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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. ABU ḤANIFA ʿAbmād Ibn Dāwūd addDīnawahī, the Grammarian, Lexicologist, Arithmetician, Astronomer, Botanist, and Historian (d. 281 or 282 or before 290), author of the Kitāb anNabāt and the Kitāb alAkhbār atTiwal.

Am. Add

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

ANI. The celebrated Ḥāfṣ, and the Traditionist of the Age, ABU Nuʿaim ʿAbmād Ibn ʿAbd Allāh alMihrānī alIṣbahānī aşṢāfī (b. 334 or 336, d. 430), author of the Ḥilāyat alAuliyyā (Portraiture of the Saints) and the Tārīkh Iṣbahān (History of Iṣbahān).

* ANj. The Gloss (c. 1293) of ABU -nNAJA upon the CĀj, printed in Egypt in 1303.

AW. Read “Abu -IKāsim ‘ABD AlWāRITH Ibn Sufyān Ibn Jubrūn, known as AlḤABĪR, of the people of ʿUrtuba, the Lexicologist (b. 317, d. 395), one of the Masters of LAB”.

BB. After “Grammarians” add “Lexicologists, Philologists, or Readers”.
Abū Muḥammad AlḤussain Ibn Masʿūd, known as AlFarrā, or Ibn AlFarrā, ALBAGHAWĪ (from Baḏar or Baḏshūr, a town in Khurasan between Marv and Harāt), ash-Shāfiʿī, the Jurist, Traditions, and Commentator (d. 516, at, or past, 80 years of age), author of the Maṣābih asSunna and other works.

* BK. The Burhān-i-Shariʿ, a Persian Lexicon, by Maulāna Muḥammad Ḥusain Tabrizi, 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 Hd 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. 11802) to AlHādī, a Commentary by the same author on another grammar of his, the Mabādī fi-tTasrīf; but it properly belongs to the CHd mentioned in HKh. VI. 470-1 (No. 14834), as is clear from the description of the work in the Jrb and BW as "Sharḥ alHādī" (not Sharḥ alMabādī).

DAd. The Dīwān alAdab, on Lexicology, by Frb.

DK. The Shaikh al-Islām Abu-lḤasan ‘Ali Ibn ‘Umar alBaghdādī, known as AlDārāṣūrī (from Dārāṣūr or Dār alKūn, a large Ward in Baghdād), the celebrated Ḥāfiz and Shāfiʿī Jurist (b. 306, d. 385).

* Dm. For the second paragraph read “Also the Commentary entitled Tuḥlīk alFarāʾidʿalā Tāshīl alFawāʾid (c. 820), by the same author upon the Tashīl of IM, cited from extracts quoted in the Sh, and latterly from an incomplete MS (copied in 1559) belonging to the India Office, Whitehall, London.”
( iii )

[This MS (No. 964 of Loth's Catalogue) contains an interesting passage in folios 3, 6, “The Shaikh TDT mentions, at the end of his Commentary on the syntactical *Hājibīya* 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 3 and 5 are transposed, the proper order being 4, 6, 7, 5, 9. The “syntactical *Hājibīya*” is the *Kāfiya* of IH, on which TDT is said in HKh. V. 17 to have written “a great Commentary, like that of R”.

Drn. The Shaikh al-Islām Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān Ibn Sa'id al-Umāwī (their freedman) al-Kūṭubī, known as AbūDānī (from his residence at Dāniya, a city in Spain, one of the governments of Balansiya), the Ḥāfiz, Reader, and Traditionist (b. 371, d. 444).

* Dw. After the additions made in Part I, Fasciculus III, and before “and of Abū Nuwās”, insert “of 'Ubaid Allāh Ibn Ḫāis ar-Ruḳayyāt, edited by Rhodokanakis; of Ma'n Ibn Aus, edited by Schwartz; of Aus Ibn Ḫajar, edited by Geyer; of Al-Kumait Ibn Zaid al-Asadī (his Ḫāṣīma'yāt only) edited by Horovitz, with the Exposition of Abū Riyāsh Aḥmad Ibn Ḫārim al-Kaisī, the Philologist (d. 339)”.

[On Abū Riyāsh see YR. I. 74.]

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

* Fbr. The *Fihrista* (Catalogue) of Books studied by its compiler, the Ḥāfiz Abū Bakr Muḥammad Ibn Khāir al-Imām (with *Fath* of the Hamza) al-Ishbīli, the Reader, Grammarian, and Lexicologist (b. 502, d. 575 at age of 73), contemporary with IBshk, edited by Codera and Biber 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 Ahmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī al-Fayyūmī, the Reader and Lexicologist (d. 770), author of the Msb.

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

Frd. al-Farābī, about whom I have no information.


I.A.B. The Ḥāfiẓ of the West, Abū 'Umar Yūsuf Ibn 'Abd Allāh, known as IBN 'ABD AL-BAREH, anNamārī (from anNamir Ibn Kāsim, a well-known clan) al-Kurṭubi, 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 Istī'am fi Ma'rifat al-'Ashāb.

[Pupil of AW.]

I.As. The Ḥāfiẓ of Syria, nay, of the World, Thikāt ad-Dīn, or Nūr ad-Dīn, Abū-l-Kāsim 'Alī Ibn Abī Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ad-Dīmashḵī ash-Shāfī‘ī, known as IBN 'Ashārī, the Traditionist of Syria in his time (b. 499, d. 571), author of the History of Damascus.

I.Az. The learned Jamāl ad-Dīn Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn Ibn Badr Ibn Ayyāz Ibn 'Abd Allāh, the Grammarian (d. 681), author of a Commentary on the Taṣrif of IM.

I.Jzr. The Ḥāfiẓ Shams ad-Dīn Abū-l-Khāir Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad al-Kurashī ad-Dīmashḵī ash-Shāfī‘ī, known as IBN al-Jazarī, the Reader and Traditionist (b. 751, d. 833).
IMH. Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad, known as Ibn ALMULLĀ AL-ḤALABĪ (d. about 990), author of a Commentary on the ML.

JDB. The Kāḍī-l-Kudāt JĀLĀL AD-DĪN Abu-l-Faḍl 'Abd AR-Rahmān Ibn 'Umar AL-BULŪŠI, the Shaʿfī Jurist (d. 763, d. 824).

Jhz. Abū Uthman ʿAmr Ibn Bahr al-Kinānī al-Laithī (from Laith Ibn Bakr Ibn 'Abd Manāt Ibn Khuzaima) al-BAṣrī, the celebrated Philologist of the BAṣrī school, and one of the Masters of the Muʿtazilīs, known as AL-JĀHIZ, because his eyes were prominent, and also called AL-HADAḳĪ, for the same reason (d. 265 at AL-Baṣrā, over 90 years old).

Kfj. The Shaikh Muʿāyyi-d-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Sulaimān ar-Rūmī AL-KĀPRIYASĪ (so-called from the frequency of his reading and teaching the Kāshiya of IJ) al-ḤARATĪ, the Jurist, Theologian, Commentator, Traditionist, Grammarian, Logician, and Philosopher (d. 788 or 790 or before 800, d. 879), one of Syt's Masters.


KIM. The Ḥāfiz and Kāḍī Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿAL-ḲASIM Ibn MA'N Ibn 'Abd AR-Rahmān al-Masʿūdī al-KUFĪ, the Traditionist (d. 175).

KK. After "Grammarians" add "Lexicologists, Philologists, or Readers".

Lth. AL-LAITH Ibn Al-MUṣṣAFFAR (so named by AZ), or Ibn NASR (as the author of the KF says in the Bulgha), or Ibn Rāfiʿ (as others say), or Ibn Al-MUṣṣAFFAR Ibn NASR (as in Mr. I. 46), Ibn Sayyār al-Laithī al-Khurūṣānī, the Philologist, Lexicologist, and Grammarian, who was Secretary to the BarAmIka.


* MDh. After "al-Jauhar" insert "(c. 332-6)".

[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 AL-MISRĀH AL-MUNİR (c. 734), by Fm.

SBd. As-Sayyid ash-Sharīf Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥasanī al-Maghribī, the denizen of Egypt, al-Mālikī, known as AS-SAYYID AL-BULĀDĪ, 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 Saʿīd Ibn Mānsūr al-Khurāsānī, resident of Makka, the Traditionist (d. in, or after, 227), author of the Kitāb as-Sunan.


* Sn. After "AS-SABBĀN" insert "(d. 1206)".

* TKh (as amended in Part I, Fasciculus III). After "Rittershausesen" 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".
* TKhlf. The Tārīkh alKhulafā' (History of the Khalīfās), by Syt, edited by Less.

Wkd. The Kāḍī Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn 'Umar Ibn Wāqid al-Wākidī al-Aslāmī al-Madāni, freedman of the Banū Ḥāshim, or, as is said, of the Banū Saḥm of Aslām, author of works on the Maghāzī (Campaigns) and other subjects (b. 130, d. 206 or 207 or 209).

[He moved from Al-Madīna, and settled in Baghdad, where he served as Kāḍī for four years under Al-Ma'mūn, dying in office.]

YH. The Shaikh Jamal ad-Dīn Abū Imuḍqāl Yūsuf Ibn Sālim ash-Shāfī'ī al-Ḳāhiri, known as Al-Hanafi, the Philologist (d. 1176), author of a Gloss on the A.

[YIM. The celebrated Ḥāfiz Abū Zakariyā Yaḥyā Ibn Maʿīn al-Murrī al-Ghatafānī (of the Murra of Ghatafān, their freedman) al-Baghdādi, 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 al-Arib ilā Maʾrifat al-Adīb, commonly known as the Muʿjam, or Ṭabaḥāt, al-Udābā, by Yākūt al-Būmī, also called Al-Ḥamawī (see Mk), edited by Margoliouth.
CHAPTER XXVI.—THE س و ش of PAUSE.

§ 617. Affixed to the ك of the fem. in pause—substituted for the ك of the fem. in pause and continuity.

CHAPTER XXVII.—THE PARTICLE of DISAPPROVAL.

§ 618. Definition—when affixed—with or without imitation.

§ 619. Its meanings

§ 620. Its affixion to the expression mentioned—to إن after the expression.

§ 621. Its position in the sentence

§ 622. Its omission allowable or necessary—retention of the Tanwin in pause allowable with it—the ꞌ of silence necessary.

CHAPTER XXVIII.—THE PARTICLE of TRYING to REMEMBER.

§ 623. Definition—it is inelegant—when used—how formed.

§ 624. Like the augment of disapprobation—but not followed by the ꞌ of silence.

PART IV.—The Common Processes.

CHAPTER I.—COMMON PROCESSES IN GENERAL.

§ 625. Last part of book—meaning of "common"—common processes—exs.—etymology—definition—conventional applications—syntax excluded—reason for exclusion.
CHAPTER II.—IMÄLA.

§ 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 ی and Kasra—which of the two stronger—more obviously Kasra.

§ 627. Kasra before ] when effective—and when not anomalies with ی—the ی disregarded—effect of disregarding it—درهمان — their anomalousness—no Imāla when ی is preceded by Damma.


§ 629. Final ]—its Imāla in v.—and in n.—... 748-749

§ 630. Intermediate ]—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 ج , not pronounced with Kasr—reason for such prevention—preventives enumerated—effective... 751-756
in restraining expressed Kasra—and, according to IM, expressed ֖—but, according to others, Kasra alone—why added by IM—not supplied Kasra or ֖—theory that letter of elevation is not preventive in ֖—criticism on exs. cited—or in certain ֖—condition of prevention by letter of elevation (1) preceding | (2) following | —letter of elevation stronger as preventive after than before | —cause of difference in strength.

