیلیٰ, change of ی into ی, is regular, and retention of ی anomalous. But in the Tashil he reverses [the rule], saying that the substitution of ی, for the ی [serving as the ج], of ٰیبیلیٰ, when a substantive, is anomalous. And, in one of his [other] compositions also, he says "One anomaly in transformation is the substitution of ی, for ی in ٰیبیلیٰ, when a substantive, like ناُمِرُ, [a district in Adhrabījān (Sn),] ٰیبیلیٰ [above], عَمْرُ [with an undotted ِ and a ن in the MSS, but not found by me in the KF or Msb or any other (work on lexicology) (Sn)], and ٰیبیلیٰ [above], the o. j. in them being ی". Then he says "But most of the GG make this regular; and, to the four [exs.] mentioned, they append [i. q. طُفْفِیْانُ (686, case 3, a) (Sn)], ٰیبیلیٰ, [so in the MSS, with ق, but not found by me in the KF or elsewhere, what is in the KF being ٰیبیلیٰ with the dotted غ, i. q. لَبْرِیٰ, i. e., what is not taken into account, whether speech or anything else, so that perhaps what is in the MSS is a mistranscription, though it is not noticed by the Glossators (Sn),] and ٰیبیلیٰ [above], asserting that their o. j. is ی: whereas, in my opinion, these last, [i. e., شُرْبِیٰ and the three after it (Sn),] should rather be regarded as
belonging to \([\text{the cat. of (Sn)}]\) the , in order to preclude multiplication of anomalies” \((A)\); though this argument does not apply to “most of the GG”, because they do not profess that these four are anomalous \((Sn)\). And afterwards he says “One thing which makes it plain that the change of ی [in نَشْرِی and the three after it \((Sn)\)] into , is anomalous, is the sounding [of the ی] true in ی [above], سُقْبِیا , and for these three, which occur [with ی] according to the o. f., and with avoidance of anomalousness, are more worthy of being considered regular”. This is his language: but a criticism on his citation of these three as proofs has already been passed \((A)\), deducible from the criticism on their exclusion by his saying “in most cases” [above] \((Sn)\).

When the ل of نَعَلَی , with ذم of the ف , is unsound, then, (1) if a ی , it is preserved in the substantive, as a legal opinion; and ep., as ﺟَلِیْ اَلْقَصِیَا fem. of ﺟَلِیْ اَلْقَصِیَا the most decisive \((A)\), to be distinguished, say our Master and YH, from ﺟَلِیْ اَلْقَصِیَا , as to which the difference between the Hijāzis and Tamīmīs will be mentioned below, the o. f. [of the ل] in the latter being , while in this it is ی \((Sn)\): (a) they make no distinction between the substantive and ep. in the نَعَلَی belonging to the cat. of the ی , as they make none in the نَعَلَی belonging to the cat. of the , [above] \((A)\): (b) its ل is not converted, in the substantive or ep., because
moderateness [in weight] is produced in the word by the heaviness of the ḃamma at its beginning, and the lightness of the ی at its end; whereas, if the ل were converted into ۰, both ends of the word would become heavy (R): (2) if ۰, it is preserved in the substantive, like حُرْئُ ۰ [1602, 272], as ۰ [685 (case 6, e)]; and converted into ی in the ep., as XXXVII. 6. and ۰ [685 (case 6)]: (a) as for the saying of the Hijāzis ۰ [685 (case 6, c)], it is anomalous by rule, [though] chaste by usage, serving to notify the o. f. (A), i. e. (Sn); while Tamīm say ۰ [above], according to rule: (b) the sweetest also is anomalous, according to all. The opinion adopted by IM is contrary to what is held by [S, Z, IH, and] the [other] Etymologists, who say that the ل of ۰, when ۰, is converted in the substantive, not in the ep.; and make حُرْئُ anomalous [685 (case 6, f)] (A). As for the cat. of the ل, a sort of heaviiness is produced in it by ḃamma's being at the beginning of the word, and ل's being near the end; while, in addition to alleviation, distinction between the substantive and ep. is intended: so that the ل is converted into ی in the substantive, not in the ep., because the substantive is anterior to the ep., and [its excessive heaviness] is therefore moderated by conversion of its ل into ی; and then, the ep., when it is
reached, is left without conversion for the sake of distinction between them. And [below], Arabic, and Arabic, though fems. of Arabic, 359 Arabic, and Arabic, the of superiority, are mentioned by S under the substantive feminine, since feminine is, according to S, virtually a substantive, because, not being a qual. without the art., it is treated like a substantive, as before mentioned 718. According to this, then, IH's making feminine [above] to be a substantive, and feminine 685 (case 6, f) and feminine [above], fems. of feminine and feminine, to be eps., requires consideration, because feminine also is fem. of feminine [above]. But, says S, they say feminine, [according to the o. f. (S)]; so that they do not convert its into feminine, because with the art. it is sometimes an ep. 356. According to the opinion of S, then, feminine, and every fem. of the feminine of superiority whose l is a feminine, should by rule have [its converted into] feminine, because treated like a substantive: Sf says "I have not found S mention any ep. on [the measure of] feminine with Damm, whose l is a feminine, except what is used with the art., as feminine, feminine, and the like; and these, according to S, are like substantives" (R). But [S adds that], when you say feminine belonging to this cat. [whose l is a feminine], it is pronounced according to the o. f., when it is an ep.; being [then] a fortiori
pronounced according to the o. f., since they say ﺍًلْقَصِرَٰ, according to the o. f., though it is a substantive (S).