§ 633. Letter of elevation treated as preventive when detached—its position—exs.—made ineffective by some—cause not effective when detached—contrast between detached preventive and detached cause—language of IM and BD—objections to it. 756-758

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

§ 635. Two other causes of Imāla—such Imāla anomalous—לָעַעַע—باب and ֗ ֗ ֗ ֗ ֗ ֗ ֗ ֗ ֗ etc.— אַרְבַּא.

§ 636. Properly no Imāla in ֓قال from reduplicated— ֑ and ֗ and ֗. 762-763
§ 637. *Imāla* for conformity

§ 638. Fathā pronounced with *Imāla* before (1) ٰ — (2) و — 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 ٰ before َ — this exception why inserted by IM—"ٰ", not َ، "of feminization" why said—dispute as to *Imāla* of Fathā before َ of silence.

§ 639. *Imāla* peculiar to ب. and decl. م. —irregular in ب. سم. —except َّ and ن. —heard in ِن، َّ، and م. —some ب. pronounced with *Imāla* — َ and َ Ibn. —*Imāla* not forbidden in م. accidentally uninf.,—allowable in ب. ه. and excellent in م. —reason for not pronouncing ب. with *Imāla*—their aplasticity a reason—*Imāla* in ب. used as proper names— in letters of monograms prefixed to chapters of ك. —various reasons given—and in letters of alphabet.

CHAPTER III.—PAUSE.

§ 640. Definition—criticism—another definition—the latter preferable — classification — tentative pause in َّ، َّ in َّ —in َ — and in َ —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 ֳ with most frequent dial.—upon ֳ—dispute about it—upon n. mobile in final—modes allowed when final is not ֳ of feminization—(1) quiescence—meaning of "mobile" here—exclusion of final in acc. 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 allowability with Fatha—its sign—(3) Ishmām—peculiar to Damma—explained—its name applied by some to Raum—alleged to be allowable with Kaṣra—its sign—its derivation—its object—question as to allowability of Raum or Ishmām with the ֳ of feminization, the ֳ of the pl., and the
accidental vowel—reason for disallowance with the ٨ of feminization—with the ٧ of the pl.—
with the accidental vowel—(4) reduplication—
explained—its object—letter added—sign of
reduplication—its rarity—its dialectic peculiarity—its conditions—extent of its occurrence
in nom., gen., and acc.—and with َ담ما،
 Kasra, or فطا — anomalous—or merely
rare—reduplication not properly applicable to
acc. pronounced with Tanwin—(5) transfer of
vowel—this also rare—its object—its sign.

§ ٤٢١. Its conditions—cases where transfer is not allow-
able—two of these conditions peculiar to ٧.
whose final is not َHAMZA—transfer of َطا—
of َعئ١ر — dial. of many of the Arabs
in case of ٧. whose final is َHAMZA—dials. of
some of َتامٖم—their treatment of ٧. whose
final is not َHAMZA—dial. of َهُجاٖز—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—ْديم transferable from
١ of pron.—exs.— ١٨٧٨٨٨٨٧ and ١٨٧٨٨٨٧—transfer
to mobile— ١٨٧٨٨٨٧ — ١٨٧٨٨٨٧—pause upon a
single letter.
§ 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 Fathā—but retained when such vowel is Ḍamma 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 ح for double ی—(2) mobile—expression of ل of defective when necessary—pause upon
defective in acc.—in nom. or gen.—elision of its
$s$ preferable in nom. or gen. pronounced with
Tanwin—opinion of S and moderns—but ex-
pression allowable—expression preferable in
nom. or gen. not pronounced with Tanwin—but
elision allowable—argument for expression in
defective pronounced with Tanwin—and for
elision in defective not pronounced with Tanwin
—former argument; stronger—classification of
defective not pronounced with Tanwin—abbrevi-
ated triptote or diptote—pause upon (1) tript-
tote pronounced with Tanwin—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 Tanwin, and diptote—their | re-
tained—dial. var. of pausal |—nature of |
converted in some of these dials.—א and
$\text{אָש}$.—Hamza in $\text{אָש}$, a subst. for |, not for
Tanwin—conversion of | into Hamza of weak
authority—as also into $\text{א}$ or $\text{א}$—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 IS—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 vs. than in vs.—elision of quiescent and in ind. of defective n.—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 n. 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 rad., and in rhymes—his meaning—i not elided in rhymes—elision of pronominal, and (1) in rhymes—exs.—pronominal i not elided—(2) in terminations of verses.

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

§ 647. Continuity treated like pause—mostly in poetry— ș sometimes in prose—pausal forms thus admissible in continuous speech—ș in prose and poetry—șș and șș explained as 847-852
instances of this treatment—unlikely—unusual quiescence of rhyme-letter—practice of Hijāsīs and Tamīmīs.

§ 648. Second position of ʿ of silence—interrog. governed in gen. and not compounded with ʿ—ʿ here necessary or preferable—reason for this difference—third position—ezz.—ʿ when not affixed—dispute about its affixion to word ending in quasi-inflectional vowel of uninflectedness—pause upon uninf. n. — (1) ظ or ظ — this ʿ — the only quiescent positions of pause with ʿ — (2) ʿ or ʿ — mostly ʿ — and ʿ — seldom ʿ — and ʿ — but never ʿ — sometimes only ʿ — and ʿ — (3) ʿ — this ʿ — pause upon ʿ — the only quiescent followed by this ʿ — (4) ʿ or ʿ — pause upon ʿ of pron., masc. or fem. or ʿ or ʿ (5) — ʿ or ʿ (6) — ʿ or ʿ (7) — ʿ or ʿ — sometimes ʿ and ʿ — retention of ʿ better than elision—elision in acc. better than in gen.—practice of some Readers—(6) ʿ and ʿ and ʿ and ʿ and ʿ and ʿ and ʿ and ʿ and ʿ.
CONTENTS.

... in first four quiescent, and its conj. or omitted—dispute as to whether this or be part of n.—x in last two also quiescent— and orig. and —discussion as to whether conj. after be part of word—in continuity, conj. (a) better elided when is preceded by quiescent—but of is not elided—(b) indispensable when is preceded by mobile—but sometimes omitted, and is even made quiescent—in pause, conj. always omitted, and quiescent—Raum and Ishmām disallowed by some in of pron., after Damma or Kasra, or allowable, without dispute, after Fatā—aallowed by some after any consonant or vowel—pronounced with Kasr and conjoined with —never pronounced with Damm—sometimes elided from in continuity, with or without quiescence of —always elided in pause, with quiescence of —preferably with , sometimes without—sometimes quiescent in continuity—always with .
§ 649. Pause upon single \( \nu \) of corroboration after (1) Fat'a—exs.—additional exs.—(2) Ḍamma or Kasra—this \( \nu \) treated like Tanwin—restoration of \( \gamma \) of pl.—and of \( \nu \) of ind.—practice of \( \gamma \)—disallowed by S.

CHAPTER IV.—THE OATH.

§ 650. Common to a. 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—\( \mathbb{L} \) of inception prefixed to \( \text{אימש} \)—vowel of its Hamza—meaning of \( \text{אמשא} \) on God when indicated by (a) the prop. enclosing or preceding the oath—this prop. a quasi-compensation for suppressed correl.—not the correl. itself—(b) a context following the oath—suppression of correl. necessary or allowable—(2) the jurative prop.—sometimes because indicated by an adv. to the v. of the correl.—quasi-jurative—sometimes not so—also quasi-jurative—sometimes not so—pronunciation of its final—(3) the sworn—by—(4) the oath whose correl.
is corroborated by the ُحَقَّ, etc., used in place of oath—and so ُنَفَّذ—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
(a) jurative v.—(b) sworn-by—illustration—
(c) enuoc in nominal jurative prop.—this suppression necessary or allowable—theory of Fr
—(d) ن and Hamza of ُأَمِيس—dispute as to whether elision of its Hamza be a liberty—
—مَامَيَّهُ and هَامَيَّهُ and or
—(e) مَامَيَّهُ and or مَامَيَّهُ—مَامَيَّهُ and or مَامَيَّهُ—مَامَيَّهُ
—these contractions used only with
Hamza of ُأَمِيس or مَامَيَّهُ or مَامَيَّهُ—مَامَيَّهُ and or مَامَيَّهُ—مَامَيَّهُ
—(f) jurative p.—(2) substitution of ُع for jurative ُء—(3) preference of Fatha over
Damma in ُء—dial. vars. of this word—
only ُعُ مُعُ used in oath.

§ 652. Oath adjuratory or not—correl. (1) of adjuratory—sometimes headed by ُو or ُلَمْ—or by
red. ُأَن—sometimes a mandatory enunciation
—(2) of non-adjuratory—four ps. 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
uncontracted or contracted
—nature of J —wha it is prefixed to— J in
op. or inop.— J exemptive—or by J —verbal
attended, (1) if aff., (a) when its v. is a pret.,
by J with or without J , or by alone— J
best—except with aplastic vs.— J alone, or
alone, allowable—nature of J prefixed to
correl. separated from oath by condition headed
by J —(b) when its v. is an aor., by J with or
without J of corroboration—omission of J —or
of J —opinions of BB and KK —aor., in sense of
present, allowable as correl. of oath—and then
corroborated by J without J —(2) if neg., (a)
when its v. is a pret., by J or J —if pret. in
sense, by J —if future, by J or J —(b) when
its v. is an aor., by J or J , the latter with or
without J of corroboration—or by J —ex. of
J and J disallowed by MB— J or J
not allowable—or very, rare—subsidiary J
often prefixed to cond. instrument preceded by
oath—especially if oath be suppressed—neg. p.
allowably suppressed, (1) in correl. of oath.
from aor.—not from nominal prop., nor from pret.—(2) otherwise than in correl. of oath, from שֵׁלֶג, 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 י, not ל—IU and IUK on suppression of ל—not none of the four ps. suppressed except י.

§ 654. Exclusive privileges of 母 mnemonic verses—exts of 母 in adjuration—adjuration not an oath—apparent evidence to contrary—but held by IM and R 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.— 母 (1) suppressed—together with v.—p. first, then v.—sworn-by governed in (a) acc. by jurative v. understood—ext.—or by trans. v. understood—opinion of IS—(b) nom. —(2) understood—like ل in 母 and 母 ع م —dispute as to whether prep. ل be suppressed here— 母 acc. preferable—gen. allowable in 母 ex.—and allowed by KK in other ns.—nom. necessary in certain phrases—acc. or nom. allowable in others—cases allowed in 母 ex. of all three cases.

§ 656. 灶 suppressed with compensation— 母 —sworn-by then 母 exclusively, and compensation the premonitory 灶 or interrog.
Hamza—different opinions on ٰه—or the disjunction of Hamza in ٰلِلل—suppressed ٰه. why held to be اطٰبٰؤٰه—necessary after ٰلِلل when compensation is ٰه—this ٰه transferred from ٰه—pronunciations of ٰلِلل ٰه—(1) ٰلِلل ٰه—why not elided—(2) ٰلِلل ٰه—(3) ٰلِل ٰه—(4) ٰلِل ٰه—دٰبٰبٰؤٰه how parsed by Khl—and by Akh—sense of interrog. Hamza—treatment of Hamza in ٰلِلل on prefixion of interrog. Hamza—ex. of ٰلِل ٰه—disjunction of Hamza peculiar to ٰلِلل after ٰلِل with or without interrog. Hamza—compensation here the disjunction of Hamza in ٰلِل—not the preceding interrog. Hamza—ف said to be red.—proof that the ٰه, the interrog. Hamza, and the disjunction of Hamza in ٰلِل are subs. for jurative ٰه.

CHAPTER V.—THE ALLEVIATION OF HAMZA.

§ 658. Hamza heavy—produced with difficulty—alleviati

vated by some—by most Ḥijāzis, especially ʿUraish—remarks of ʿAli—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 Mā 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 or, or , by conversion—i. e., change—no other mode possible—its alleviation not obligatory—opinion of S on , and
and of IH—(2) when quiescent is ٠، 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 ﷿، or a coordinative aug. ﷾ or ﷿، by elision after transfer of vowel to quiescent—not by betwixt-and-between or change—neutral ﷺ and and ﷿، and ﷻ and ﷼ and —conj. of ﷼، —exs. of alleviation where quiescent is not in same word as Hamza—saving سو ﷽—alleviation obligatory in cat. of ﷼، and of pret. ﷼ and aor. ﷽—i. e., in certain derivs. of ﷽—and frequent in cat. of سل ﷼—more so in سل ﷼ than in سل ﷼—cause of its frequency—consequent elision of conj. Hamza—س ﷼ —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 ٠—(2) preceded by ٠—Hamza
usually converted into I in latter case—treatment of the two I's—and of acc. pronounced with Tanwin—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 betwixt-and-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 I or quiescent, or I—this change confined to hearsay—مناسة—but regular in metric exigency—exs.
of it not explicable as dial. vars.—سنَت سُّلَت; aor. سَلَت سَلَّت, and سَلُت سَلَّت or سَلُت سَلَّت said to be dial. vars.—فَجَّرُي رَأَجُي for cited by S at end of verse as ex. of this change—but not really so—though in continuity for would be—this change restricted to case where Hamza and preceding mobile are both pronounced with Fath, Damm, or Kasr, respectively—و or I
quiescent when thus substituted for Hamza—cases where this change is not allowable—anomalies in connection with initial Hamza—irregular elision of Hamza in \( \text{نَاس} \) and \( \text{نَت} \) or —elision of Hamza sometimes avoided by transposition.

§ 659. Imp. of \( \text{ب} \) is Hamza quiescent in aor.—

\( \text{كَل} \), and \( \text{مُر} \) —their rad. Hamza elided, and conj. Hamza then dispensed with—their measure—elision obligatory in \( \text{حُذُر} \) and \( \text{اًرُكَذ} \) and \( \text{مُر} \) not said, but \( \text{أَرَزُمُر} \) —regular form of these three imps.—irregular form always used in \( \text{كُلُّكُنْدُخُ} \) and \( \text{أَكَلُّكُنْدُخُ} \) —but either allowed in \( \text{أَرَزُمُر} \) —i.e., when inceptive—in interior of sentence retention of Hamza more frequent—but elision allowable—this subject why discussed here.

§ 660. Transfer of \( \text{و} \) from initial mobile Hamza to preceding \( \text{ل} \) of \text{art.}—

\( \text{لَعْنُمُر} \) with conj. Hamza expressed—\( \text{ل} \) being constructively quiescent—\( \text{لَعْنُمُر} \) with conj. Hamza elided—\( \text{ل} \) being actually mobile—more frequent than \( \text{لَعْنُمُر} \) and \( \text{لَعْنُمُر} \) treated like \( \text{مِنَ العَمَر} \) or \( \text{لَعْنُمُر} \)
§ 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) ! after Fatḥa—

1st pers. sing. of aor. subj. from ʾaṭṭar—

a mispronunciation ʾaṭṭar allowed by some—but disallowed in KF—(2) ʾ after Kasra—

—(3) ʾ after Ḍamma—

—if first quiescent, and second mobile, which never occurs in position of ʿ, then, (1) in position of ʿ, first incorporated into second —(2) in position of ʾ, second changed into ʾ ʾaṭṭar—incorporation—why not adopted here—

—if both mobile, then second changed, (1)
if final, or non-final but pronounced with Kasr, into ـ (2) if non-final and pronounced with Damm, into ـ (3) if non-final and pronounced with Fath, into if first be pronounced with Fath or Damm, and into ـ 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 ـ in all three sorts—non-final into ـ in four, and ـ in five sorts—exs. of (1) final—(2) non-final pronounced with (a) Kasr—prescribed action necessary—ـ pl. of ـ not ~—ـ in LX. 12—or ~—its second Hamza converted into ـ or sounded true—how pronounced by Readers—softening or sounding true allowed in reading the Kur, but not conversion into ـ—two former pronunciations not peculiar to ~—conversion best according to GG—(b) Damm—(c) Fath, when first is pronounced with (a) Fat' or Damm—pl. and d. of ـ—doubt as to whether ـ be Arabic—(b) Kasr—opinion of Akh on two of the nine sorts—ـ or ـ or ـ—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 — $\text{ج} \text{ب}$ — its second Hamza not put betwixt and between — $\text{ج}$ not a case of two Hamzas according to Kh— $\text{خ} \text{ی}$ — 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 1 between the two Hamzas—no conversion when Hamzas are separated by original 1 — alleviation preventible by interpolated 1 — and therefore prevented by existing 1 — combination of two separate Hamzas ineffective in causing alleviation— $\text{ن} \text{ر} \text{و} \text{ل} \text{ب}$ — Hamza of elided in cat. of $\text{آ} \text{ر} \text{م}$ — o.f. of $\text{د} \text{ر} \text{و} \text{ل}$ — elision adopted here instead of conversion—and extended to its variations—Hamza converted into $\text{ی}$ pronounced with Fath in cat. of $\text{م} \text{لا} \text{ی}$ — and $\text{خ} \text{لا} \text{ی}$ — 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 1 — e.z.e.—treatment of two Hamzas after entry of 1 — 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—(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 AZ—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 $n$, $r$, and $p$.—(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 $l$—less light when first is $s$ or $z$ preceded by Damma or Kasra, respectively—least light when first is $s$ or $z$ preceded by Fatha—last combination peculiar to $a$

<table>
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<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
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<td>986-987</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

| § 663. Common to $n$, $r$, and $p$.—(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 $l$—less light when first is $s$ or $z$ preceded by Damma or Kasra, respectively—least light when first is $s$ or $z$ preceded by Fatha—last combination peculiar to $a$—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>incorporation or pause prescribed for second</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
quiescent—pause constitutional or accidental—concurrence of two quiescents pardonable (1) in pause—concurrence 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 softness, provided that both be in one word—meaning of "letter of softness" and "letter of prolongation"—| a letter of prolongation—\ and \ letters of softness or prolongation, or neither—these letters loosely termed "letters of prolongation and softness"—concurrence why allowable here—concurrence of three quiescents—of four—(3) in n. uninf. from want of construction—not from existence of preventive of inflection—theory that quiescence of their finals, even in continuity, is pause—classification of such n.—concurrence why allowable here—reason for quiescence of their finals—opinion of Z—of R—predicament of pause how far made applicable to them—\ and \ disallowed by Mz—Ishmām allowed by S in nom. of n. accidentally, not constitutionally, quiescent in final—but disallowed by Akh—Ishmām allowable in pre. n.—| —Fat.' of the | —dispute about | —(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—converted from Hamza why not elided—(5) in such as *هَا لاَّ وَلاَّ* and *إِئِبَن* combination of two quiescents optional here, necessary in preceding cases—concurrency of two quiescents not pardonable in other cases—

| 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—|
| — (2) first is elided if its elision do not lead to confusion—concurrence avoided by elision or mobilization of first rather than second—letter of prolongation not mobilized when و or ج—not when ج — elided in *غَزَن* and *رَمَسْ* — but not in ل of *أَفْنُو* and *أَفْرُن* of apoc. and imp. in defective v. how treated upon affixion of nom. prons.—why not converted into ل in *إِخْشَاٰهَا وَأَرْضَيَا* elided ع of *إِخْشَاٰهَا* and *أَرْضٌ* and elided ل of *إِخْشَاٰهَا* and *أَرْضٌ* how treated upon mobilization of ف. و, and ب, |
respectively—why treated differently in ٨ and ٩ from ٨ in ٨ in ٨ why not elided—vowel of ٨ in ٨, ٨, ٨, ٨, ٨, ٨, and ٨, as also in ٨, ٨, ٨, ٨, ٨. quasi-original—and permanent—hence return of their ٨ is inevitable—why retained in ٨, ٨, ٨, and ٨—first quiescent why converted into ٨ or ٨, and mobilized, in ٨ and ٨—elided of ٨ and ٨ not restored in ٨ and ٨—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. لُدنَّ ن (2) لُدنَّ ن but not (3) Tanwín of proper name qualified by ٨ pre. to proper name—elision of Tanwín, on account of concurrence of two quiescents, anomalous in other cases—٨ and ٨ of determination mobilized with Kaar when prefixed to conj. Hamza—transfer of vowel from conj. Hamza to preceding quiescent—exs. with Fatha—and Kasra—and Damma—transfer dis-approved—second quiescent mobilized (1) when
mobilization of first is avoided for alleviation—

§ 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) of pl.—vowel of this after (a) Kasra on s—(b) Damma on any letter—(b) Damma here not necessary, but usual—(c) Kasra not accepted by Readers—question whether Kasra is relevant here—Fatḥa on final of v. in

and (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 MB after Kasra—
any vowel allowed by IJ in م of 3
here—(4) Damma preferable in
(a) & of pron. of pl., after Fat'a, in (a)
reason for Damma according to
Khl—and to others—(b) —possible explanation of Damma here—(b), of pl.,
after Fat'a, in explicit n.—in other cases
pronounced with Kasr after Fat'a— of pl.
sometimes pronounced with Kasr—and of
and ی with Damm— of pron. pronounced
with Kasr after Fat'a—and similarly of pl.
in explicit n.—(c) —(5) Damma or
Fat'a allowable, besides Kasra, in ی and ی
Kasra preferred in ی —Fat'a sometimes
found—Damma rarely—all of this applicable
when aor. is pronounced with Damm of ی
Kasra or Fat'a allowable when aor. is
pronounced with Fat. or Kasr—three methods of
mobilizing second quiescent in such imp. and
apoces.—(a) Fat'—(b) alliteration—(c) Kasr
م—Kasra adopted by most in apoc. or imp.
before quiescent—Fat'a by some—Damma?
none—IH and Jrb mistaken in allowing it—
(6) Fat'a necessary before fem. pron. جان—and Damma before masc. pron. ك—in latter position, a weak dial. var.—Fat'a considered erroneous—reason for Damma—this vowel chastest here—Kasra explicable—Fat'ha not forbidden by analogy—Fat'ha necessary in ن 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 ز of masc.—(2) where second is incorporated, and first an ل—ex. of this case not accepted by مز as precedents—opinion of عز and IH on reason for conversion of ل into Hamza pronounced with Fath—alternative theory—vowel of Hamza if أ, ي, or ل be mobile—و or ك not converted into Hamza—reason for not altering ل—modes of avoiding concurrence of two quiescents in ل مز.

§ 666. Vowel of final in (1) مسم, (a) before ل of art. —Fatha not caused by transfer from conj. Hamza—opinion of عز—(b) before any other quiescent—Fatha sometimes used in latter case—and Kasra in forms—(2) م.
and كفا (3) - reasons for Damma and Kasra here - (4) - Damma bad—
feeble explained—and, if correct, restricted
to certain positions—Fatha not allowable.