"And", says Sf, "he means that ﻉُلَلَى, when a scion of the ﯽ، is [to be pronounced] according to its o. f., when it is an ep., even if no ex. of that [ep.] on [the measure of] ﻉُلَلَى be remembered from their speech, because the rule is to make the thing accord with its o. f., unless it be plainly excluded from its o. f., deviating from its cat." But, as for ﻉُلَلَى, with Kasr of the ﯽ, from the defective, its ﯽ, is not converted into ﯽ, nor its ﯽ into ﯽ, whether it be a substantive or an ep., because Kasra is not so heavy as دامما, nor so light as فتحا, but is intermediate between the two; so that moderateness [in weight] is produced in it with the ﯽ and with the ﯽ, while the real reason for converting the ﯽ of ﻉُلَلَى with Fath, and the ﯽ of ﻉُلَلَى with دامما, is quest of moderateness [in weight], not of distinction between the ep. and the substantive: do you not see that there is no distinction between them in the ﻉُلَلَى pronounced with Fath of its ﯽ, when belonging to the cat. of the ﯽ, and the ﻉُلَلَى pronounced with دامما of its ﯽ, when belonging to the cat. of the ﯽ, since moderateness is produced in both? But, as for exs. of ﻉُلَلَى, with Kasr of the ﯽ, belonging to the cat. of the ﯽ, and likewise of the ﯽ, they are scarce (R).
§. 726. When the final of the ultimate pl. [18, 256] is a ی preceded by Hamza, its sing. (1) contains an ِ second, followed by (α) a Hamza, (α) original, as in شارَت, outwent; (β) converted, as in شَتْث I wished: (b) a و, as in شارِیة from شَرَت I roasted: (b) third, followed by (α) a و, as in لدُرْق [281] and هَرْار [below]; (b) a ی, as in دَرْایة [α thin skin that rises to the top of milk and broth (MAR)] and سَقَایة [266]: (2) is not formed in any of these ways, whether its ُ be a Hamza, as in خَطینة fault [below]; or be not, as in بَلیة trial, affliction. The general rule in the [ultimate] pls. of all these sings. is that the two heavies—I mean the ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, and the Hamza—must be alleviated, because the measure is [heavy, as being] that of the ultimate pl.; while these two heavies are at its end, which is the position of alleviation. They are alleviated by converting (1) the ی into ٓ, and the Kasra before it into Fatha; and (2) the Hamza into ی. For, since the ی is allowably converted into ٓ in such as مَداَری [below], notwithstanding that the letter before the ی is not Hamza, it is reasonable that the conversion here should be necessary, because Hamza is heavy. And the Hamza is converted into ی, not ُ, because the former
is lighter than the latter, and nearer to Hamza in outlet [782]. The reason why, in such as حَمْرَأَوَانِ [230, 686], it is mostly converted into ٰ, not ى, is quest of moderation, because, ى being approximate to ٰ, the insertion of a ى between two ٰs would be [equivalent to] a combination of three ٰs: so that a relief from the succession of likes is sought in ٰ, notwithstanding its heaviness, (1) because the formation is light; and (2) because the enclosure of the ٰ, by two ٰs in the du. is not permanent, since, the ٰ of dualization [16, 228, 685] not being inseparable [from the n.], the ٰ supervening on account of it is not permanent. But, as for the ultimate pl., the Hamza in it is not converted into ٰ, (1) because the formation is heavy; and (2) because the enclosure [of the Hamza] by two ٰs is permanent, so that the ٰ would be permanent, if the Hamza were converted into it. In the pl. of حَدَّارَيْكْ ِ حَمْرَأَوَانِ present, however, حَدَّارَيْكْ occurs, for the sake of moderation, as in حَمْرَأَوَانِ; but this is anomalous, except according to Akh [below], who considers it regular, as in حَمْرَأَوَانِ [above]. The general rule mentioned is contravened in two cases, (1) when the sing. contains an ٰ [second], followed by a Hamza, as in حَمْرَأَوَانِ from حَمْرَأَوَانِ or from حَمْرَأَوَانِ [above]; in which case the Hamza and ى are left unaltered, as حُمَلِی اَلْشُروائْی. These are the preceders or the wishers, for observance of the
sing. in the pl., as it is observed in such as حَبَّالْيَاء and حَفْنَالْيَاء [248]; (2) when the sing. contains an | third, followed by a و, [as in لَاوَرِة (above) and عَلَّارِة (266);] in which case the Hamza is converted, but into و, as آَدَارِي and عَلَّارِي, not into ی, [this contravention] also [being] for observance of the sing. [715]. And, according to this, in the pl. whose sing. contains an | second, followed by ا و, like ا و. of شَرْوايَة [above], the sing. ought to be observed, as شَرْوايَة [715]; but, since it is orig. شَرْوايَی, and then the و after the | is converted into Hamza, as in آَرْوَیْل [683 (case 4), 715], because the | of the pl. is enclosed by two unsound letters, the Hamza is not afterwards converted [back] into و, lest this [conversion] be a reversion to what has been fled from; so that here one returns from observance of the sing. to observance of conformity to the general rule, vid. conversion of the Hamza into ی, as شَرْوايَی [715]. Similarly, [the general rule is observed] in the pl. whose sing. (1) contains an | [third], followed by a ی, like سَقَایَة and دَوْرَایَة [above]; so that, if they were given this pl., they would be said: (a) ی is more appropriate here for two reasons, observance of the sing., and conformity to the general rule: (2) does not contain an | followed by a Hamza, ی, or و; so that the Hamza [in the pl.] is converted into 178 a
and the ی [after it] into ی, as خُطَّابَى and یَلِّیًا, pls. of خُطَّابَى [below] and یَلِّی [above]: (a) ہَدَارٰی (above) occurs in the pl. of ہَدَیة [above], as we have mentioned. This being established, know that (1) the ی [third] in all these pls. is imported for pluralization [256], and is not [found] in the sing.: (2) the Hamza after the ی in شَوْآه pl. of شَاوَیة [above], (a) from شُوْت is the original [Hamza], which is [found] in the sing., [being the ی of the word]; (b) from یَشْغٔت is adventitious in the pl. [683 (case 4), 715], as in the sing. [683 (case 2), 708]: (3) the ی [second] in the sing. of both is converted into شَاوِیة [247, 686] in the pl. [شَوْآه]; and so is the ی of the شَاوِیة [above] in the pl., شَاوِیا: (4) the ی of the sing. [شَاوِیة], which is after the ی [second], is converted into Hamza [in the pl.], as in یَآرْئُل [above]; and then the Hamza [pronounced with Kasr] into ی pronounced with Fath, as we mentioned: (5) the ی [third] in یَدَارٰی is converted in the pl. into Hamza, as in یَرْسَائِل [below]; and its ی into ی because [final and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 1, a), 724]; and then the Hamza [pronounced with Kasr] into ی, pronounced with Fath, [and the ی into ی, as یَدَارٰی above]: (6) similarly, [mutatis mutandis,] in سِقَایة, [as سِقَایة above]:
(7) the ی in خطابیة [below] is converted into Hamza, according to S, as in صحايف [246, 683 (case 3), 717]: and, two Hamzas being then combined, the second is converted into ی [below]; and the first into ی pronounced with Fath, as in بلایى [above] and the like; and the ی after it into ی [684, 719], because the ی necessarily converted from Hamza is in the predicament of an original ی, [which is converted into ی when mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath;] while the second Hamza here is necessarily converted into ی [above], because final [661]: so that خطابیة is like خطابیة [below], the ی, i.e. the last letter, of both being converted into ی: (a) Khl [below] says that it is orig. خطابی with Hamza after the ی that is [third] in the sing., [so that its measure is ذا جا ]; but that the ی is put into the position of the Hamza, and the Hamza into the position of the ی, [so that its measure becomes فعالی ]; and afterwards the Hamza, which is the ی of the word, is converted into ی pronounced with Fath. so that its measure is فعالی, which, by conversion of the final ی into ی becomes فعالی [below]: (b) IH, therefore, says "And hence خطابیة, according to the two sayings" [661], meaning that, according to [both] Khl and S [above], it belongs to the cat. of conversion of the single Hamza into a ی pronounced with Fath (R on
Alleviation of the Hamza. When Hamza occurs after the ی of the pl. upon [the measure of (Tsr)] مَفَاعِلٍ [18, 256, 685], and that Hamza is adventitious in the pl. [below], and the ی of the pl. is a Hamza, ی, or ٰ, then two operations are necessary, (1) conversion of the Kasra of the Hamza into Fatha: (2) conversion of the Hamza (a) into ی in three cases, vid. when the ی of the sing. is a Hamza, an original ی, or ٰ, converted into ی; and (b) into ی in one case, vid. when the ی of the sing. is ٰ, apparent (And) in the expression, preserved from conversion into ی: so that these are four cases, which need four exs. [given below] (Tsr). When the Hamza is not adventitious in the pl., [but is found in the sing. as an ی (IY),] like the Hamza of جَوَاْه [248, 708] and سَاْه, سَوَاْه, [which are] جَاْه from جَآَه came, [orig. جِذَاْه] and سَاْه illtreated, vexed, [orig. سَاْه,] it is not converted (M), but remains in its o. f., [whether the Hamza found in the position of the ی in the sing. be a subst. for ی, or ۱, as in the two exs. just given by Z, or be original;] so that, in the pl. of جَاْه, جَاْه جَاْه [fem.] act. part. from جَاْه عَلَیْهَه bit it, and of جَاْه [above] from جَاْه preceded, outwent, him, you say جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه [248, 708], like جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه جَاْه girls and coverings [18], to distinguish the original Hamza,
existing in the *sing.*, from the adventitious (IY). In order that such [a formation] as شَءُوا pl. of شَءْكِئة from شَءَكَتْ [above] may be excluded, IH prescribes, as a condition for conversion of the Hamza of the pl. into ی, and of its ی into ی, that the *sing.* should not be like that, i.e., should not have after its ی a Hamza followed by ی, [as شَءْكَتْ, like شَءَكَتْ, has]; since, if it were like that, the Hamza and ی would be left in the pl. without conversion, in order that the pl. might match its *sing.*: do you not observe them say حَبْلَی as pl. of حَبْلَی [248] as pl. of حَبْلِی [above], and شَءَرَ as pl. of شَءْرَئِی [above], to make the pl. match the *sing.?* S, however, [followed by Z and IHsh.] does not pre-
scribe, as a condition for the conversion mentioned, that the *sing.* should not be like that, but that the Hamza in the pl. should be adventitious. If, then, it be said that, in the pl. of شَءْكِئة from شَءَتْ [above], S is bound to say شَءَایا, because the Hamza is adventitious [683 (case 4), 715], according to him, [in the pl. شَرَأه,] as it is in the *sing.* [683 (case 2), 708], we say that, by its being "adventitious in the pl." [above], he means [here] only that it is not a Hamza in the *sing.*: whereas the Hamza of شَءَه from شَءَتْ is a Hamza in the *sing.* also; so that, by this interpretation, it is not "adventitious in the pl."
(R on Transformation). The stipulation of adventitiousness excludes [also] such as 
\[\text{رباءة} \text{ pl. of رُبَّاؤِي} \] [658], where the Hamza, being found in the sing.,
because مُفْعَلَةٍ مِّرَأَةٍ [366] from رویة [658], is not altered
in the pl. (Aud); although آلْبَرَائِيَّا, with change, anomalously, has been heard (Tsr). And the stipulation of
unsoundness of the ل excludes such as مَكَانِفٍ [above],
رسَائِلٍ [below], in none of which also is the
Hamza altered (Aud), although it is [adventitious] in
the pl. (Tsr). Here [IHsh following] IM, according
to the construction put upon his language by BD,
includes Hamza among the unsound letters [697]; but
in the Tashil IM differentiates them, [because he couples
"Hamza" to the "unsound letter", and coupling neces-
sarily implies difference (Sn):] and there are three
sayings about the Hamza, (1) that it is a sound letter;
(2) that it is an unsound letter, which [opinion] is
adopted by F; (3) that it is a quasi-unsound letter (A).
The ex. of the [first] case [specified above by IHsh],
where the ل is a Hamza, is خَطَابَاً [661, 708] (Aud), pl.
of خَطِيبَةٍ [above], خَاطِبَاً from committing a fault
(Tsr): [for] it is orig. خَطَابَاً with a ى pronounced with
Kasr, which is the ى of خَطِيبَةٍ; and followed by a
Hamza, which is its ل: then (1) the ى [pronounced
with Kasr (Tsr) is changed into Hamza, as in مَخْتَلِفُ with two [above]; so that the word becomes مَخْتَلِفُ with two Hamzas, [the first substituted for the ی, and the second the J of the word (Tsr)]: then (2) the second Hamza is changed into ی, because final Hamza after Hamza is changed into ی, even if it be not after a [Hamza (Tsr)] pronounced with Kasr [661], and a fortiori after a [Hamza (Tsr)] pronounced with Kasr; [so that the word becomes مَخْتَلِفُ]: then (3) the Kasra of the first [Hamza (Tsr)] is converted into Fathā for alleviation, since they sometimes do that where the J is sound, as in مَدَارَی [above] and عَدَارِی [248, 256], as [504] and

مَدَأْرَیُ الْعُلُوِّ

تَضِعُ الْمَدَأْرَیَ فِي مُثَنَّى ۖ وُمَرَسِیَ [which also is (Tsr) by Imra alKals (MN, Tsr), The plaits whereof are piled up on high, the hair-pins being lost in hair coiled and loosened (MN)]; and a fortiori here (Aud), where the J is unsound, because [ی preceded by] Kasra is heavy (Tsr); [so that the word becomes مَخْتَلِفُ]: then (4) the ی is converted into ٰ [684, 719], because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; so that the word becomes مَخْتَلِفُ, with two یs, having a Hamza between them: and then,
(5) since Hamza resembles ٰ, [because it is from the same outlet (Tsr),] three ٰs seem to be combined; and, [that being disliked (Tsr),] the Hamza is therefore changed into ی, [not into ٰ, because ی is lighter than it (Tsr)]: so that the word becomes ٠خَطَائِي٠ after five operations (Aud). This is the opinion of س and the majority of the بب [below]. كه, however, holds that in this case, where the ی is a Hamza, the letter of prolongation [third] in the sing. is not changed into Hamza [in the pl.], lest a combination of two Hamzas ensue; but is transposed by putting the Hamza before the ی, so that the word becomes ٠خَطَائِي٠ [661]; and then what has been mentioned [in operations 3—5] above, as to converting the Kasra into Fatha, then the ی into ی, and then the Hamza into ی, is done here. But it is objected that they sometimes pronounce the pl. according to the o.f., since ٠أَلْلَٰهُ أَكْذَٰبَٰرُ الْعَالٰم٠ [661], with two Hamzas, has been heard in their speech; whereas, if it were [formed] as كه says, no second Hamza would be there at all (Tsr). The ex. of the [second] case, where the ی is an original ی, is قَصَائِیٍ [pl. of قَصَائِیٍ decision (Tsr)]: [for] it is orig. قَصَائِیٍ with two یs, the first the ی of قَعِیْلَةٌ, and the second the ی of قَعِیْلَةٌ: then (1) the first [ی (Tsr)] is changed into Hamza, as in مُصْكَأَطَف١ [above] (Aud); so that the word
becomes تَسْمَى (Tsr): then (2) the Kasra of the Hamza is converted into Fatha (Aud); so that it becomes تَسْمَى (Tsr): then (3) the ی is converted into ی (Aud); so that it becomes تَسْمَى (Tsr): and then (4) the Hamza [intermediate between the two یs (Tsr)] is converted into ی, [for a return to its o. f. (Tsr)]; so that the word becomes تَسْمَى after four operations. The ex. of the [third] case, where the ی is a, converted into ی in the sing., is مَطْيَّة [saddle-camel (Tsr)]: for it is orig. مَطْيَّة from meaning back (Aud), or from مَطْرَب, مَطْرَب, as مَطْرَب يَهْم في السَّيْر. I made them extend the journey, i. e., مُدّدُتُ (Tsr); but the ی is changed into ی, and the [preceding] ی then incorporated into it, on the principle of the change and incorporation in مَيْتُ سَيْدَة and مَيْتُ سَيْدَة, for which مَيْتَ سَيْدَة and مَيْتَ سَيْدَة [685 (case 7, a, a), 716, 747] are said: and its pl. is مَطْاَمْيَة [with a ی pronounced with Kasr before the ی (Tsr)]; where (1) the ی is converted into ی, because final after Kasra, as in ی ی (Tsr): then (2) the first ی is converted into Hamza, as in مَثْاَمْيَة [above] (Aud); so that it becomes مَثْاَمْيَة (Tsr): then (3) the Kasra is changed into Fatha (Aud);
so that it becomes \( \text{مُطاَلَة} \) (Tsr): then (4) the \( \text{ی} \) [is changed (Tsr)] into \( ١ \); [so that it becomes \( ١	ext{مُطاَلَة} \)]: and then (5) the Hamza [intermediate between the two \( ١ \) s is changed (Tsr)] into \( ١ \); so that it becomes \( ١	ext{مُطاَلَة} \) after five operations. The ex. of the [fourth] case, where the \( ١ \) is a \( ١ \) [apparent (Tsr),] preserved in the sing., is \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) [big stick (Tsr)], pl. \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \): for (1) we convert the \( ١ \) of \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) in the pl. into Hamza, as in pl. of \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) [246, 688 (case 3, a-d), 717] (Aud); so that it becomes \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) (Tsr): then (2) we change the \( ١ \) into \( ١ \), because final after Kasra. [685 (case 1, a), 724] (Aud); so that it becomes \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) (Tsr): then (3) we convert the Kasra into Fatha (Aud); so that it becomes \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) (Tsr): then (4) the \( ١ \) is converted into \( ١ \) (Aud), because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 719]; so that it becomes \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) with a Hamza between two \( ١ \) s (Tsr): and then (5) we convert the Hamza into \( ١ \), [in order that the pl. may be conformable to the sing. (Tsr);] so that it becomes \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \), [which result] also [is reached] after five operations (Aud). As for [\( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) pl. of \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) in \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \)], \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \) \( ١	ext{١٢٢} \). Such a one comes to us in the mornings and evenings, Jj in the Commentary on the Takmilat [al\( \text{أ} \)d\( \text{أ} \) by F (Hkh)] and I\( \text{أ} \)d in the Exposition of the verses of the Jumal [by Zji
(Hkh) say that ا occurs in it only in order that it may be akin to [pl. of عشة (KF)]. But the right [view] is that what is done [here] for conformity is only to give ٰٜٛٝٛٝ the pl. عشةٛ, to which it is not entitled, [its measure being ٜٛٝٛٝ, which does not take the pl. قصيةٛ,] contrary to عشةٛ, which is like قصيةٛ [above] and قصيةٛ [testament, precept, pl. ركابِ (MAZ)]; whereas, after receiving this pl., it is entitled to ا, which is substituted for the Hamza of نعام [246], not for the ل of عشةٛٛ, which is و, because its pl. is ٜٛٛٛ, like صلوات [719]. For, since they give ٰٜٛٝ a pl. on [the measure of] نعامٛ for affinity [to عشةٛ], while every pl. on [the measure of] نعامٛ, whose ل is a Hamza or ا, or a و not preserved in the sing., is entitled to have ا substituted for its Hamza, like ٛٛٛٛٛٛ, and ركابٔ, they do that in عشةٛ, because the و of عشةٛ is not preserved. If you say “Assume عشةٛ to be pl. of ٛٛٛ [286]: then their language is correct, because, the و being preserved in the sing., the regular form would be ٔٛٛ, like pl. of ٛٛٛٛٛ [above].” I say “This is forbidden by two considerations, (1) that, since they say only that it is pl. of عشةٛ, I cannot put upon their language a construction contrary to what they expressly state; (2) that, when a matter admits of
two alternatives, attribution of the predicament to affinity, and its attribution to a matter requisite in the word itself, the second must be adopted.” IAmb asserts that غَدَّيَا is not said for affinity at all, since it is pl. of غَدَّيَة, not of غَدَّة; and, as evidence for the existence of غَدَّيَة, he cites the saying

أَكَّلَتْ حُظْيَةٌ مِنْ رِبَآءِ مِمَّهِ # غَدَّيَاتِ قِيرُطِ أَوْ عُشْيَاتِ أَشْتَيْةَ

Now, would that my share of visiting Mayya were in mornings of summer or evenings of winters! but there is no evidence in this, because غَدَّيَات may be allowable only for affinity to عُشْيَات, not because غَدَّة is said (BS). Three sorts of anomaly occur in this cat.:—(1) sounding the Hamza true after the ء, as

فَمَا تَرَحَّتْ أُقَادِمُنا فِي مَقَامِهِ # نَلَا قَتَنَا حَتَّى أَرَءَى أَلِيَانِيًَا

[by 'Ubaida Ibn AlHārith Ibn 'Abd AlMu'tṭalib alKurashi alMu'tṭalibi, son of the Prophet's paternal uncle, Then our feet ceased not to be steadfast in our post in the battle, the feet of the three of us, meaning himself and 'Ali and Ḥamza, until they were made to visit the fates, i.e., death (MN)], by rule عَلَّيَا, but pronounced according to the o. f. [by poetic license (MN)]: (2) sounding it, and the Hamza after it, which is a ن, true, as اللهُ أَفْقَرَ أَلِيَ [above], with two Hamzas, by rule خَطَأَيَا; and this is more anomalous
than the preceding: (3) changing the letter after the َ into a letter not required by rule, as هِدَّائِيّاً (Sn) pl. of هِدَّائِيّ (above), by rule هِدَّائِيّ (Tsr). Akh [above] holds هِدَّائِيّ to be regular: but this [opinion] is weak, [and Dm says that no reason for it is apparent (Sn),] since this word is the only instance of it that has been transmitted. The opinion of the KK is that all these pls. [mentioned above as exs. of the four cases] are on the measure of [272] (A), where the letter after the َ of the pl. is the َ of the word, and the [final] َ is for feminization (Sn): the َ being sounded true in هِرَائِيّ, as in the sing.; and transformed [into َ] in مطابِيّ, as in the sing.; while [تْغَائِيّ] or هِدَّائِيّ is [also] on the measure of the o. f. (A), i. e., matches the sing., its َ being sounded true, like the َ of the sing. (Sn); and, as for خطائِيّ, it comes from خطًَيّة [658], with change and incorporation, on the measure of هِدَّائِيّ (A), خطائِيّ also, according to this, being on the measure of the o. f., like هْرَائِيّ [above], مطابِيّ, and تْغَائِيّ or هِدَّائِيّ (Sn). But the BB [above] hold that they are [on the measure of (KIAmb)] خطائِيّ [which is the opinion adopted by IM (Sn),] in order to make the unsound [in the َ], [like هِدَّائِيّ pl. of هِدَّائِيّ (Sn),] conform to the sound (A), like
§ 727. Every (M) [final], occurring fourth or upwards is converted into ī [685 (case 4)], when the letter before it is not pronounced with Damm [below] (M, SH), whether that letter be pronounced with Fath [below] or Kasr [685 (case 1), 724] (Jrb), as ٌ أَغْرَزَتْ (1) [685 (M, SH), 685 (case 4, b)] ٌ رَجَشْتَ, I hoped, ٌ تَفْعَزَتْتُ I hoped (M) and تَفْعَزَتْتُ I was equipped for raiding (SH), ٌ إِسْتَفْرَزَتْتُ [685 (case 4, b)] (IY), I demanded a bribe (M) and لَفْصَزْتُ [685] (SH); and their aors. [in most cases] (M): (a) every v. whose pret.
is of four or more letters, except تفاعَلَ, تفاعلَ, and تفاعلَ, has the penultimate of its aor. pronounced with Kasr [404]; so that its ال, when it, is converted into ی [685 (case 1, a), 724], because final and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as يَفْتَرَ and يَفْتَرَ: and they make the pret. accord with the aor., saying يَفْتَرَ. (b) similarly they convert the ال in [the pret. of] تفاعَلَ and تفاعَلَ, because تفاعَلَ and تفاعَلَ are quasi-pass. of تفاعَلَ and تفاعَلَ [486, 487]; so that, since the ال is converted into ی in the o. f., it remains so after prefixion of the ال of quasi-passivity (Jrb): يَفْرَّيْاَبِ (2) [719] (M, SH) and يَفْرَّيْاَبِ [685 (case 4, c)], in the aors. of يَفْرَّيْاَبِ and يَفْرَّيْاَبِ [229, 626, 629] (M), du. of يَفْرَّيْاَبِ [IY] (3): شَأْاا [327] (M), du. of يَفْرَّيْاَبِ [327] (M), du. of يَفْرَّيْاَبِ [IY], and [similarly (IY)] [327] (M): contrary to يَدْعُو and يَدْعُو [404, 719–721] (SH), where the ال, though fourth, is not converted into ی, because the letter before it is pronounced with Damm (Jrb). The final ال fourth or upwards, preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [above], is converted into ی on two conditions, (1) that
its conversion into ٰ be not allowable because of (a) quiescence of the ٰ [684 (condition ٰ), 719], as in ٰ and ٰ [above]; (b) ambiguity [684 (condition ٰ, ٰ, ٰ), 719], as in ٰ and ٰ [above], and ٰ [du. of ٰ higher]: (a) that is because, their object being alleviation, the ٰ, so long as its conversion into ٰ continues to be possible for them, is not converted into ٰ, since ٰ is lighter: (2) that it be not followed by an inseparable letter, making it virtually medial, as in ٰ [228, 229, 721]. The ٰ mentioned is converted into ٰ, (1) because it occurs in a place to which lightness is suitable, since it is fourth [or upwards] and final; while extreme alleviation—I mean its conversion into ٰ—is impracticable, as we have mentioned [in the first condition]; so that it is converted into a letter lighter than ٰ, vid. ٰ: (2) as is said [by IHsh in the Commentary on the IM (MAR)], because it is converted into ٰ in some variations [685 (case ٰ, a), as ٰ and ٰ [above], the aor. of which is ٰ and ٰ: (a) as for ٰ and ٰ [above], although the ٰ is not converted into ٰ in their aors., as ٰ and ٰ, still they are deriv. of ٰ I equipped for raiding and ٰ [above], the ٰ of which is converted into ٰ [685 (case ٰ, b)] (R): (b) Akh says that, since they say ٰ in the aor. [of ٰ], pronouncing [the ٰ]
with Fath [482, 685 (case 4, c)], it resembles the aor. whose pret. is نَعُّل with Kasr, because the normal pret. of نَعُّل is نَعُّل [482]; and therefore it is treated like [the aor. of] رَضَى [above] and was wretched, so that they say يُشْأَيَان [above], as they say يُرْضَيْان and يُشْقِيْان (IY): (c) this reason [ascribed to IHsh] is weak, as you see, since (a) it does not apply to أُعْلِيَان [above]; (b) if conversion of the ى into ی in the pret. were necessitated by its conversion in the aor., much more would it be necessitated by conversion in the pret. itself, and غَرَّبَ [for غَرَّبَ] ought to be said because of their saying غَرُّبَ [626, 629, 632, 724]; (c) the aor. is a deriv. of the pret. in form [404], then how has the case been reversed? (R). By saying “when the letter before it is not pronounced with Damm” [above], Z [followed by IH] guards against such vs. as يَغَرُّرَ and [above], and vs. as تَرْصَوْرَة [283, 385] and عَرْثَوْرَة [248] (IY). [Z and] IH ought to say “when the letter before it is not pronounced with Damm, and its conversion into ی is not allowable”, in order to exclude such as أَغْزَرَ. He equipped for raiding. Nor is the saying “when the letter before it is not pronounced with Damm” [to be taken] without restriction; but the condition is that the letter before it should not be
pronounced with َلَّمْبَم in the َب, as َنَّمَر [above]; whereas in the َب the َب is converted into َى, [notwithstanding that the letter before it is pronounced with َلَّمْبَم,] as *غَرَقَّةُُّ َثَفاَر*; [while in ُتُرِقَّةُ and ُتُرِقَّةُ َثَفاَر* 721;] conversion is prevented not, as IY makes out, by the َلَّمْبَم before the َب, but by the َب after it, which is inseparable, so that conversion is barred by the second of the two conditions mentioned above]: And, in place of saying “when the letter before it is not pronounced with َلَّمْبَم”, [Z and] IH should rather say “when the letter before it is pronounced with فَث”, [Kasr having been provided for in § 724] (R).