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 quies-
cent allowed by some—answer to their argu-
ment—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 need-
ed—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
8 9أعـال (2) vs., (a) pret. and imp. in vs. of
inf. ns. before mentioned—(b) imp. of 2nd pers.
in unaugmented tril. sound in ﺔ and ﺔ — (3)
ps., ﯥ and ﯥ of art.—quiescence of initial gener-
ally found in vs. and inf. ns.—not in pure ns.,
except ten irregular ns.—nor in ps., except ﯥ
and ﯤ of art.—Hamza in these ten ns. a com-
ensation for actual or virtual elision of ﯥ—
not found in all *trils* whose ل is elided—why prefixed to these جs—finals not actually elided in اُمسِرُّ، اُدْنُ، and اُدِّيابُمُ —but virtually in اُمسِرُّ إِنْمُمُ and اُمسِرُّ — actually in اُمسِرُّ إِنْمُمُ if م be considered *aug.*—and virtually in اُمسِرُّ إِنْمُمُ also—o.f. of (1) — proof of Fath of (a) its ُينَوُ — فُنَوُ — (b) its ع—evolution from o.f.—elided ل — no evidence in ُينَوُ — opinion of مُرجُ(2) — اُدِّيابُمُ — not to be copied—its م — اُدْنُانُ(3) — evolution— اُمسِرُّ اُدِّيابُمُ and اُمسِرُّ إِنْمُمُ — not elided from اُمسِرُّ — or اُمسِرُّ — their evolution—*conj.* Hamza why combined with ل—*fems.* of اُمسِرُّ، اُدِّيابُمُ، اُمسِرُّ، اُدْنُانُ(4)— اُمسِرُّ، اُدِّيابُمُ، اُمسِرُّ—(5) — اُمسِرُّ، اُدِّيابُمُ، اُمسِرُّ—(6) — اُمسِرُّ، اُدِّيابُمُ، اُمسِرُّ—(7) — اُمسِرُّ، اُدِّيابُمُ، اُمسِرُُ—(8) — اُمسِرُّ، اُدِّيابُمُ، اُمسِرُُ—(9) — اُمسِرُّ، اُدِّيابُمُ، اُمسِرُُ—(10) — 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 ج —
Hamza in their ج. — Hamza of ج. — according to S, aug. — but, according to Khl, rad. —
and orig. ج. — opinion of IM — ج. — these initials quiescent — and therefore proceeded by mobile aug. Hamzas in inceptive positions — impracticability of beginning with quiescent not peculiar to Arabic.

Khl on Hamza of ج — (3) tril. or numerically quad. pret. — but found in quin. or sex. pret. — and in their s. and in imp. 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) ton ns. mentioned in § 667—with conjunct ʾāl and ʾālam—ʾāl. as worthy of separate mention as ʾālam,—distinction between them possible—but immaterial ʾāl, not specified here—ʾāl, dial. var. of ʾāl, should be mentioned—rule in case of doubt—conjunct ʾāl—conj. Hamza why put—dispensed with when quiescent initial becomes mobile—ʾālam for ʾālam—but ʾālam ʾālam for ʾāl, rather than ʾālam, for ʾāl—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) Fatḥa necessary in ʾāl—(2) Ḥammā necessary in (a) pret. pass.—(b) imp. of tril. when such imp. is orig. pronounced with Ḥammā of ʿāl—Kasra sometimes found before original Ḥammā—causes of these two vars.—Kasra said to be corrupt—(3) Ḥammā preponderant over Kasra in 2nd pers. sing. fem. of imp. of tril. when Ḥammā of ʿāl is accidentally replaced by Kasra—opinion of F on Ishmām of first and third letters here—and of IM—(4) Fatḥa
preponderant over Kasra in 

(5) Kasra preponderant over Damma in 

(6) Damma, Kasra, or Ishmām allowable in pass. of such prets. as 

(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—ezs.—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—\( \text{\'\'\'\'} \), etc., not said—\( \text{\'\'\'\'} \) a poetic license—\( \text{\'\'\'\'} \) 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 Hamzae
of \( \text{ذ} \) and \( \text{ج} \) — exs.—both methods used among the Seven—conj. Hamza not elided when pronounced with Fat', as when pronounced with Ka'ar or Damm—nor sounded true.

§ 670. \( \text{ال} \) of \( \text{ه} \) is quiescent, when preceded by \( \text{ف} \), or by \( \text{ل} \) of inception, often quiescent—sometimes mobile—similarly imp. \( \text{ف} \) with, and \( \text{ل} \) quiescence accidental, but elegant, in \( \text{s} \) — and in imp. \( \text{أ} \) is \( \text{ه} \) and \( \text{ل} \) لیقضوا, and \( \text{أ} \) لیقضوا, and \( \text{ه} \) لیقضوا — 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 \( \text{أ} \) and \( \text{ه} \), \( \text{ل} \), \( \text{ف} \), \( \text{ل} \) and \( \text{ه} \) — quiescence allowable in imp. \( \text{ل} \) — not in \( \text{l} \) of \( \text{ك} \) — quiescence of \( \text{s} \) after \( \text{م} \) — and of imp. \( \text{م} \) لیقضوا — \( \text{ل} \) analogous to \( \text{م} \) لیقضوا, and \( \text{l} \) لیقضوا — \( \text{ل} \) inelegant, and \( \text{ل} \) لیقضوا superior to it—quiescence an accidental alleviation—and mobilization the \( \text{o.} \) — words of S.

CHAPTER VIII.—THE AUGMENTATIVENESS OF LETTERS.

§ 671. Common to \( \text{n} \) and \( \text{v} \) — no augmentation in \( \text{p} \) —
meaning of augmentation—this process coordinative or non-coordinative—meaning of coordinative augmentation—
but not nor and meaning of coordination—its use—effect of coordinative augment upon meaning—augs.
not coordinative when regularly importing a particular meaning—causes of augmentation—
(1) indication of meaning—(2) coordination—
IM 's definition of it—(3) prolongation—(4) compensation— (5) magnification of sense, and multiplication of letter—(6) making articulation possible—(7) making the vowel plain, or completely plain—letters of augmentation, or aug. letters, with their mnemonic combinations—best of such combinations—meaning of “letters of augmentation”—reduplicative augment, coordinative or non-coordinative—non-reduplicative coordinative augment—aug. repetitive or non-repetitive—repetitive aug.—its condition—repetition (a) of two out of three rads.—opinion of IM on and of KK on —(b) of or of separated from its duplicate by a rad.—(c) of two letters to form a quad., (1) if its third be not omissible—opinion of Khl and KK—(2) if its third be omissible—opinion of KK—of Zj—of rest of BB—opinion
of KK preferred by BD—non-repetitive aug.—

8 omitted by Mb from letters of augmentation—these ten letters why peculiar to augmentation—،،،،،،، and آ—remaining seven letters—measurement or exemplification—its use—"م" constituted as measure—its crude-form, not its actual conformation, here intended—rads. how represented in measure—this representation explained—e.g. with three rads.—and with more—measurement of tril. agreed upon—but of non-tril. disputed between BB and KK—three opinions among KK—thus four measures possible for augs.—augs. how represented in measure—representation of repetitive aug. disputed—aug. when repetitive, and when not—incorporation 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 definitions (1) explained and exemplified—(2) criticized—neither definition inclusive or exclusive—accurate formula for recognizing aug.—(3) defended by IUK—improved definition of aug.—indications of augmentativeness—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

§ 673. when judged to be aug.—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. | when medial—and when final—| of
and | like | of
like | of
| meaning of

§ 674. 

| and | when judged to be aug.—| their three
| and | states—|—
| Arabic—| opinion of IAI on its measure—
| said to be foreign— | or — its first
| ——why decided to be aug.— | both | is | not
| rad. or aug., nor second aug.—
| its
| rad., and | and | aug.— | its | not imagined
| by any one to be rad.— | aug. with (1) three
| rads.—(2) four or more rads., when it is (a)
| non-initial—(b) initial, if word be a n.—positions of aug. | in n. and v.—additional
| exs.— | how known to be aug. in these exs.—
| both | s | rad. in | ——also | in
| and | and | not aug. in last two formations—or | —initial

§ 675. 

| not aug. when initial—opinion of majority—
| of | always aug. when medial with
| three or more rads.—its positions in such cases
| —positions of aug. | in n. and v.

1131-1138
1138-1141
§ 676. Ḍ resembles Hamza in augmentativeness—

aug. Ḍ and Hamza mostly initial—non-initial not aug., except when so indicated—

Hamza aug. in n. and v., but Ḍ only in n.—

why not in v.—initial Ḍ aug. oftener than

initial Hamza—universally aug. in certain

formations—derivation the test—made
to accord with 

exceptional—derivation of 

conditions of aug. Ḍ—exs.—additional condition— Ḍ fulfilling conditions judged
to be aug. in absence of contrary indication—

such indication decisive— Ḍ—opinion of

AAMr— Ḍ—non-initial Ḍ not

judged to be aug., except on plain indication—

and its vars.—opinion of Mz— Ḍ—

and its cat.—predicament of Ḍ 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. Ḍ.

§ 677. Ḍ aug., (1) when final, upon two conditions—

additional condition—apparently applicable to

final Hamza also— Ḍ and Ḍ as a termination—
judged to be **aug.** unless otherwise indicated—

— حسان, فیدان — مران — مران

derivation and declension of حسان — and of 

— 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— (2) when medial, upon three conditions—for three reasons—

aug in عربند — and but

rad. in (a) — though aug. in (b)

— عدنیب، خندویس، عنقود، قنديل، ظنار

— though aug. in عدنل، عنسال، عنبلس،

— كنابل، خندوب، غونیف (c) — كنابل (d)

— explanation of its double.

— its measure—(3) when initial, in aor. — ن

regularly aug. in certain formations omitted by IM—other aug. ن s not mentioned by him—positions of aug. ن —in other cases ن rad., with some exceptions.

§ 678. **aug.** in (1) **fem.**، (a) فم. — حنیف and **fem.**، حنیف

and **fem.** — but not **fem.**—"**fem.**explained

— **sing.** or **pl.**—quiescent of feminization

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 derive.—and without—(4) quasi-pass.—بُرِسُ— in other positions not judged to be aug., unless so indicated—أجمان aug. when (1) initial —فعولتي وفعلوت— and —فعلات عناوين —فعلوت — opinion of S on final ت after aug. preceded by three or more rads. —and after aug. preceded by three rads. —عنقوتو ن —سورت —(3) medial—عنقوتو —كلتا —in other cases راد., unless otherwise indicated.

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

§ 680. regulary—of and of —refutation of Z on former—(2) by hearsay—theory of S—loss of mobility in of and —anomalous use of and as compensation for it—aor. of according to S—criticism of Mb on his theory—theory of Fr—aor. according to him—objection to his theory— neglected by IM and his son—only nine letters of augmentation mentioned in Alfiya—excuse for omission of .
§ 681. ِ ج aug. in (1) dems.—added there to indicate distance—generally mobile, and pronounced with کسر—(2) ِ زيدل، ِ ميدل—فاصل ِ ج ِ عبدل ambiguous—ِ ج used as a letter of augmentation—but rarely—being the least aug. letter—regular only in dem.—but heard in other words—opinion of ِ أکح on ِ ج of ِ عبدل —contrary opinion expressed by him—remaining instances dubious—augmentativeness of ِ ج denied by ِ أکح—no evidence of it in ِ ج of dem.—this ِ ج rightly not a letter of augmentation —ِ ج explained by him as ِ راد. in three other words—but apparently aug. in all.