§ 728. The cat. of ُقَوْيَى and ُهوَى is [treated as] sound [in the َع which, though mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with فَث, is not converted into ُ] (Jrb)), because of the two transformations (SH). For in ُقَوْيَى 729, 730. A], the َع and َل of which are َب, َب the [second] َب is unavoidably converted into َى [685 (case 1, a)]; so that, if the first were converted into ُ, two transformations would be combined in a tri-, which is not allowable: while in ُهوَى fell down [302, 713] you transform the َل by converting it into [684, 719]; so that you have no means of transforming the َع, from fear of two transformations (R). And the cat. of ُطَرِيَى [302, 703, 713, 724] and ُجَيِّي [697, 698, 703] (SH),
notwithstanding that two transformations would not be combined in it, if they converted the ع into ل, is also [treated as] sound (Jrb), because it is subordinate to [the cat. of (MASH)] عَرُوَى [above] (SH): for فَعَلَ with Fath of the ع [482] is the principal [form of unaugmented tril. pret.], because of its lightness and frequency; and, since the ع is sounded true in the principal, it is sounded true in the subordinate (Jrb). Or [their omission to transform the ع in three of the vs. mentioned, vid. those which are on the measure of فَعَلَ with Kasr of the ع, is (R)] because [every hollow v. of the conjug. of فَعَلَ, whose ع is converted into ل in the pret., has its ع converted in the aor., as خَافَ, aor. يَضَفَفَ, and aor. يَهَبُ: so that, if they said جَلَّتِي, قَبَّي, and جَلَّتِي, جَلَّتِي, يَتَفَلَّي, and would have to be said (SH) in the aor.; whereas, in the aor., Damm of the ج, when a ع, is eschewed [720], even with quiescence of the letter before it, contrary to the n., as ْعَطَى [720] and ْرَايٌ [723], because the v. is heavy. And the like may be said of عَرُوَى also, because every hollow [v.] of the conjug. of فَعَلَ, whose ع is made quiescent by conversion into ل [in the pret.], must have the ع of its aor. made quiescent, the vowel thereof being transferred to the preceding letter, as قَالَ, aor. يَقُولُ, and بَعَى, aor. يَبْيَعُ [697, 703]; and it would [therefore]
be necessary to say $\text{حَسْيُ}^\text{ي}$ for the aor. of $\text{حَسِيُّ}$; whereas a double ی [below] does not occur at the end of the aor. v., because the final is the seat of inflection, while the v. is heavy; though that is allowable in the n., because it is light, as ۲ حَسُي [697, 698]. Or their omission to transform the ع of طَرْوِي and حَسُي [729] may, as before mentioned [703], be accounted for by the fact that transformation of their ح, which, if the letter before it were pronounced with Fath, would be worthier of transformation, because it is the final of the word [703, 719], is prevented [by the preceding Kasra]. And, in the n., they say حَسِيَّة [684 (condition 10, b, c), 730. A], حَسِيَّة [300], and حَسِيَّة date-stone: while حَسِيَّة غَاِي for غَاِي [684 (condition 10, b), 723], رَأَي and رَأَي [723], and رَأَي and رَأَي [683 (case 1, c, b), 684 (condition 10 b, a, γ, b-δ), 723] are anomalous, by rule [e.g.] حَسِيَّة غَوِر or حَسِيَّة غَوِر, more properly the former, because the cat. of طُوِّي is more numerous than that of حَسُي [698]. We call that [conversion of the first of the two unsound letters into ٍ ] anomalous, because conversion of the last, as in حَسِي [above] and رَأَي [697], is more appropriate. Fr and many of the Ancients say of رَأَي that it is quiescent in the ع, the o. f. being رَأَي and رَأَي; but that the quiescent ع is converted into ٍ, because of the Fath of the
letter before it, as in ٍمَّلاٍ and يُلِجُّ [684, 703] and َمَّلَّ [pl. of َمَّلُّ a thicket (MAR)], which [conversion] is more appropriate here, because of the combination of two یs: while Ks says that it is orig. َمَّثَآ, on the measure of َمَّلَّ; but that they dislike the combination of two یs, the first of which is pronounced with Kasr; so that the first is elided. But, according to all [three] accounts, َمَّثَآ is not free from anomalousness in conversion or elision. And it is possible to account for َمَّثَآ [above], َمَّثَآ [684 (condition 10, b, α, ζ), 723], and َمَّثَآ in the [last] two ways (R). Incorporation is frequent in the cat. of َمَّثَآ [731], because of the [combination of (Jrb)] two likes (SH), as َمَّثَآ [730. A, 747]: but some do not incorporate, because analogy requires what is incorporated in the pret. to be incorporated in the aor.; so that the [double] ی [above] would have to be vocalized with ِنَمَّ (Jrb), [as] َمَّثَآ [above], aor. َمَّثَآ [below] (KF). S says “Incorporation is more frequent; but the other [method] is [good] Arabic, frequent” (R). Most of them incorporate [the ِع into the ِج when the ِج is mobile (IY)], saying َمَّثَآ and َمَّثَآ with ِنَمَّ or Kasr of the ِع [below], as َلَّي or َلَّي is said for the pl. of َلَّي [716] (M). Incorporation is more frequent because the combination of two mobile likes is deemed heavy.
But, for allowability of incorporation in such [a formation], i.e., where the two unsound letters are mobile, it is stipulated that the vowel of the second be inseparable [731], as َحَيَّةٍ he lived, du. َحَيَّةٍ حَيَّةٌ pl. َحَيَّةٍ حَيَّةٍ, and َحَيَّةٍ she lived, du. َحَيَّةٍ حَيَّةٍ (R). The Kur has َحَيَّةٍ مَنْ َحَيَّةٍ مَنْ بَيْنَتَهَا VIII. 44. And he that should live might live after a manifest sign; and (M) the poet (R) Abīd (M), [or] Ibn Mufarrigh (Jh on حيَّةٍ), says

(م، ر)، cited by As (IY), They boggled over their business, as the ostrich, or, in the version of the [س] Jh, [and M], the pigeon boggled over her egg, when she put for it two twigs of the tree called nasham, of which bows are made, and another of the weak plant called panic-grass (MAR). If the vowel of the second [unsound letter] be [imported] on account of an adventitious, [and] separable, letter, incorporation is not used, as in [the fem.] َمُخْسَيِّبَةُ quickening and [the du.] َمُخْسَيِّبَةُ quickened, where the vowel is [imported] on account of the َ in the ep. [below] and of the َ in the du. [228], both of which letters are adventitious, [and] separable from the word: and similarly with the inflectional vowels [16, 404], as َلَّا يُحْسِبِ َلَّا يُحْسِبِ أَلْبَرْتَيْنَ LXXV. 40. [551] and
I saw a مَعْيَةٍ [248]. But, if the vowel be naturally inseparable, as in حَيَّةٌ (Jh, KF), or be [imported] on account of an adventitious, [but] inseparable, letter, as in أَحْيَيْةٌ (S, M), pl. of حَيَّاءٌ vulva, where the ی is inseparable [265 (case 6, a, a)], contrary to the ی of the ep. [265 (case 1, a), 266], then incorporation or display is allowable, for which reason أَعْيَيْء أَعْيَيْاء is allowable in the pl. of مَعْيَةٍ boggler, because the ی [of أَعْيَيْةٍ] is inseparable. And, in this [second] sort also, incorporation is more proper, as it is in [the first, like] حَيَّةٌ [above] and أَحْيَيْةٌ [below]. The reason why, for allowability of incorporation, it is stipulated in this cat., contrary to the cat. of يُرِنْ restores and يَمْسِ touches [731], that the vowel [of the second homogeneous letter] be inseparable, is that, in the sound [formation], a vowel of some kind is inseparable from the second, unless it be invaded by what necessitates its quiescence, as in لَمْ يُرِنْ [402, 406] and ۰ رَأَيْتَ مَعْيَةٍ [663]: whereas, in the unsound, as مَعْيَةٍ [248] and مَعْيَةٍ [above], the second is [often] made quiescent without the invasion of anything, as مَعْيَةٍ [248]; so that they do not approve of incorporating a letter into what is quasi-quiescent [731]. And, when the [first] ی is displayed, whether necessarily, as in مَعْيَةٍ [above], or allowable,
as in حَيِّيٍّ [above], then, (1) if it be pronounced with Kasr, its Kasr is better made faint than clear [730], in order that display may be like incorporation, since Kasr [of the ی] is deemed heavy: (2) if it be pronounced with Fath, as in حَيِّيٍّ du. of حَيِّيٍّ 684 (condition 10, a, αα, ββ), its Fath may be made faint; but should rather be made plain, because it is not deemed heavy: (a) here incorporation is not allowable, because the of dualization is not inseparable. He that displays the [first] ی in حَيِّيٍّ says with a single ی, like خَحْشِرًا حَيِّيٍّ they dreaded, as

وَكَنَا حَسِبَنَا هَمْ فَوَارِسَ كَهْسِي
حَيِّيٍّ بَعْدَمَا مَاتُوا مِنَ الْدُّهْرِ آفَضْرَأ