§ 681 A. Letters of augmentation when judged to be ِ راد. 1180-1181

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 ِ إکن—difference between these two definitions—conversion included by ِ إک—less comprehensive than substitution—peculiar to unsound letters and ِ حامزه—compensation different from both—meaning of "original" and "substituted" or "subst." —classification of substituted letters—ِ إک's object in this chapter—incorporative substitution
not considered here—letters of non-incorporative substitution common in (1) etymology—substitution of other letters anomalous or rare—excluded by “common”—not mentioned by IM in Tashil—not fully discussed by him here—(2) speech of Arabs—mnemonic phrases combining each of these two sets of letters of non-incorporative common substitution—remaining letters of alphabet anomalously substituted—implied instances of substitution common in speech of Arabs—meaning of “common” in this phrase—dialectic substitution a department of lexicology rather than etymology—this the language of IM—letters of general, inclusive of necessary, substitution reckoned by many as twelve—reduced by some to eleven—increased by others to fourteen—and so stated by IH—but asserted to be reckoned by Z as thirteen—this reckoning disapproved by IH—substitution of س in اسم merely incorporative—but not in س—fifteen really mentioned by Z—these being often substituted—eleven mentioned by S and IJ—seven added by some, making eighteen—opinion of S the well-known one—س and ج added by St—and ش of کهکشة not reckoned by S—said to be substituted for ب—م for خ—
for Hamza—these substitutions rare and anomalous—originals of substituted letters—substitution recognizable by reversion to original—

and—conclusion to be drawn from absence of reversion—substr. 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—

substitution 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 substr. be in deriv. or in o. f.—obscurity of IH's expressions here—(5) "the fact that an unknown formation would be entailed"—

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, أ, and ف—order of mention—substitution for, and necessary in four cases, where, or ا is (1) final after اع. ا—أي—أو—أي associated with, and ا—substitution retained with adventitious ی of femininization, but disallowed with un-adventitious—converse case—predicament of two اع. of du.—no substitution in ی غ curtailed form of voc. غاری—و غاری of غار not 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 v. whose خ is transformed—this substitution extended to خ فعال and خ فعل when not act. parts.—dispute as to whether act. part. be subordinate to v. in transformation and sounding true—manner of substitution— ا or ا disregarded in act. part. by Mb—Hamza in both خ ت and خ تا written as خ—but not changed into pure خ in either—rad. خ not sounded true in خ تا, any more than rad. ا in خ تا—setting of خ in خ تا and خ تا disallowed—(3) after ا of خ فعل in pl., when
such \( \varepsilon \) or \( \imath \) is an aug. letter of prolongation third in sing. — 1 associated with \( \imath \) and \( \hat{\imath} \) — IM's rule for third case — reason given by LI for converting this letter of prolongation into Hamza — and by Khi — no conversion when \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) or \( \dot{\imath} \) in sing. is (a) not a letter of prolongation — (b) not aug. — and anomalous — as also (c) not third — (d) second of two soft letters having \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) of between them — reason for changing soft letter after \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) of pl. into Hamza — dispute as to whether this substitution be peculiar to pl. — this Hamza also written as undotted \( \imath \) — fifth case peculiar to \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) — IHsh's rule for it — two cases included under this rule — substitution in these exs. not necessary, but allowable — rule given by Z and IX — by R — by — 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 \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) — change of first necessary where condition is fulfilled, and allowable elsewhere — restriction as to initiality of first \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) — theory of IM that conjunction of the two \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) should
not be accidental—opinion of others—allowable substitution of Hamza for letter of softness when (1) a  permsanently 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 Kasr 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) Kasr—cause of this substitution—its irregularity disputed—  of  not converted— (b) Fath—(b) a letter of prolongation—reason for substitution here—(3) a  when (a) an initial pronounced with Fath— for  —dispute as to whether it is a dial. var.— for  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  —  —(2)  and  —Hamza a subst. for  in  —not in  —substitution for  —
—these allowable and irregular substitutions why not mentioned here by IM—substitution of Hamza for خ and غ —very strange.

§ 684. ) substituted for four letters—or five—its substitution for ٥ and ى regular and irregular—regular upon eleven conditions, (1) that they be mobile—(2) that their vowel be original—(3) that letter before them be pronounced with Fatha—(4) that this Fatha be conjoined with them—these four conditions indicated by IM—(5) that their conjunction be original—this condition omitted in IM, IA, and Aud—(6) that letter after them be mobile if they be خ or غ, and be not ٥ or double ى if they be ل or س—this condition indicated by IM—exs. of خ and ل sounded true on breach, and transformed on fulfilment, of this condition. ٥ and غ زرروت عصون ٥ and غ زرروت رميزت —but, غ زرروت رميزت —reason for sounding غ true before ل or double ى—(7, 8) that neither of them be ل انعل whose qual. is انعل, or of its inf. n.—these two conditions indicated by IM—reason for sounding غ true in such ل or inf. n.— ل انعل —(9) that ل be not of انعل denoting reciprocity—this condition indicated by IM—
and ٍئَتْنَ ٌرَتْنُ — this condition not applied to ٍئَتْنَ — (10) that neither of them be immediately followed by another transformable letter—this condition indicated by IM—first of two consecutive transformables usually sounded true—second being transformed—or sounded true—first sometimes transformed, and second sounded true—۪ۭۭ ۪ۭ، ۪ۭ، ۪ۭ، ۪ۭ، ۪ۭ، ۪ۭ، ۪ۭ، ۪ۭ، ۪ۭ، and ۪ۭ (for ۪ۭ) — objections to statement that ۪ۭ is for ۪ۭ — or ۪ۭ — or ۪ۭ —six modes of accounting for ۪ۭ — or eight—consequential transformation—two transformations allowable when separate, and not absolutely disallowed by IM when consecutive — (11) that neither of them be ۸۸۸ of word ending in augment peculiar to ۸۸۸—this condition indicated by IM—۳۳۳ and د۸ ۳۸۸—conflict of opinion when word ends in ۸۸۸ and ۸۸۸—or abbreviated ۸۸۸ of feminization—۳ of feminization disregarded—two other conditions—that ۸۸۸ be not a subst. for a letter not transformable—nor be in place of such a letter—reason for sounding ۸۸۸ true in ۸۸۸، as explained by IM—and by some—another condition—not needed—۴۸ ۴۸ ۴۸ and
weakness of two last—ياءٌ—ياءٌ—ياجل and مازور—داوي of du. convertible into َّ ال for Hamza (1) obligatory—meaning of "obligatory"—(2) regular, but not obligatory—its substitution for ُن or Tanwîn in pause upon (1) acc. pronounced with Tanwîn—(2) v. to which single corrob. ُن preceded by letter pronounced with Fath is affixed—(a) تاجج for تاجج (b) تاجج for تاجج —(3) َءاذن why substituted for ُن in these positions—its substitution for ُن َء for ُن—(3) explanation given in KF.

§ 685. َُل most extensive subst.—substituted for nine letters—its substitution why so frequent—regular and anomalous—regular for three letters—for َّ in two cases, where preceding letter is (1) pronounced with Kasr—َّينين and َّغرب—(b) َّغرب—why then converted into َّ في—(2) َّ of dim.—for َّ in ten cases, where َّ is (1) preceded by Kasra, and (a) final—َّ why then converted into َّ for َّ(b) before َّ of femininization—َّ why then converted into َّ—no distinction here between separable and inseparable َّ—two anomalies—(a) َّسوسة for َّ its measure and other peculiarities—(b)
no third anomaly—arab. سواسة used as pl. سواسة and سواسة—Ibr's explanation of سواسة before ِ of feminization, abbreviated or prolonged—(d) before pl. ن ū and (2) ū of inf. n. having the ū of its v. transformed, and its own ū preceded by Kasra and followed by ِ and جوا أ and جوا أ and جوا أ—transformation rare

where ِ is lacking—anomalous to sound, true when conditions of transformation are fulfilled—ن ū—no counterpart of it—ت ūم after it here—حوج—(b) quiescent, provided that in pl. it be followed by ِ and then overpowered by Kasra in pl.—no necessity for ِ after it here—حوج—(b) quiescent, provided that in pl. it be followed by ِ and then overpowered by Kasra in pl.—five conditions of conversion here—ع sounded true if ِ be missing—ن ū—explained as expanded from ن ū or contracted from ن ū or transformed from ن ū to distinguish pl. of ū bull
from pl. of مور slab (of dried curd)—also sounded true if mobile in sing.—and or if ل be unsound—(4) final, fourth or upwards, and after فتح—why changed into in pret. and pass. part.—pret. here conformable to aor., and pass. part. to act.

part. يُشَابِيَ — نُدْعِيَنا and (5) quiescent, single, and immediately after كسر—سُوْأَر and لُمْلُعُونَانَ — لَدَنِيَ — نُعْلَى and لُمْلُظًا of ep. لُمْلُظ use of لُمْلُظ as substantive—لُمْلُظ of substantive لُمْلُظ not altered—conflict of opinion—(7) combined with ل in single, or virtually single, word, while first of them is quiescent, original in nature and quiescence—سُيَدَ their measure فَعَلِّي — لَتْ — فَعَلِّي and sounded true if ل and ل be in separate words—or if first of them be mobile—or adventitious in nature—or quiescence—رُيَ — عَرْأَةُ، أَيُومْ، ضُوْمُونَ — راٰ and لُمْلُظ — dim. of n. whose third is a mobile ل and whose broken pl. is on measure of
—treatment of this in dim. how accounted for—dim. of اسوت when an ep.—of عمومی and pl. and dim. of گبول —(8) ل of گبول from v. whose ع is pronounced with Kasr in pret.—this ل why converted into ى — and pronounced with Fath— ی عیدی —reason for either treatment of ع—different versions of ex. cited in Aud—(9) ل of pl. عصی، نطول، and دل—sounding ل true anomalous in pl.—necessary in sing.— ی عیدی and ی عیدی —IM's language in Alfiya—(10) ع of pl. فعل sound in ل ی وما and ی وما and ی وما more frequent— sounded true if ل be unsound—or be separated from ع by ل ی وما anomalous—substitution of ی for ل and ی in gen. and acc. of du. and perf. pl. masc.—its substitution (1) for ل (a) regular—(b) anomalous or weak—(2) for د (a) regular—(b) anomalous—dispute as to regularity of ی وما—and of ی وما، ی وما، and ی وما—it's substitution for Hamza (1) regular, but not obligatory—(2) necessary—substitution of ی and ی for Hamza necessary in two
cats.— anomaly substituted for many letters—its substitution for rest of above-mentioned nine letters confined to hearsay—frequent in such as (1) and meaning of "such as"—second duplicate not converted in unsaturated tri._—substitution of ى for (a) first duplicate when a non-inf. substantive—not ending in ُ of femininization — ديفيميس and ُ اخيراً — جيلود and ُ تروتر — (b) second duplicate or third triplicate in (a) dispute as to whether this form be deriv. or original— (d) — ُ زربيك (e) — ُ نصيت — ُ لم يتنس and ُ تظنيت — ُ سبي — تسريت — ُ يا تي (g) — ُ تقض — تقسي (f) — ُ تقدير (h) — ُ نصية ُ دهينت— its measure and formation—(i) ُ تلميت— its formation—(j) ُ صاصوت— their formation—(k) ُ ونامی— their formation—(l) ُ طیب، ُ دیوان (m) — ُ دیپاس and ُ شرزا — (o) ُ نامی (n)— its sing._—substitution of for for ى , ب , ع, ث — these four
substitutions weak—and, for ج — ی substituted for eighteen letters in all.

§ 686. ی substituted for three letters—for ی in one case, where preceding letter is pronounced with دامم—ی in four cases, where ی occurs (1) quiescent, single, in a sing., and after دامم—ی unchanged if mobile—or incorporated—or in a pl., preceding دامم being then converted into کسر—(2) after دامم as ل of (a) فعل—(b) a n. ending in fundamental, inseparable, غ of feminization—زمان—ن. ending in sing. and (c) a n. ending in aug. (3) as ل of فعل when a substantive سعودي، ی، and said to be anomalous—meaning of “anomalous”—spellings of طفیعی (4) as ل of فعل when (a) a substantive طولانی لک—(b) an ep. acting as a substantive—indication of its so acting—أ.م. of طولانی، لک، when a pure ep., said by GG to be converted into کسر، and جیبی—opinion of IM and his son—its differences from saying of GG—language of Shl—طیبی as a substantive—substitution of ی (1) for ی (a) obligatory in such as (a) گذارب.
and cause of conversion in dim.—and in broken pl.—(b) ضوپیب (c) ورام (d) ضوفرب and رکویی (e) ضرفرب and ارویم (f) لواپن, etc., and etc., —cause of conversion—(s) here assumed to be orig. 8—(b) weak in such as and every final l converted by Fazāra and some of Kais into ی in pause—reason for such conversion—heaviness of ی why tolerated in pause—similar excuse for conversion of l into Hamza—ی retained by Tayyi in continuity—l converted by some of Tayyi into ی in pause—ی more frequent then, in dial. of Tayyi—ی retained in continuity—reason for conversion of l into ی or ی —(2) for ی obligatory in such as (a) طاریب, یمیر and مقوی and میثاق, یمیر and مقوی and میثاق, یمیر and مقوی —(b) ضوپیب and تقؤی (c) تقؤی —(b) anomalous, weak, in such as (a) مشقو (b) مشقو —reason for change of ی into ی here—(c) جبارة —dispute as to reality of change in and ی —dim. of ی and ی —of ی and
the last said to be a weak dial. var.—substitution of گ for Hamza (1) allowable—(2) necessary—substitution of ج for گ.

§ 687. م substituted for four letters, (1) م, necessarily, in م alone—evolution of م من from م—vowel of its ف—م in م said by Akh to be a subst. for گ—م (a) aprothetic—(b) pre. to ی of 1st pers.—م زید فی، فی، فی، فی—م (c) pre. to more correct than فی فی—م (c) pre. to explicit n., or to pron. other than ی of 1st pers.—م combined with م in م م م م—explanation suggested by F—opinion of S—another explanation reported by F—opinion of IJ—dial. vars. of م—(2) ل of art., in dial. of some—(3) ن, (a) regularly before ب, when ن is quiescent—language of IM—reason of conversion—immaterial whether ب and ن be in one word or two—ن written as ن, though pronounced as م—change of ن into م not properly termed “conversion”—(b) anomalously.
without ب, when ن is (a) quiescent—(b) mobile—converse substitution of م ن for م ب in (a) بذات مذكر —opinions of IS and IJ—sometimes pronounced with undotted ح—(b) زائد —opinions of AASh and IJ—(c) نغم م why used as subst. for these four letters.

§ 688. ن substituted for four letters, (1) صعاني م —(2) ل —opinion of S—of Mb—of others—that of S preferable—ن here why not a subst. for Hamza of feminization—(2) ل —أるもの —or a separate dial. var.—енный صعاني — لغن and characterized by IH as anomalous, and لع as weak—(3) م —(4) Hamza—alleged substitution of ن in فعال، masc. of Hamza of ملا —"substitution" here merely alternation—this application of "alternation" tropical.

§ 689. ف substituted for seven letters, (1, 2) ف and م، when (a) a ف—such substitution (a) regular in and its variations—meaning of IH's language—this substitution how indicated by IM—reason for change of ف into م—theory that substitution here is
always for بـ and ابـن—1 not included with بـ and ابـن—dialectic peculiarities

—(b) irregular in numerous expressions

and تُكَبَّرُ and تُكَبَّرُ and تُكَبَّرُ and تُكَبَّرُ and تُكَبَّرُ—measure of last two—نوراة necessary in default of نوراة

إختحت (b) a ل, in (a) تْلَد and تْلَد—نوراة and نوراة—بنم their rad.—meaning of "rad."

sign of feminization in them—بنت used oftener than بنم—SF's opinion on ت in and

-کَثَا (c) - اخْتِحت بنم (d) - مترادها - its ت a subst. for or ابـن—بنت

-its ت a subst. for ت—its formation—مترادها

-its ت a subst. for ت—its formation—مترادها

-its ت a subst. for ت—its formation—مترادها

—their dial. var.—their ت not a subst. for ت—possible o. f. of ذَدَت —its rel. n.

—said by Fr to be a dial. var.—its ت why not original—regarded by IH as sole instance of unincorporative substitution for س—(b) ست—its formation—
§. 690. s substituted for six letters, (1) Hamza, (a) aug., in (a) هِمْـتـي (b) هَمْـتـي (c) هَمْـتـي (d) هَمْـتـي — aors. — all four exs. transmitted by ISk — (b) rad., in (a) لَهْـمـك (b) لَهْـمـك — Hamza here why altered into s — (a) كَـمْ (b) كَـمْ — (d) كَـمْ — (e) كَـمْ and (f) كَـمْ — Hamza in these cases why changed into s — substitution of s for Hamza confined to hearsay—(2) i., in (a) أَنَْـه (b) حَـلْـه (c) حَـلْـه — opinions on its s — (h) حَـلْـه — opinions on its last s — (c) حَـلْـه and (b) حَـلْـه — i. q. or (f) كَـمْ — opinions on its s in former case—
dispute about its last reesome of BB—of Z and IH—of AZ, Akh, and KK—of others—substitution of  for I anomalous—

dispute as to whether its last  be substituted for  or for I converted from —meaning of I here—
it's last a subst. for in pause—or in pause and continuity alike—such substitution not regular—subsidiary to introduction of conj. in continuity—conj. elided in pause—last  of quiescent in pause, rarely in continuity—mostly pronounced with Kasr in continuity, with or without conj. —proof that  is not for femininization—(b) , etc., in pause—continuity sometimes treated like pause, and pause like contin-
unity—(b) and —regard-
ed by many as a dial. var.—measure of —like that of —its o. f.—measure of —
(d) —(e) —(f) , in (a) —(b) —(c) —distiguished by some from 

§. 691. I substituted for two letters, (1) —dim. of —or a sing. n. peculiar
to the dim.—effect of dim. formation on its
sense—alternative forms.

§ 692. ل substituted for two letters, (1) ﺛ ، (a)
regularly in إِنْتَعَلَ 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—ي of v., if ل ، then incorp-
orated into ل of pron.—substitution why
anomalous—(2) ﺟـ — لـ and ﺟـ.

§ 693. ﺟ substituted for three letters, (1) ﺛ in (a)
إِنْتَعَلَ ، (a) regularly after ﺟ ، ﺟ ، or ﺟ —
and mostly ﺟ then incorporated into it—
causes of conversion and incorporation—
incorporative conversion not relevant here—
after ﺟ conversion necessary, and incorporation
usual—(b) anomalously after ﺟ —conversion
why anomalous—exas.—confined to hearsay—
(b) some anomalous formations, (a) ﺟـ and
ٕـ—(b) دِلْجِ —reason for supposing its
ٕ to be a subst. for ﺛ —this substitution not
to be copied—contrasted with cases (a, a) and
§ 694. 
\( \text{ج} \) substituted for \( \text{ي} \) 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—(3) and (4) of substitution—

vocalization of \( \text{ج} \)—substitution more anomalous here than in cases (1, a), (1, b), and (2, a)—\( \text{ج} \) in possibly a subst. for \( \text{ي} \) of \( \text{كودا} \).
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 \( ز \) 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) \( ز \)—
(4) \( خ \) for two letters, \( ج \) and Hamza—(5) \( خ \) for
two letters, \( خ \) and Hamza—(6) \( خ \) for
\( خ \) —reciprocity between them—(8) \( ق \) for
(9) \( ك \) for two letters, (a) \( ق \) — reciprocity
between them—(b) \( ت \) — (11) \( ش \) for
three letters, (a) \( ك \) — (b) \( ج \) — observation
by IU—(c) \( س \) — (13) \( ض \)
for ل ض — wrongly put here, instead of ض by some MSS — جم, not جم, given by lexicologists for ل (14) ل — جم (15) for د (18) — ط (17) — ن (16) — ل (20), س (22) — ز (21) for three letters،

— devised — ت (a) — adduced by Z as evidence that س is a letter of substitution — ش (b) — س (23) ط — no instance of its unincorporative substitution — ث (24) ح for two letters، د and ث، س — ث (25) ث for two letters، ف and ث (26) ف (27) ب — ب (b) (28) م — م (29) ف

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—ъ, ы, 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—ъ, ы, ى found in ns., vs., and ps.—ъ not rad. in decl. ns. or in vs.—rad. in ps., uninf. ns., imitative eje., and foreign names—formations sound or unsound—quad. n. or v.—quin.—condition of reduplication in quad.—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 IH—reduplicated also formed, and not formed, with Hamza—definition of "formed with Hamza"—and of "reduplicated"—such formations as ٣٥٤٥٤ ٣٥٤٥٣ not named "reduplicated"—seven divisions of unsound formations—their names.
§. 698. Positions of unsound letters—

agreement between unaug.  and  in (1) occurrence of either as (a)  ف  — (b)  ع  — (c)  ل  — (d)  ع  and  ل  — double  or  as rare here as double guttural—double Hamza not used—double  extraordinary—(2) precedence of either before the other as  ع  and  ل  respectively—precedence of  ل  more frequent—only instances of either—difference between them in (1) precedence of  ل  before as  ف  or  ع  and  ل  respectively—converse precedence not found—

held by S to be a subst. for second  ل  — first  ع  in  حکاکان  why not converted into  ل  — or incorporated into second— in  حکاکان  held by Mz to be original—opinion of S correct—his remarks on  ع  why substituted for its last —(2) occurrence of  ف  as (a)  ل  and  ع  —

like  کثف  and  ع  (b)  ف  —  دیرون  and  ع  —  یدیت  and  ع  not so used in either case, except in (a)  اول  — opinion of R—homogeneity of  ف  and  ع  rare—less disagreeable with separation or incorporation—(b)  وار — its o. f.—its component letters—reasons for considering its  ع  a  ع  — its dim. —  ع  a  ع  more often than  ل
repeated—repeated—repeated
—similarity of \( \text{ل} \) and \( \text{ر} \) rare in
tril.—(3) occurrence of \( \text{ع}, \text{ن} \), and
\( \text{ل} \), contrary to \( \text{و} \) with possible exception of
\( \text{د} \) or \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{س} \), etc.—their
\( \text{أ} \) of \( \text{ب} \), \( \text{ض} \), etc.—their
\( \text{ب} \) of \( \text{م} \) and \( \text{ن} \), etc.—
measure of \( \text{ج} \).

---

THE AND AS.

§. 699. (1) retained unaltered—why so treated—\\
(2) elided in (a) aors.—o. f. of \( \text{لم} \) and
—their \( \text{ي} \) why elided—elision desirable for
alleviation—Their \( \text{ي} \) why not elided—or their
Kaara—\( \text{و} \) why not elided—Theory of
KK on reason for elision—\( \text{و} \) retained if letter
after it be pronounced with Fath—\\
—elision extended to remaining variations of
aor., and to imp.—(b) inf. ns.—o. f. of \( \text{ع} \)
said to be (a) \( \text{ع} \) — its \( \text{ي} \) 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) دَهَنُو—ةً in دَهَنُو a compensation for elided و—in دَهَنُو and دَهَنُو, why combined with و—elision of و—(c) دَهَنُو—ite

why pronounced with Kasr in سَهَنُو—سَهَنُو and دَهَنُو. و—سَهَنُو or سَهَنُو—سَهَنُو and دَهَنُو—دَهَنُو—(3) converted—ي like و, except in elision—not elided in انر.—exs.—why not elided—ْيَس and ْيَس—only instances of elision—conversion of و—конverted into Hamza, (1) necessarily, when initial and followed by a mobile و—or rather by a , 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 دَهَنُو—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 و, why not converted into و—(2) allowable in such as 8 جو
asphalt, and according to Liz, the fatih...
peculiar to dial. of Band Asad—imp. of 

—indication that conversion of 

and 

into  {

} or  {

} is regular—language of Sf, 

F, and others—of IH—

this conversion of  {

} into  {

} found only in aor.

whose  {

} is pronounced with Fath, and said by 

S not to be regular—aoristic  {

} not pronounced with Kasr here.