(R) And we had accounted them to be horsemen of Kahmas, [a man of Tamīm celebrated for horsemanship and valour (IX),] father of a clan of Rabi'a Ibn Hanzala, who, after they had died, lived, in reputation for valour, through ages of time (Jsh). The ِ ف is [said to be] sometimes pronounced with Kasr [above] (SH) in the act. حَيِّيٍّ (R), when incorporation takes place. Some retain the Fathā of the ِ ف , for lightness; while others pronounce [the ِ ف ] with Kasr, for affinity [to the ی], as they say لِيٌ or لِيَ, with Kasr or Damm of the َل, for the pl. of َلَرْيٍ [above]. But, it is said, this
requires consideration, because the َدَامْٰمَة before the incorporated ى in ٰنثُر ى is heavy, so that it is proper to flee therefrom to Kasra; whereas the Fatha before the incorporated ى in ٰحَبِيّ is light, so that it is not proper to flee therefrom to Kasra; and therefore we should rather say that those who incorporate by transferring the vowel of the [first] ى to the letter before it pronounce the ح with Kasr; while those who elide the vowel without transfer retain the Fatha (Jrb). Apparently, however, this [assertion that the ف is sometimes pronounced with Kasr in the act. voice] is a blunder copied by IH from the M [above]; whereas S cites only ٰحَبِيّ in the pass., like ٰنثُر ى [below], with َدَامْٰمَة and Kasr, pl. of ٰنثُر ى أُرُى [twisted horn (MAR)], in the n. (R). Similarly (M) incorporation is allowable in (SH) [the pret. of] every pass. v. [of this cat.], as ٰحَبِيّ ّنَفَّس هذا الّبَكَانِ This place was lived in [below] and (IY) and (Jrb) and (IY) أَصْبَحَى and أَصْبَحَى (M, SH) and أَصْبَحَى (M), because of the combination of two likes (Jrb); contrary to [the act. prets. (Jrb)] أَحْيَا and أَحْيَا [and حَيَا] (SH), because, when the [second] ي is converted into ى, the motive for incorporation does not remain. But it is not so frequent [in أَحْيَا and the
following] as in جَهَيُّ [above], because here the letter before the two likes is quiescent; while it does not follow that جَهَيُّ should be treated like جَهَيُّ was sent on pilgrimage is put on a par with جَهَيُّ went on pilgrimage, because incorporation in that is necessary, contrary to this (Jrb). جَهَيُّ [above] is constructed with a prep. and gen., which take the place of the [pro-] ag., since جَهَيُّ is intrans. [436, 438]. You are allowed the option of pronouncing the ج with Damm or Kasr; but Kasr is more frequent, because lighter. Damm is according to the o. f. [436]: and Kasr for a kind of alleviation, because the double letter is, in some positions, treated like a single letter, as in شَابَةٌ and دَابَةٌ [665], where the double ب is treated, according to them, like a single mobile letter, otherwise it would not be combinable with the quiescent ل; that [treatment of the double letter] being [allowable] because the tongue recoils from [both components of] it with one impulse [663, 686 (case 1, α, β); 731]: and therefore, as the occurrence of a [single] ل preceding by Damma, at the end [of a word], is disallowed, so Damm is rare here, though not disallowed; and like it is قَرْوَنٌ لَيْ [above], where Damm and Kasr are allowable, but Kasr is more frequent; the rarity of Damm [in لَيْ] corresponding to the disallowance of [it in] أَظَبي ُاُذَّرُ and gazelles [243, 721] (IV).
If any one say "How is conversion of ْدَامَم into َكَسْر necessary in [the case of formations] other than نَفَعُ, as [685 (case 7), 716], َجُيُّدَيْنِ [685 (case 9, b, a), 722], and ُهُزِرَي [722, 780. A], while both modes [of vocalization] are allowable in نَفَعُ?"; the answer is that, نَفَعُ being liable to be mistaken for نَفَعُ, ْدَامَم may be retained in it for an indication of the original mode of formation; whereas, in other [cases], one formation is not liable to be mistaken for another: or that what makes the ْدَامَم of نَفَعُ allowable before ِّى is the lightness of the formation. Sf says that ُّلَى with َكَسْر may be said as pl. of ُّلَى, like pl. of ُّلَى [686, 718], the incorporated quiescent ِّى being treated like the unincorporated; and that ُّجَيْنِ for ُّجَيْنِ [above] is like ُّعَدَلُ and ُّبَعِّدَ [436, 706]. Those who incorporate say ُّدَيْنِ ُّدَيْنِ was quickened, du. أَحْيَا, أَحْيَا, pl. أَحْيَا, أَحْيَا; أَسْثَنَى, pl. أَسْثَنَى, because the vowel [of the second unsound letter] is inseparable: while those who do not incorporate say ِّدَيْنِ, du. أَحْيَا, like ُّدَيْنِ ُّدَيْنِ was thrown, du. أَحْيَا, أَحْيَا, pl. أَحْيَا, أَحْيَا, أَرْمُوا. But has three dial. vars. — (1) this, which is its o. f.; (2) incorporation; (3) elision of the first ِّى, as in [the act.] إِسْتَنَكَى was ashamed
[below], according to Tamim. [The aor. استَخْبِيَّا has two dial. vars.:—(1) that of the people of the Hijāz is استَخْبِيّا, aor. استَخَبِيّا, act. part. استَخْبِيّا, pass. part. استَخْبِيّا, exactly on the measure of استَرَعَّا asked to keep guard, aor. استَرَعْتُ, (2) that of Tamim is استَخْبِيّا [above], aor. استَخْبِيّا, with vocalization of the ح, and elision of one of the two ىs: (a) the opinion of Khl is that it is formed from حَبِّ when transformed like َبَّاِع [684, 703], as though حَبِّ [above] were said; and therefore, as you say I asked to sell from َبَّاِع, so you say from حَبِّ استَخْبِيّت: (a) the reason why it is formed from the eschewed حَبِّ is that the ع of حَبِّ ought to be transformed, since transformation of its ل is impossible: (b) [the pret. استَخْبَأ, according to this, is orig. استَخْبَأ [below], like استَبْعَأ: but the vowel of the ى is elided, since no ل of the pret. is found, in their speech, to be a mobile ى preceded by a quiescent; so that, two quiescents then concurring, the first of them is elided; and afterwards the quiescent ى is converted into ٰ, because preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as in ٰبََجُّ and ٰطَأْيِ [above]: (c) similarly you say of the aor. يَسْتَبْعَأ that it ought to be َيْسَتَبْعَأ, like َيْسَتَبْعَأ: but that the vowel of the [final] ى is elided,
since there is no precedent for it among vs. [720]; and afterwards the first ی is elided, because of the two quiescents: (d) its imp. is یَسْتَحِبَّ, (e) its inf. n., according to this, ought to be یَسْتَحْبِعَةَ, like یَسْتَبْعَاءَ [338]; but is not used: (f) the act. part. is یَسْتَحْبِعُ, orig. مُسْتَجِي, like مُسْتَبْعَعُ; but transformed in the same way as the aor.: (g) the pass. part. is مُسْتَزْكَأَ, orig. مُسْتَزَكَّي, the vowel of the ی being elided, as in یَسْتَزَكَّأَ [720]; and the word then transformed in the same way as یَسْتَزَكَّأَ [above]: (h) there is a weakness, that will not escape notice, in the opinion of Khl, because of [his] venturing upon the disliked form حَافِئ: (b) others, whose opinion is adopted by Mz, say that, in all of these variations, the first ی is elided, as [the first س or ل is elided] in اَفْحَسَتُ. I perceived, یَطَلَّتْ I passed the day, and یَمْسَتُ I touched [759], because the property of the two likes is incorporation; and, since this is impossible, the first is elided, because elision is very similar to incorporation: (a) Mz says “If it were elided because of the two quiescents, [as Khl declares,] it would not be elided in the ِدْعَ; and they would say یَسْتَحَبَّا, like یَسْتَبْعَاءَا” (R). The verse یَتَقُولُ یَا یَشَيْعُ ِالْحَم 329. A.] contains evidence that یَسْتَصَيَّ [above], aor. یَسْتَهْجَي, like یَسْتَبَأ.
took captive, aor. \( \text{يَسْتَخَبِي} \), is said; while Ya‘kūb and Ibn Muḥaisin read \( \text{إِنَّ اللَّهَ لا يَسْتَخَبِي أَن يَضِربَ مَتَّا} \). II. 24. 

Verily God is not ashamed to propound a parable, with a single ی, which is reported to have been read by Ibn Kathīr also, and is the dial. var. of Tanwin. The o. f. is [ءَسْتَخْبَيْ] aor. \( \text{ءَسْتَخْبَيْ} \) with two یs: but the vowel of the ِع is transferred to the َف; and, two quiescents then concurring, the ِل is said to be elided, the measure [of the in the verse] being ْكَتَسَّنَفْ ْكَتَسَّنَفْ (BS). And, as for revived, aor. \( \text{يَسْتَخْبَي} \), when you put it into the pass., you say ْحْوَى, according to the o. f.; or, if you please, you incorporate, saying ْحْوَى, because the vowel of its final is inseparable. But he that says ْحَيٌّ and ْحَيٌّ does not say ْيَسْتَخْبَي [for their aor.], because ِدَامَم does not enter [the final of] these vs. at all, since the ِل in them takes the place of ِدَامَم, and is not combined with it [720] (IY). In the aor. of [the pass.] ْكَسْتَخْبَيْ ْكَسْتَخْبَيْ you say ْيَسْتَخْبَي and ْيَسْتَخْبَي without incorporation, because the vowel [of the second unsound letter, being a vowel of inflection,] is not inseparable (R). As for their abstaining [from incorporation (MASH)] in [the act. aors. (MASH)] ْكَسْتَخْبَيْ ْيَسْتَخْبَيْ [although two likes are combined in them (Jrb),] it is [in order that ِدَامَم may
not fall upon the ى (Jrb), lest that [final] whose ذamm is eschewed [720], [vid. ى (MASH),] be pronounced with ذamm (SH). And so, if you used the subj., saying لَن يُحَيَّى He shall not quicken [730. A, 731], you would not incorporate, because the فَاثْمَة is adventitious, being an inflectional vowel [730] that is not inseparable, since it is removed in the ind. and apoc (IY). Incorporation is allowable only in [the cat. of] حَيْيَى (R), contrary to the cat. of قُرِيّ (SH), although قُرِى has a double ُو, as حِييى has a double ى [697]; so that قُرِى is not said, as they say حَيَى (R), (1) because transformation comes before incorporation [below] (SH), since conversion of the [final] ُو into ى is a transformation at the end, while incorporation of the ؤ into the ِل is a transformation in the middle; and the former is more appropriate, as we have mentioned more than once; for which reason one begins with incorporation in ِأَيَّة before [and to the exclusion of] conversion of the quiescent Hamza into ! [661, 684 (condition 10, b, b, γ)] (R); and, when the final ُو is converted into ى, the motive for incorporation does not remain (Jrb): (2) because قُرِى with conversion of the [second] ُو into ى is lighter than قُرِى with incorporation of one ُو into the other; and the method [that is] conducive to increase of lightness should be pursued rather than what is not so (R). We say that
transformation comes before incorporation [684, 721, 729, 730] because the cause of transformation makes transformation necessary; whereas the cause of incorporation does not make incorporation necessary, but allowable; which is proved by the fact that sounding [the ] true in the cat. of رَضِيَ [685 (case 1, a), 724] is absolutely disallowed, whereas dissolution [of incorporation] in the cat. of حَبَيْيَى is allowable (Jrb). And [similarly (R), or, in some MSS (M.A.R.),] therefore, they say يَقُرَى [719, 730. A] (SH); not يَحَيُّى [above], although they incorporate in the pret. [ حَيُّى ], nor يَقُرُّ (R): (1) because transformation comes before incorporation (R, Jrb); and, when the [final] يَحَيُّى and يَقُرُّ is converted into يَحُيَّى, the motive for incorporation does not remain (Jrb): (2) because the word is lighter with transformation than with incorporation: (3) because the vowel of the second [unsound letter, being a vowel of inflection,] lacks the inseparability, which is the condition of incorporation in such [formations], as above stated (R).

§ 729. Having spoken about قُرُى [728] and its likes, vid. those [vs.] whose ع and ج are s, so far as concerns transformation and incorporation, IH [now] points out that double ع is peculiar to فَعُلَ, with Kasr of
the ع (Jrb). They do not form from the cat. of قرى any [ with Fath (R),] like صرْب 482, nor any [ with Damm (R),] like شرْف 482, from dislike to [the combination of two s in (R)] قرْب and قرْب 730. A] (SH), when the nom. pron. is attached to the pret. [ 482 or 482 ] (R), because they dislike the combination of two s more than the combination of two ى s (Jrb). As for ُّعُ, if it were formed therefrom, two s would be produced without attachment of the pron., because the [first] ى, which is an ع, would not be converted [into ى], since the cause of [such] conversion would not exist in the ى, as we mentioned in the case of قري 703, 728; nor would the second [ ى ] be converted into ى on account of the Damma before it, as in ٌٌّل 243, 721, since that [conversion] is [found only] in the n., [not in the v.,] as you see in such as سرَب 721 (R). They therefore deviate to ُّعُ, in order that the [second] ى, may be converted into ى, and the heaviness be removed by the difference of the two letters, on the principle of their action in حيَّوان 698, 730. A], orig. حيَّوان; and, since [in حيَّوان] they convert the lighter [letter] into the heavier, in order that the form may be lightened by removal of reduplication, a fortiori [in قرى] they convert.
the heavier into the lighter for removal of reduplication. For that reason they say *I was strong* [730. A], orig. قِرْطُبٌ, the ج, which is a ذ, being converted into ی, because [quiescent and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)]; and the غ being [treated as] sound [728], because the ج is transformed. This [avoidance of double ] is when the غ is orig. mobile (IY). But [such as (IY, SH)] قَرْطَبٌ [685 (case 1, a, a), 697, 698] (M, SH) and ضَرْعُ (SH) α mark [of stone (MASH)] on the way (Jrb, MASH), قَرْطَبٌ [698] (M, SH) and قَوَو كَاَوَو [698, 730. A, 734], a name of a place (IY), and قَرْطَبٌ [685 (case 3, b, d, b) (SH), and قَرْطَبٌ [684 (condition 10, a, a, α), 730. A] (M, Jrb), where the غ is orig. quiescent (IY), are tolerated, [i.e., pardoned and permitted (Jrb)], because of the incorporation (M, SH), by which the word is lightened. In the v., however, even if incorporation came before transformation [728], that [double ] would not be allowable, as it is in the n., from the heaviness of two، s in the v., which is itself heavy (R).

§ 730. They say, (1) [in إنَّعَال (492. A) (M), like إحْرَوَى (482) (IY),] (a) became blackish red (M, SH), إنَّعَال (R) from حَوَة [672] (M, R), orig. إحْرَوَى (IY; R), converting the second، [at the end (IY)] into
(M), because mobile and preceded by Fatha \([684, 719] \) (IY); (b) aor. (R) \(\text{يَخَوَّارِي} \) (M, SH): (2) similarly, in [493. A], like [482] (R), (a) (SH) refrained \((\text{from foul conduct})\), from رَعَا فُرَبَرَ, aor. [730. A] (R); (b) [aor.] \(\text{يَرَعُّرِي} \) (SH). They do not incorporate \((M, SH)\), but transform \((R)\), (1) because transformation comes before incorporation \([728] \) (R, Jrb); and, when the [final] \(\omega\) is converted in \(\text{إِحْوَرَي} \) and and in and \(\text{يَرَعُّرِي} \) into \(\text{يَخَوَّارِي} \), the motive for incorporation does not remain \((Jrb)\): (2) because the word is lighter \((R, MASH)\) with transformation than with incorporation \((MASH)\): (3) because incorporation, if they said \(\text{إِحْوَرَي} \), aor. \(\text{يَخَوَّارِي} \), would reduce them to that vocalization of \(\text{إِحْوَرُي} \) with Damm, which they eschew in such as \(\text{يَغَرُّو} \) and \(\text{يَسْرُو} \) \([719-721] \) (M); but \([IY \text{ asserts that}]\) Z's saying "because incorporation . . . . . \(\text{يَسْرُو} \)" is not correct, since vowels of inflection are not heavy upon double \(\omega\), as \(\text{هَذَا عَدُر} \), \(\text{This is an enemy} \) \([643, 720]\) and \(\text{عُنْتُر} \) \([685 \text{ (case 9, b), 722} \) (IY): (4) because the [inflectional] vowel \([728]\) on the final of the aor. is adventitious \((R)\). And [for the inf. n. of \(\text{إِحْوَرَي} \) \((M, R, Jrb)\)] you say (1) \(\text{إِحْوِرَي} \) \((M, SH)\), according to some \((IY)\),
like [332, 391] (R), without [conversion and (R)] incorporation [685 (case 7)] (IY, R, Jrb), because the ي is adventitious in the inf. n., on account of the Kasra, being orig. the ل in وإنواري [685 (case 1, a)]; and, by reason of its adventitiousness, is not taken into account, as the ل in السور and قورل [685 (case 7, b, b, b), 716] is not taken into account, because it is a subst. for the ل [in قارل and سابر]: (a) properly, however, the ل in the v. is a subst. for the ي in [its o. f.] the inf. n. [331] (R); [and, according to Jrb, incorporation is omitted] in order that the inf. n. may correspond to its v. in appearance (Jrb): (2) إحبăr (M, SH), with incorporation (Jrb), the [only (R)] form mentioned by S (IY, R), orig. إحبăr [above] and إشћبيبتب [391, 667]; (a) they convert the middle ل into ي, because ي occurs quiescent before it, as in ويبن and 685 (case 7, a, a), 703, 716]; this ي being substituted for the ل [of وإنواري], because of the Kasra before it [685 (case 1, a)]: (b) the last ل is converted into Hamza, because it occurs as a final after an aug. ل, according to the rule in such as ل 683 (case 1), 723 (IY). But those who say إشћبيبتب (R, Jrb), by eliding the ي (IY, Jrb) for alleviation, because the n. is long (IY), say إحبăr (M, SH) for إحبăr [above] (R, Jrb), by
eliding the ی, because یِرَآ is heavier than یِرَی (Jrb); so that two ی ی are combined, as two ی ی are combined in یِنِتَال [756], although یِرَآ is not of the same *conjug.* as یِنِتَال [492] (R); and they do not incorporate (IY, Jrb), (1) because the two ی ی are medial, as they do not incorporate in یِنِتَال, because the two ی ی, though alike, are strong as being in the middle; and are not considered like the ی ی in یَدَت and یَدَت [731], which are at the end (IY): (2) because the letter before the two likes is quiescent, as in یِنِتَال (Jrb). Those, however, who incorporate in یِنِتَال, [not regarding the quiescence of the letter before the two likes in such a formation as this (Jrb), and say یِنِتَال (M, R, Jrb), ought by analogy to (Jrb)] say یِرَآ (M, SH), incorporating one ی ی into the other; and transferring the vowel of the first ی ی to the ی ی before it, so that they dispense with the *conj.* Hamza (IY). For two ی ی, one of which is incorporated into the other, are not deemed heavy in the middle, as [they are] at the end; so that one says یُرِى, *aor.* یُرِى, with Fath of the ی ی in both, and یُرِى, *aor.* یُرِى, with Kasr of the two ی ی, [inf. n. یِرَآ, ] like یُرِى, *aor.* یُرِى, inf. n. یِنِتَال [756]. When from یُرِى and یُرِى you form a [pret.] like یِنِتَال and یِنِتَال [above], you
say [730. A] and اِرْمَائَا and إِحْيَيَا, and transformation coming before incorporation; 

and إِحْيَيَا and إِرْمَائَا, and incorporation not being allowable, because the vowel on the last [ی] is adventitious, on account of the ی of the 

[and اِرْمَائَا] [and إِرْمَائَا] (S): but, when the vowel is inseparable, vid. in the pass., as أَحْيَيَا and یا أَرْمَائَا [and أَحْيَيَا] and أَرْمَائَا [and أَحْيَيَا], and أَرْمَائَا [and أَحْيَيَا] ], pl. [and أَرْمَائَا], and أَحْيَيَا [and أَرْمَائَا], incorporation is allowable, as أَحْيَيَا, 

orig. أَحْيَيَا, the ی pronounced with داوم being then pronounced with كسر, as in مُسْلِمٍ [685 (case 7), 716], 

du. أَحْيَيَا, pl. أَحْيَيَا; and أَحْيَيَا, pl. أَحْيَيَا: but the in أَحْيَيَا and أَحْيَيَا, like that of سُبْر [above], may not be incorporated. And you say, (1) in the aor. [act.], and يَرْمَيِي, and يَرْمَيِي and يَرْمَيِي, and 