§ 702. Substitution of  {

} for  {

} when a

Hamza—this  {

} not converted into  {

} 

wrong—

and anomalous or 

rare—  {

} in act., or  {

} in pass., not changed 

into  {

} in chaste dial.—

not from  {

}—but from  {

}—so said by F—existence of 

contested by Zj—F's opinion verified—

or from  {

}—this derivation better—some 

Bdd reported to allow conversion of  {

} into 

wrong—

and vulgar.

THE AND  {

} AS  {

}.

§ 703. Transformed, elided, or preserved—transfor-

mation—three modes of transformation in 

— (1) conversion—into  

—precluded in
... reasons for conversion into \( \overline{1} \) — its cause not very substantial — operative only on \( \underline{1} \) or \( \underline{\overline{1}} \), and easily restrained from action — principally effective in \( \underline{v} \) — this transformation original in \textit{pret. act.} of unaugmented \textit{tril.} — and conformable to original in \textit{aor.}, \textit{act.} or \textit{pass.}, of unaugmented \textit{tril.}, and in \textit{pret. act.}, and \textit{aor. pass.}, of two augmented \textit{trils}, \( \underline{\text{إ}}\text{سنفعل} \) and \( \underline{\text{فعل}} \) and \( \underline{\text{فعل}} \)

— but not found in \textit{aor.} whose \( \underline{\text{ع}} \) is \textit{orig.} pronounced with \( \underline{\text{دام}} \) or \( \underline{\text{كر}} \) — classification of \textit{ns.} subjected to this transformation — conversion into \( \underline{1} \) found in (a) \textit{tril.} \( n. \) — (b) \( \underline{\text{v. (a)}} \)

\( \text{تاميل} \) — (b) conformable to \textit{tril.} — (c) \textit{n.} conformable to (b, a) or (b, b) — contrary to (a)  

\( \text{تاميل} \) — (b) \( \text{باجل} \) anomalous — or \( \text{باع} \) regular, but weak — (a)  

\( \text{باع} \) and \( \text{باع} \) — conditions of conversion in two last — (b)  

\( \text{باد} \) and \( \text{باد} \) and \( \text{باد} \) and \( \text{باد} \) and \( \text{باد} \) and \( \text{باد} \) and \( \text{باد} \) and \( \text{باد} \) — these formations disqualified for conversion of \( \underline{\text{ع}} \) into \( \underline{1} \) — contrary to \( \underline{\text{قائ}} \) and
o
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and not a superfluous repetition—

(b) allowable in such as (a) سید and 

(b) ظفر شد and ظفرة — 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. 

being regular in assimilate ep.— and latter orig. — transformation of فعل into فعل — opinion of S preferable—elision why necessary in latter cat.—

(c) rare in — preservation of and — reasons for it in such as (1) حرفیه and — (2) مرنين، جولان، حیوان — additional reason in latter cat.— (3) قبایل and

§ 704. Tril. vs. whose is unsound — — formations of us. in cats. of and — no in cat. of , nor in cat. of — یگیه — their pret.— and o. f. — (b) فعال in cat. of (a) — (b), anomalously—(2) intermixtures of two dial. vars.— refutation of (2) — and of (1, b, b). —
§ 705. Transmutation of 乡村振兴 when its 乡村振兴 is or 乡村振兴 into 乡村振兴 on attachment of mobile 乡村振兴 pron.—乡村振兴 and 乡村振兴 not 乡村振兴—but 乡村振兴 dispute on manner of transition from 乡村振兴 to 乡村振兴—theory (1) of many that 乡村振兴 is transmuted into 乡村振兴—this opinion adopted by Z and 乡村振兴 IM—(2) of IH that 乡村振兴 and Kasr are for explanation of the 乡村振兴 as a scion of 乡村振兴 and 乡村振兴 respectively—meaning of "scion"—his argument—reason given by earlier authorities for suggesting transmutation—his argument in reply—(3) of R—alleged transmutation of 乡村振兴 into 乡村振兴 and 乡村振兴 and 乡村振兴—no transmutation without mobile 乡村振兴 pron., except in 乡村振兴 and 乡村振兴—explanation of these two.

§ 706. Vocalization of letter preceding unsound 乡村振兴 in 乡村振兴 pass. of pret., tril. or on measure of 乡村振兴 or 乡村振兴—dial. vars. in cat. of (1) and 乡村振兴—a pure 乡村振兴—evolution of 乡村振兴—and 乡村振兴—opinion of S in § 710 strengthened—(b) Ishmâm—this dial. var. chaste—(c) pure 乡村振兴—evolution of 乡村振兴—and 乡村振兴—opinion of Akh in § 710 strengthened—this dial. var. of
no account— fuller explanations—pure and explained by IH—and by Jx—latter explanation 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 —ambiguous forms avoided—and replaced by unambiguous—but not disallowed by Westerns—nor noticed by S—ambiguity disregarded by him—and pardoned by Sf—possible meaning of “avoided”—avoidance preferable—but not necessary with distinctive context—vocalization of their conj. Hamza.

§ 707. sounded true in (1) v. of wonder—(2) منع (3) of superiority—two causes assigned by IH—only second by S—no reason for first—i. q. إبتذال and إبتذال—(4) إبتذال —(5) إبتذال —(6) no reason for assigning any cause—distinction between إبتذال and إبتذال —(6) such as سود and سود —(7) variations of vs. whose ع is sounded.
true—เ sometimes (1) transformed in فعل denoting 'defects—and in its deriv.—(2)
anomalously sounded true in فعل and استفعل—to notify o. f. of conjug.

§. 708. Additional cause requisite for conversion of ی or ی into ی in penultimate after aug. ی—
nature of such cause—no conversion in ante-penultimate—Hamza in ی and ی and ی and ی and ی and ی
—why substituted for ی—first ی why not elided—Hamza in ی and ی, and in act. part, of unaugmented tril., said to be converted into Hamza when transformed in ی.—really converted into ی, and from ی into Hamza—elision of ی impossible—cause of its conversion into ی—and from ی into Hamza—this Hamza written as undotted ی — ی sounded true in act. part. when so sounded in ی.—ی and ل sometimes transposed in act. part. of hollow ی.—and always by Kh1 when its ل is Hamza—his argument—similar transposition by him

in جو and جو and جو and جو and جو and جو—answer to his argument—لا and للا and للا and للا

anomalous—its derivation—and forms.
§ 709. Pass. part. of tril. v. whose خ is unsound—evolution of "خ"—and why not "خ"—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 "خ"—and on alleviation of "خ"—anomalies in cat. of و—"خ"—cat. of ض treated as sound by Banū Tamīm—"خ" in poetry—"خ"—anomalous according to H—his opinion controverted—"خ"—said—and "خ"—complete form allowed by Mb as a poetic license—but regarded by A as a Tamīnī dialect. var.—opinion of ISh on pass. part. in cat. of ض—and of ض—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 \( \ddot{\text{a}} \) when a quiescent \( \ddot{\text{\text{c}}} \) preceded by \( \ddot{\text{\text{D}}} \)-ma and of Akh—reason for treatment advocated by S—and by Akh—reply to letter—exs.—measure of \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \) and \( \ddot{\text{\\&}} \) —and of Akh—Akh's rule
(1) contravened by himself in pass. part.—measure of \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \) or \( \ddot{\text{\\&}} \) —(2) inconsistent with hearsay—its measure and derivation—

§ 711. Transformation a property of \( \ddot{\text{\text{v}}} \)—imported to \( \ddot{\text{\text{n}}} \). only by conformity to \( \ddot{\text{\text{v}}} \)—unaugmented tril. n. (1) transformed when modelled on \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \), i. e. when on measure of \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \) or \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \) —conversion of \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \) necessary here—but sometimes omitted—such forms anomalous—no \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \) in hollow \( \ddot{\text{\text{n}}} \).—(2) treated as sound when not modelled on \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \) —transformation of inf. n. determined by that of \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \).

§ 712. Condition of transformation in augmented tril. n. not conformable to \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \)—difference from \( \ddot{\text{\text{\&}}} \) not prescribed in unaugmented tril.—why prescribed in augmented, and not in unaugmented—meaning of "conformable"
applicability of condition to na. hitherto mentioned—nature of prescribed difference—peculiar difference in 'تَّعَلَّمَ and 'بَلْعُ—exs. of augmented tril. with, and without, prescribed difference—rule as stated by A—two sorts of n. covered by it—(1) مَقَام* and (2) مَتَّعَ—5 of feminization no obstacle to agreement with v. in measure—anomalies—their object—مِمِّسَم* and مُذِدُب* and تِبْعُ and تِبْعُ or تِبْعُ—this sort of n. how distinguishable from v.—another condition prescribed by Mb—مَرَجُم* and مِمِّسَم* and تِبْعُ and تِبْعُ —n. resembling, or differing from, aor. in both measure and augment—first sort like بَيْض* and سُود* and بُيْض* and ثُوْب* and دَوْن* and اِبْطُح* and خَروْبة* and عِسْعَ و* and خَدْمَاء* and اِبِنَتَا* —transfer here anomalous—مَخْطَط*—second sort like بَيْض*—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—١٤٠٠٠، جدول، and الصبر.

§ 713. Non-final mobile ة، and ي* generally impervious to conversion, by preceding Kasra and ٍDamma, into ة and ة، respectively—and still stronger when doubled—، sometimes so converted for conformity—but not ي—such conversion found in (1) the inf. n. whose ي is transformed in the v.—though not necessarily in this way—١٤٠٠٠٠٠، contrasted with ١٤٠٠٠٠٠، حور—١٤٠٠٠٠٠، طرٓان and ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠، توام—and ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠، عرٓش، with ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠، قيم (2) the pl. whose ي is transformed in the sing.—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠، and of ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠، ثير—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠، and ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، طال—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠، دم (3) the pl. whose ي is quiescent in the sing., and followed by ١ in the pl.—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، وكوز—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، عودة، and ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، ثير—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، anomalous—١ needed here—effective as element in cause of conversion—and powerful as auxiliary in (1) and (2)—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، لفٓر and ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، خوارٓان، allowable for conformity—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، and ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، فور—١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، said to be contracted from ١٤٠٠٠٠٠٠٠، دار.

* See Note on p. 1525, l. 18.
§ 714. Augmented tril. ns., when not like 

، debarred from transformation by quiescent before, or after, its — such ns. of three kinds — reason for absence of transformation in (1) these ns. generally — "" and "" and "" sometimes said — "" and why transformed — (3) and and and — ambiguity alleged as reason in and and — nature of this ambiguity — true reason — (4) and — cause of transformation present here — excuse for non-transformation — (5) and and — so far as regards conversion of their ع into — غور — جرود — true reason.

§ 715. Second of two unsound letters enclosing of ultimate pl. is converted into — and this into Hamza — غور — anomalous, like — such conformity of pl. to sing. not universal — nor غور to be taken as a precedent — conversion actually heard only
in case of two ʿ as enclosing letters—but extended by ʿKhīl and ʿS to case of two ʿ as or of ʿ and ʿ—this extension disallowed by Akh—pl. of act. part. from ʿKhīl and ʿS—reason for Akh's doubt—sound opinion that of ʿS—further authority for it—second unsound letter not converted when far from end—and ʿKhīl and ʿS, but and ʿKhīl and ʿS—conversion and incorporation disallowed—similar conflict of opinion on conversion of second of two unsound letters enclosing antepenultimate | in non-pl.