in the act. part., نُعْمَيِي and مُعْمَيِي, incorporation not being allowable, because the vowel [of the last unsound letter] is adventitious; but كسر being made faint rather than clear, as we said [728]: (3) in the inf. n (a) of إِحْيَا, إِحْيَا, with incorporation: (a) those who do not incorporate in إِحْيَاةٍ, یا إِحْيَاةٍ, and إِحْيَا.
§ 730. A. This being the end of the chapter on Transformation; let us make such additions to it as are suitable. When two یs are combined, (1) if the last be not a ل, then, (a) if the first be quiescent, it is incorporated, as بیاَ بیغ and بیاَ [714 715]: (b) if the second be quiescent, or both be mobile, each of them is in the predicament of a single ی, as بیت [274, 686, 721]; and similarly ییان and ییان, when you form words like بیاَ [684, 708] and هیاَم [686, 714] from ییاَ [698]: (2) if the last be a ل, then, (a) if the first be quiescent, it is incorporated into the second, as حیاَ [697, 698]: (b) if the last be quiescent, both are preserved, as حیبیت [698]: (c) if both be mobile, then, if conversion of the second into ل be allowable, it is converted, as حیاَة [684, 728]: but, if such conversion be not allowable, then the vowel of the second is either inseparable or not:—(a) if it be inseparable, then, (α) if incorporation of the first into the second be not allowable, it is best to convert the
second into َوَ, as َحَبْيَاتِ ٢٦٩ [698], where incorporation [of the first َي into the second] is not allowable, because َرَدَّانَ َنَعُلَانَ from the reduplicated, as َرَدَّانِ, is not subject to incorporation [731]; nor may the second be converted into َى, for lack of commensurability with the ُحَبْيَاتِ ٢٦٩ [712]; but it is converted into َى, because the combination of two mobile َيِّs is deemed heavy, while it is impossible to alter that heaviness by the lighter method of incorporating [the first into the second] or converting the second into َى; the second, not the first, being converted [into َوَ], because by it the sensation of heaviness in the combination is produced; while the َى, notwithstanding that the final ought to be a light letter, is convertible into َى, because the inseparability of the َى and َي make it medial, as they say of [the َوَ in ُعَنْفَرْانِ ٢٦٩ and ُعَنْصُرْة ٢٦٩ [721]: but S says that the regular form is َحَبْيَاتِ, so that he does not convert the second [َي into َى]; while َحَبْيَاتِ, according to him, is anomalous: and so, in َقُرُّوا َفَنَعُلَانُ [below], as will be seen (R); for the first َى is like the َى of ُعَوْرِرْ [707]; while the last َى, is strong, like the َى in َكَرْزَانِ ٢٦٩ [719], and becomes equivalent to the sound; and they do not deem them heavy, when pronounced with Fath, as they say ُلَوْرِى [302] and ُلَوْرِي [300] (S): and so you say َحَبْيَاتِ, on the measure of ُسَبْعَانِ [236, 686 (case 2, c)], from َحَيَيِّ; and do not
incorporate, as you do in رُدْدَانُ [731], because transformation comes before incorporation; but S makes the regular form حَيْيَانُ with incorporation, because he does not convert [the second ي into ] in such [formations]: (β) if incorporation be allowable, you may incorporate or not, as حَيْيَانُ [728, 747]; and [similarly, in حَيْيَانُ from تَعَلَّانُ (S), حَيْيِبُ with Kasr or حَيْيَانُ: but incorporation is more frequent, as before mentioned [728], since it is lighter: (β) if the vowel of the second be not inseparable, as in لَنْ يُحْيَيَ [728, 731], both [ي s] must be sounded true, [and] displayed; while the Kasra of the first is better made faint. When three ي s are combined, (1) if the last be a ج, then, (α) if the first be incorporated into the second, (α) when that is in a v. or part., the third is treated as though it were not preceded by ي; as حَيْيُ [281], aor. يُحْيَي, act. part. يُحَيَّي, pass. part. يُحَيَّي, like denuded, aor. يُعَيَّ, act. part. يُعَيَّ, pass. part. يُعَيَّ: (α) the reason why the third [ي] preceded by Kasra, notwithstanding that this [combination of ي s and Kasra] is deemed heavy, is not elided, as forgotten, in the v., as يُحَيَّي [for يُحَيَّي], as it is in مُعَيَّ [below], is only that the vowel of the YA in the v. may be spared, since 183 a
through it the measures of the \( v \). vary; while the measures of the \( v \). must be observed, as before explained in accounting for the impossibility of converting the, of such as \( \text{يُذُرُو} \) [721]: (β) then the part., as \( \text{الْبِيْكِي} \), is treated like the \( v \). in respect of omission to elide the third \( \text{ى} \) as forgotten: (b) when that is not in a \( v \). or part., then, (α) if conversion of the third [into \( \text{!} \)] be allowable, vid. when the double [\( \text{ى} \)] is pronounced with Fath: and the last is final, it is converted, as \( \text{ُيَيْا} \), on the measure of \( \text{ُرُؤُسُر} \) goose [here supposed to be for \( \text{ٌرُؤُسُر} \)], from \( \text{ُيَنُتُ} \) I betook myself, repaired, orig. [on the measure of \( \text{ُنُؤُرُسُر} \)], then \( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \) [661], [then \( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \) (685, case 7),] then \( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \) [684]; (α) if that [conversion of the third] be not allowable, either because, though the double [\( \text{ى} \)] is pronounced with Fath, the last is intermediate, as being followed by a letter constitutionally inseparable in every position, like the non-dualistic \( \text{!} \) and \( \text{ن} \), or because, [though the last is final,] the double [\( \text{ى} \)] is pronounced with Damm or Kasr, then, in the first case, the third [\( \text{ى} \)] is converted into \( \text{ٌرُؤُسُر} \), as \( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \), on [the measure of] \( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \) \( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \) from \( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \), because it is heavier than \( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \) [above] with a single \( \text{ى} \); but, according to S, [\( \text{ُيَيْيَة} \), as [implied] above: and, in the second case, the Damma [of the double \( \text{ى} \), if it be pronounced with Damm,] is
converted into Kasra; while the third [ی, whether the double ی be pronounced with Kasr or Damm,] is elided as forgotten, because the [three] ی s, together with Kasra of the double ی, are deemed heavy at the end; as حَيِّ [281], orig. حَيِّ مْعِيْرَة, then حَيِّ مْعِيْرَة; and as حَيِّ [394], from حَيِّ then حَيِّ, and then حَيِّ: and so, in this second [case], the last [ی] is elided as forgotten, even though it be followed by an inseparable letter, as in the dim. of أَشْيَيْكَانَ, on the measure of سُرْبَجْكَان [fermented dough (MAR)], from شَيِّ [inf. n. of شُرَبَ he roasted meat (Jh, KF)], where you say أَشْيَيْكَانَ, then أَشْيَيْكَانَ, and then أَشْيَيْكَانَ: but IA1 differs from S about that [formation] which is commensurable with the v., and whose initial is an augment like that of the v.; for here he does not elide the third as forgotten, but says حَيِّ as dim. of أَحْرَى [281], as before stated in [the chapter on] the Diminutive: (b) if the second be incorporated into the third, then, (a) if the letter before the first be quiescent—none of them is altered, as طَحِيْبِي and قَرَابِي [302] in the rel. n.; and رَكِيمِي, on the measure of بَرْطِيْل [long stone (MAR)], from رَمْيِ: (b) if the letter before the first be mobile, then, (α) if the first (ی) be the second [letter] of the word, [all] the ی s are preserved, as حَيِّ.
like ٌهجَف [375]; and ٌحَبِي [below], like ٌنْمَد [375, 724], orig. ٌحَبِي with Damm of the ع; and ٌحَبِي shamefaced, bashful, modest, [like ُغَنْى independent, wealthy (KF),] from ُشَحَم shame; because the word is light; (8) if the first ى be the third [letter] of the word, it is made a ، whether the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as when you form a [word] like ْحَبَصَصَة [274, 303], [n. un. of ْحَبَصَصَ (KF),] from ُرَمَيى, in which case you say ُرَمَيى , [orig. ُرَمَيى (S),] like ُرَحْوَى, [orig. ُرَحْوَى ,] in [the fem. of] the rel. n. (R) from ىرُحَى [294, 300, 686] (S); and do not convert the first ى into ٍ, either in the rel. n., because the vowel [of this ى] is accidental [300, 684 (condition 2), 719], or in the non-rel., because it is incommensurable with the v. [703, 712]; and so, when you form [a word] on the measure of ٌحَلْكُون intensified black [below] from ُرَمَيى . you say ُرَمَيى , orig. ُرَمَيى [685 (case 7)], then ُرَمَيى , [like ُرَمَيى (724) and ُحَبِي (above)], and then ُرَمَيى: or with Kasr, as ُعَمْرَى [294, 301, 686], where you convert the Kasra into Fatha, in order that the ى may be preserved; and, in these exs., one of the ىs is converted into ، because the [three] ىs are deemed heavy; but, although alteration is more appropriate in the final, the last is not
converted, as in ُخَبَرُ [above], because it is strong through the doubling; and, for this reason, the third is not elided, as in ُمِعْيَة [above]; while, in the ُعَلَة of relation, elision and conversion would be more extraordinary, because it is a sign [282, 294]: (γ) if the first ُعَلَة be the fourth [letter] of the word, then, if it be before the ُعَلَة of relation, it is elided, according to the soundest [opinion], as ُقَاضِي [282, 301], because of the combination of ُعَلَة s, together with the heaviness of the word, and the first's being the final of the word, since the ُعَلَة of relation is adventitious; but ُقَاضِي is allowable, as before stated [301]: whereas, if it be not before the ُعَلَة of relation, it is not elided, because it is not the final of the word; but is converted into َ، as when it is the third [letter] of the word [case (β) above]: you say ُرَمَى، on the measure of ُحَيَّتَهُ [398] from ُرَمَى، orig. ُرَمَيْرَى، the ُرَمَيْرَى of which is converted into ُعَلَة, and incorporated into the last ُعَلَة; and the Damma then converted into Kasra, and the ُعَلَة [before the double ُعَلَة] into َ، and similarly ُبُنكَيْرَى، [orig. ُبُنكَيْرَى] like ُخَنْفَقَيْق [677], from ُبُكي wept: (c) if none of them be incorporated, then, (α) if the third be entitled to conversion into ِ، it is converted, as when a [ν] like اَحَبَّى is formed from اَحَبَّى, in which case you convert the third into ِ، as اَحَبَّى.
[730]: and then, if you incorporate, as in ١٠٣٠ [756], you say حْيَا [730]; but, if not, you convert the second into ٧ , as in حْيَٰوى [above]: (b) if the third be not entitled [to conversion into ] , as when you form a [n. حْيَا] like حِدِبِّ ١٠٣٠ [contracted from حِدِبِّ ١٠٣٠ very thick milk (MAR)] or حِيَّٰى [296, 392], from حْيَا , you may elide it as forgotten, because the heaviness is more than in حْيَا [above]; so that you say حْيَا or حْيَا , by converting the second into ١ , because mobile [with the inflectional vowel] as a final, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 719]; or you may convert the second into ٧ , as in حْيَٰوى [above]; so that the third is preserved, because the combination of ي s ceases; and the word then becomes حْيَّٰى or حْيَّٰى [acc. حْيَّٰى or حْيَّٰى] : and similarly, when you form a [n. حْيَا] like قَضَّيَا [401], you say قَضَّيَا , by eliding the last [ ي ] as forgotten, and converting the second into ١ ; or قَضَّيَا , by converting the second into ٧ , [and preserving the third]: (α) the third is not converted into ٧ , [like the second in حْيَٰوى , ] because ٧ is heavy, while] the end of the word is worthier of alleviation [than the middle]; and also [because], if you converted it into ٧ , the combination of the first two ي s would remain unaltered:
(b) as for the first [ی], it is not converted, because the heaviness arises from the second and third: while in ِحُيِّيٍّ [above], like ُجُبْدِنْلُ, the first is not converted, because its analogue is not converted into ٌ in the v., as ِحُيِّيٍّ [728]; so that, α fortiori, it is not converted in a n. not commensurable with the v. [703, 712]: (v) if the last ی be not a ل, [all] the ی's remain unaltered, without conversion or elision, as ِسِبْرُم (R), which is foreign, arabicized, the archer, or horseman, of the Persians (Jk). And, when four یs are combined, (1) if the two last do not denote relation, then, in forming [a word], (α) from ِحُيِّيٍّ [728], (α) on the measure of ِجُحْمُرْش [401], you say ِحُيِّيٍّ, incorporating the first into the second, so that they become like a single ی: and [then] (α) you convert the third into ِ, as we said of [the second in] the [n.] formed on the measure of ُجُبْدِنْلُ [above]; so that the fourth is preserved, as ِحُيِّيٍّ, [αααα، ِحُيِّيٍّ]: or (β) you may elide the last as forgotten, because it is heavier than in ِمُعْبَيّة [above]; so that the third is converted into ِ, because mobile as a final, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as ِحَيَا: as we said before [about ِحَيِّيٍّ and ِحَيِّيٍّ] : (b) like ُسَلَسِبْيَل [368, 401, 674], you say ِحُيِّيٍّ: (c) like ِتَرْطَعُب [401], you say ِحُيِّيٍّ, the second double [ی] not being
converted into \( \text{ضـِّ } \), as [the second single \( \text{i} \) is] in \( \text{في } \), because it is the final of the word, and is therefore not changed into a heavier letter: nor being elided, as [the final single \( \text{i} \) is] in \( \text{مـِّي } \), because its elision would be an elision of two letters: (\( \alpha \)) the combination of the two [double \( \text{i} \) s] is tolerated, because their doubling strengthens them; and, since such as \( \text{أـِّي } \) [302] and \( \text{أـِّي } \) [299] are allowable, according to one saying, notwithstanding that the two first [\( \text{i} \) s] are the termination of the word [\( \text{تـِّي } \) and \( \text{أـِّي } \)], the \( \text{i} \) of relation being adventitious, this is more excellent: (\( \delta \)) like \( \text{قـِّي } \) [401], you say \( \text{حـِّي } \), incorporating the second into the third; and [then] elide the fourth, as [you elide the third] in \( \text{مـِّي } \) [above], which [elision] is more appropriate here; and do not convert the double [\( \text{i} \)] into \( \text{و } \), because by the doubling it becomes strong, like a sound letter; so that \( \text{حـِّي } \) remains: (b) from \( \text{قـِّي } \), judged, decreed, on the measure of \( \text{تـِّي } \) [401], you say \( \text{قـِّي } \): (a) Mz allows only \( \text{قـِّي } \), [with elision of the first \( \text{i} \), and conversion of the second into \( , \)] as in the rel. n. [\( \text{قـِّي } \) (299)]: but others, together with \( \text{قـِّي } \), allow with two double [\( \text{i} \) s] more often than \( \text{أـِّي } \) [above]: (b) what I hold is that only \( \text{قـِّي } \) with two double \( \text{i} \) s, is allowable, since the two last [\( \text{i} \) s],
being strong through the doubling, are not elided, as the third is elided in \( \text{مَعَبَّة} \) [above]; while the two first are not the end of the word, so that the weaker, meaner, of them, [vid.] the quiescent, should be elided, as in 2 396, you say 2 396; and then convert the two 2 365 into 2 365, and incorporate them into the two 2 365 [685 (case 7)]; so that it becomes 2 302, the Damma of the first double 2 365 being converted into Kasra; and Kasr of the 2 310 also being then allowable, as in 2 310 [685 (case 9, b, a), 728]: (a) S says 2 302, by analogy to 2 302 \( \text{قَدَّرَي} \) and 2 302 \( \text{قَدَّرَي} \) rel. ns. of 2 302 \( \text{قَدَّرَي} \) and 2 302 \( \text{قَدَّرَي} \); and 2 302 or 2 302, as 2 302 [302] is said: (d) from 2 302 [728], on the measure of 2 302 \( \text{قَدَّرَي} \) cattle, you say 2 302, and then convert (a) the first 2 302 into 2 302, incorporating the quiescent 2 302 into it; and (b) the second 2 302 into 2 302; incorporating it into the last 2 302; and then change the Damma of the [second] 2 302 into Kasra; so that you say 2 302, and 2 302 also, like the rel. ns. [2 302 \( \text{قَدَّرَي} \) and 2 302 \( \text{قَدَّرَي} \) of 2 302: (2) if the two last 2 302 do denote relation, as in the rel. ns. of 2 302 and 2 302 [302], 2 302 and 2 302 [302, 684 (condition 6, b, and g, b)] and 2 302 [299], 2 302 [299] and 2 302 [301], the predicament of the four 2 302 has been already
explained in the chapter on the Relative Noun: (a) it has also been mentioned [in the chapter on the Diminutive] that the َى of the َdim., if the rel. formation invade the َdim., is elided, as أُمُرُي [above]; but, if the َdim. formation invade the rel. n., is not elided, as أُرَيَّة, with two double َى s, َdim. of أُرُيَّة [281]. All of this is the predicament of the َى s. And, as for the predicament of the َى s, we say that, when two َى s are combined, (1) if their second be quiescent, then, (a) if it be final, the first cannot be pronounced with Fath or Damm, except when the second is adscititious, as in لَمْ يَبَزْوَا
They quenched not their thirst and مَرَّوْنَ زَيْدُ quenchers of Zaid's thirst, because, at the end of the word, which is the seat of lightness, they deem two َى s without incorporation to be heavy, for which reason they do not form a [v.] like ُقَوْرَت or ُقَوْرَت [729]; so that, if the two َى s were in one word, the first would unavoidably be pronounced with Kasr, in order that the second might be converted into َى, as ُقَوْيَت [729]: (b) if the last be medial, their combination is allowable, as ُقُوْرُ [714]: (2) if both be mobile, then, (a) if that be at the beginning of the word, the first is converted into Hamza, as ُقُوْرُ [683, 699]; (b) if it be in the middle, then, (a) if incorporation be allowable, you incorporate, as when you form ُعَلَّدُنَ, with Damm of the ُع, from ُقُوْرة, in
which case you say تَرَوَّانُ, according to [S and] Mb: (α) the proper [course], however, is not to incorporate; but to convert the second into ی and the Damme before it into Kasra, as كَرِيَانٍ already mentioned in this chapter [721], because transformation comes before incorporation: and this is the saying of Jr: (b) if incorporation be not allowable, as when you form تُعَكَّلُانُ, with Fath of the ھ, from تَرَوَّانُ; S says that you say تَرَوَّانُ [above], as he says حَيْيَان كَرِيَانٍ: (α) the proper [course], however, is to say كَرِيَانٍ [below], because two یs are deemed heavy; so that, when alleviation by incorporation is not allowable, you alleviate by converting one of them into ی: and, since the [second] ی is converted into ی in حَيْيَان كَرِيَانٍ [above] from dislike of two یs, a fortiori the second ی in كَرِيَانٍ is converted into ی, because ی is heavier [than ی]: (c) if you form تُعَكَّلُانُ, with Kasr of the ھ, you say كَرِيَانٍ, because (S) you convert the second ی into ی on account of the Kasra, since transformation comes before incorporation: (c) if that be at the end, then, (α) if the first be permanently pronounced with Fath, the second is converted into ی, as ذَرُوَى [Note on Part I, p. 908, ll. 15-17, 719, 728], and ذَرُوَى stronger: (א) as for [the retention of the second ی in] rel. n. of ذَرُوَى [302], it is because
the فَتْحَا of the first is accidental [684 (condition 5)]; while in قَرْوَى rel. n. of قَرْوَى strong, it is because the vowel of the second is accidental [684 (condition 2)]; (b) if the first be pronounced with Kasr or Damm, the second is converted into ى, as قَرْوَى [685 (case 1, a), 728, 729], and قَوْرُ on the measure of عَضْدٍ [368], from قَوْرُ: (3) if the first of the two ى be quiescent, then, (a) if they be in the middle, both are preserved from conversion, as قَوْلُ [371] and قَوْمُ He reported [such a one] as having said [703], except in such [pl. ] as قَوْلٌ [722], as before stated: (b) if they be at the end, then, if the word be (a) tril., they are not converted, as قَوْرُ and حَوْرُ [729]; except when the letter before them is pronounced with Kasr, as قَوْرُ desert, on the measure of جَنَّ قَرْوَى: (b) of more than three letters, the [double ى , when] preceded by a letter pronounced (১২) with Fath, is sounded true, as غَرْرُ [on the measure of فعل]: (8) with Kasr, is necessarily converted into [double] ى , as غَرْرُ [375]: (γ) with Damm, is converted into [double] ى , allowably in the sing., as غَرْرُ or غَرْرُ, like غَرْرُ or غَرْرُ [685 (case 9, b, a), 722]; and necessarily in the pl., as ى [243, 685 (case 9), 722]. When three ى are combined, (1) if the last be a ل , then (a) if the first be incorporated into the second, the
third is converted into (a) ٩ ، if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as قَرَى strengthened himself and قَرَى the strengthened: (b) ی، if the letter before it be pronounced with Kasr, as قَرَى strengthens and قَرَى the strengthener; or Damm, as قَرَى, on the measure of قَرَى [392], from قَرَى: (b) if the second be incorporated into the third, the double [و] is converted into double ی, whether the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as قَرَى, on the measure of قَرَى هَجَف [375] or قَرَى [245, 392]; or Kasr, as قَرَى, on the measure of قَرَى فِلَر [375]; or Damm, as قَرَى, on the measure of قَرَى قَد [375, 724], that Damm being converted into Kasr, and Kasr of the ی being then allowable, by imitation, as in قَرَى [722], from the heaviness of the ی, s preceded by a mobile, contrary to such as قَرَى [above], since ی is lighter than و: (a) [in the preceding exs. under case (b) the first of the three ی, s is the second letter of the word:] and similarly [the double ی is converted into double ی], when the first of the [three] ی, s is the third [letter] of the word, and the letter before it is mobile, as قَرَى غَرَى, on the measure of قَرَى [above]: whereas, if it be quiescent, then, if the first [و] be pronounced with Fath, the whole are preserved, as قَرَى غَرَى [below], on the measure of قَرَى ۡفَرَصَب [397] or قَرَى قَرَطَعَب [401]; but, if with Damm or
Kasr, the double [و] is converted into [double]٥، and the دامما_ into Kasra, as مُقَرِّبٍ [685 (case 8), 722] and غُرْؤِي [722, 728]: (c) if none of them be incorporated, you convert the last into (α) ٥، if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as اقْرُوُرَ on the " sure of إِحْمَرٍ [730]: and then, (α) if you incorporate, you say اقْرُوُر [730, 756]: (β) if not, you convert the second [و] into ٥، on the analogy of كُوبِانٰ [above], which [conversion] is more appropriate here [at the end of the word]; so that you say اقْرُوُر، aor. (β) [٥] يَقْوُيٰٓ، saying قُوُر [for قُوُرُ], like جَمِيدٌ or هَدِيدٌ [above], from قُوُر، because of the Kasra on the letter before it: (α) the first [و] in قُوُر is not incorporated into the second, notwithstanding that the vowel of the second is inseparable [728], in order that the form of co-ordination [with *فِعْلُ] may be preserved, and also because resemblance to the v. is lacking [731]: (β) it is better, however, not to form such augmented ns. unconnected with the v. [330] as lead to heaviness like this: (2) if [the last of] the three [و، ٥] be [not a ج، because of their being] combined in the middle [of the word], they remain unaltered, as صَبُوحٍ، on the measure of ضِمْهٍ [384]; and قُوُرٰلٰ [below], like إِغْدَّرَدَنٰ [482, 483]: (α) Akh converts
the last [و] in إقْتُرُولل، and therefore the second also [685 (case 7)], into ﻋٰ; but S does not mind that [combination of م، and]، because they are in the middle: (b) Akh ought to say ٷوُلُ for ٷیلُ; but excuses himself by the plea that the ء of prolongation is light: (c) Akh does not convert [the third ﺇ in] أُﻗّرُوٰی، because the mi ﺎ is like ﺯ، for which it is a subst.: do you not see that, for a similar reason, the initial of ووَرْي pass. of وازرٰی [683, 699] is not necessarily converted into Hamza? And, when four م، are combined, then, (1) if the third be incorporated into the fourth, the third and fourth must be converted into ﻋٰ، on the measure of ﺟُرُطٰبٰ [401], from ﺟُرُوٰٰ، because ﺟُرُوٰٰ is heavier than such as ﺟُرُوٰٰ [above]: (2) if the third be not incorporated into the fourth, the last is converted into ﻋٰ، if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath; and into ﺟ، if it be pronounced with Kasr: while the third (a) remains unaltered, according to S, as ﻋٰ [below], on the measure of ﺟُڪْرِش، because it is then [in the middle,] like [the third ﺇ in] إقْتُرُولل [above]; (b) ﻋٰ، on the measure of ﺟُڪْرِش، (c) ﻋٰ، on the measure of ﺟُڪْرِش; (b) is converted into ﺟ، by Akh, who says (a) ﻋٰ، like ﻋٰ، (b) ﻋٰ، like ﻋٰ، (c) ﻋٰ، like ﻋٰ
for, deeming the [combination of] s heavy, he converts the one near the end into : (α) the third in [above], like : [orig.], then , and then , ] is not converted into , as the , of [728] is not converted. And God best knows the right! (R).