§ 716. Treatment of ʿ and ʿ combined, when their first is quiescent—cause of incorporation—ʿ and ʿ treated as likes—incorporation encouraged by quiescence of their first— ʿ converted, whether first or second—no incorporation in (1) ʿ and ʿKhīl and ʿKhīl and ʿKhīl (2) ʿ and ʿKhīl, and ʿKhīl (3) ʿ and ʿKhīl—measure of ʿKhīl and ʿKhīl—conversion and incorporation sometimes found in (3)—never allowable in (1) ʿ and ʿKhīl, ʿKhīl, ʿKhīl, ʿKhīl—dispute about of ʿKhīl— ʿKhīl—preceeding ʿDamma changed into
Kasra—either vowel allowable in \( \mathit{ل} \) pl. of 
\( \mathit{ل} \) and in some other forms—conversion
(1) in and \( \mathit{م} \) anomalous—for want of
in their o. f.—or of finality in their
double \( \mathit{ي} \)—reason of its conversion—(2) in
\( \mathit{نيم} \) more anomalous.

§ 717. Treatment of \( \mathit{د} \) and \( \mathit{ي} \) after \( \mathit{ل} \) of ultimate pl.
not preceded by \( \mathit{د} \) or \( \mathit{ي} \) —
—opinion of S on last—of Jh—
regular form—of Zj—of IH—confirmation
of his opinion—Hamza in all three pls.
anomalous.

§ 718. \( \mathit{ي} \), when of \( \mathit{ع} \), \( \mathit{ئ} \), (1) converted into \( \mathit{ن} \), in
substantive—
—virtually, when not
actually, a substantive—
treated as substantives—anarthrous
not a qual.—but treated as a substantive
small sense of qualification in \( \mathit{أقلم} \) of
superiority—(2) not converted in ep.—but
\( \mathit{د} \) before it converted into Kasra—so
in pl. \( \mathit{ن} \) —its \( \mathit{د} \) converted
into Kasra—but sometimes left, and \( \mathit{ي} \) then
converted into \( \mathit{ء} \).
§ 719. More unsound than as ع s—the nearer to the end, the more subject to transformation—transformation lighter than use of o. f.—predicament of و and ی as finals—modes of transformation—these letters (1) converted into ی and ی, and ی— تا بین ی— تحشیه ی— and—measure of last two ی— میں ی— غزیر ی— رس ی— غزیر ی— and یخشیک ی— رحیم ی— عصوان ی— and یخشیک—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—یخشیک and یخشیک and یخشیک—one condition of conversion that vowel of و or ی be permanent—conformability, or affinity, of ی to ی, not a condition of conversion in its ل—and یخشیک and یخشیک—and یخشیک—conversion not prevented by ظ of feminization after the ل—nor by aug. ل before it—restoration of ل to its o. f., (a) from fear of ambiguity—exs. in ی—and یل—ل—elided in عصًا and یخشیک how treated in rol. یل.
restored and ی not reconverted into ی—

(b) for conformity—restoration of ی to its place— ی then not converted into ی in

and ی—elision of ی in sing.

masc. after Kasra or Fatha— ی and ی in

and ی not converted—but ی sometimes elided—in absence of ambiguity,

ی not restored [to its o.f.] for avoidance of elision on account of two quiescents—(2)

made quiescent—

(2) (nom.)—similarly ی—(gen.)

and ی—(3) elided—sometimes arbitrary—from frequency of usage— ی not elided in

(4) preserved.

§ 720. Capacity of ی 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—

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.—predica-
ment of 
sometimes mobile—this pro-
nunciation said to be a poetic license—
opinion of R—، and ى elided in apoc.—
sometimes retained— | retained, except in
apoc.—and sometimes even there.

§. 721. No decl. n. ending in ، preceded by a vowel
—cause of that—treatment of ، when a ى,
final or virtually final, after original دام،
in decl. n.—exs.—， converted into ى، and
then دام into كـرا—، not so converted
when (1) not a ى —، (2) followed by
inseparable termination—exception when
preceding دام is upon another ، (3)
after accidental دام— (4) in a ∨— (5)
in a n.، but invariably pronounced with
فـث —، sole instance—reasons for reten-
tion of ، here—corresponding predicament
of، after دام as respects conversion
of دام into كـرا—فر and سف on تر
—instances of non-finality as preventive of
conversion—analogous instances in other
cats.—كـل on differentiation of تر and
تـر from تر and تر.
§. 722. Similar treatment of final ך after ฏamma, in
spite of intervening letter of prolongation,
in ופד—this converted into ך—and
then preceding ך—and ฏamma of ך into
Kasra—this process invariable in pl., but
not in sing.—except of conversion and non-
conversion in sing.—S on proper letter in
sing. and pl.—final ך strong when doubled—
conversion then necessary, proper, or
improper—ך, not converted if not final—
extraordinary cases of conversion—
cause of transformation in former
—similar transformation in pass. part. whose
ך is Hamza—ך, vowel of ך in ך'
after conversion of ך and ฏamma—ך, and
ך, —conversion why allowable here—it's
regularity disputed—ך, anomalous.

§. 723. Final ך and ך after aug. ך converted into ך,
and afterwards into Hamza—ך, and ך
—cause of conversion into ך—and then into
Hamza—preceding ך to be aug.—reasons for
this—and also, says Mz, third—ץ—ץ
coordinated with ץ, and ץ—ץ
and ך, not converted before inseparable ך.
of feminization—insparable termination a preventive of conversion into ل—exa.

§ 724. Conversion of final ل after Kasra into ل—is its cause—conditions requisite for conversion of mobile ل after Kasra into ل—treatment of mobile ل after دامما—نون and دنيا—reason of conversion in them—derivation of دنيا—of مه and دنيا—conversion of ل in cat. of دن و، دن و، لى، فه and لى into ل

§ 725. ل of ل<ul> (1) when ل، preserved—no distinction here between substantive and ep.—cause of non-conversion—(2) if ل، preserved in ep. and converted into ل in substantive—substantive why selected for
transformation—moderation intended—this change made in most cases—alleged exceptions—change of ُعَلَى into ُعَلَى 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—ُعَلَى of ُعَلَى, preserved—no distinction here between substantive and ep.—cause of non-conversion—(2) if ُعَلَى preserved in substantive, and converted into ُعَلَى in ep.—IM’s opinion contrary to that of most Etymologists—opinion expressed by R—ُعَلَى, أَلْدُنَى, and regarded by S as substantives—inconsistency of IH in treating ُعَلَى as a substantive, and ُعَلَى and ُعَلَى as eps.—S on ُعَلَى—conversion the rule, according to him, in every ُعَلَى fem. of ُعَلَى whose ُلَى is ُعَلَى—unless it be [actually used as] an ep.—Sf’s explanation of his meaning in latter case—ُعَلَى of ُعَلَى, from
defective, not converted in substantive or
ep.—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 allevia-
tion—ی why converted into ی—and
Hamza into ی—Hamza mostly converted
into ی in du. of ی—scarce—but not in ultimate
pl.—هداری anomalous—general rule con-
travened in (1) هدئ (2) گهرو and
عیلاً (2) شوایا (1) عیلاً هدئ (3) سئایا and ی طالیا
exceptional—observations on (1) ی third in
all these pls.—(2) Hamza after ی in ایکو
(3) ی second in sings. شوایا and شوایا
(4)
, after ی in ایکو شوایا
(5) ی and ی in ایکو
, (6) ی and ی in سئایا حئطلا
, ی هدئ (7) ی and Hamza
—Khl on حئطلا—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, ژ, and IHsh—meaning of “adventitious in pl.”—(2) when \( \text{ل} \) is sound—Hamza here included among unsound letters—conflicting opinions on its soundness or unsoundness—formation of (1) خطايا—opinion of 8 and majority of BB—and of Khl—objection to latter—(2) قضايا—(4) حراي (3) مضايا—Jj and ISd on pl. of گداي—right view—true explanation of ی in it—their language not justifiable by assuming its sing. to be گد—assertion of IAmb—anomalies in this cat.—Akh on هدأوي—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 خطايا.

§ 727. Final ۷, fourth or upwards converted into ﯾ when letter before it is not pronounced with دامم—conditions of conversion when letter before it is pronounced with فاث—two reasons assigned for conversion—Ak on یشيان—weakness of second reason—object of proviso "when letter before it is not pronounced
with Damm"—additional proviso requisite.
original proviso properly restricted to vs.
amendment of it suggested by R.

§. 728. ع in cat. of قَوَى يُوُوًى and treated as sound—reason for not transforming it—and so in
cat. of حِئْب and طُلَى—another reason in
case of حِئْب طُلَى قَوَى and—another in that of حِئْب طُلَى قَوَى—treated as sound in n. also— ع غَالِبَة etc., anomalous—why so called—why so called explained by Fr—and by Ks—anomalous according to all three accounts—last two explanations applicable to ع غَالِبَة etc.—incorporation in cat. of حِئْب—more frequent than display— حِئْب ع ع and حِئْب incorporated why more frequent—stipulation that vowel of second unsound letter be inseparable—exs.—not imported on account of adventitious and separable letter, nor inflectional—incorporation 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 ع how pronounced in display—
Kasr of ف in حَبُّ - 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 حَبِّ.

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

سَفْنِ on لِلْيَامِ for لِلْيَامِ for حُوْيَ - du. and pl. of حَبِّ and of حَبِّ - استُحِيصِ and of استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ.

dial. vars. of استُحِيصِ - and of استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ.

exs. of استُحِيصِ, aor. استُحِيصِ - استُحِيصِ, aor. حْوَيْ - حْوَيْ, pass. of حْوَيْ - حْوَيْ.

A أَحْيَأ - not said as aor. of آَحْيَأ or آَحْيَأ - incorporation eschewed in aor. pass. of أَحْيَأ and استُحِيصِ - and in aor. act. - even in subj. - no incorporation in est. of تُحَيَ - transformation preferred to incorporation - يِهَدِيَ and يقَوِي.

§ 729. Double، peculiar to فعل - objection to forming or تَحَيَ - especially تُحَيَ - this objection obviated in 1638-1640.
—double and avoided when ا is orig. mobile—
but tolerated with incorporation—in n., not'
in v.

§. 730. Pret. and aor. of ل اتُعَالَل (1) whose ا and ل are (2) whose ا is — reasons
for not incorporating—inf. n. of اتُحَأَرَتِي، aor. يَحَأَرَتِي، حَأَرَة — اتُحُوَّرَتِي، aor.
inf. n. اتُحُوَّرَتِي—pret. of اتُعَالَل and whose ا and ل are (1) اس, or whose ا is — their
aor., act. part., and inf. n.—یَحَأَرَي، aor. يَحَأَرَي، حَأَرَة.

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

CHAPTER XI.—INCORPORATION.

§. 731. Definition—دَعَامٌ or دَعاَمٌ—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—\( \delta' \) and \( \delta' \), \( \eta' \) —(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) virally 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—

—

incorporation not disallowed if preceding quiescent be a letter of prolongation or softness—inclusion of approximates—inclusion of two kinds—of likes and of approximates, in one word and in two—meaning of "approximates"—inclusion proper to etymology and to Readers, but latter kind ignored here by IM—inclusion of likes, whose first is quiescent and second mobile, necessary on three conditions, that first be not

(1) a s of silence—

—

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—

and

—

(b) substituted, not permanently, for another letter—لроб for أورب—IM's mention of these conditions—inclusion 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 اذد. 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 is approximate to its —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 1 in —(c) if first be unsound—or sound, (aa) in v.—(bb) in tril. n., unaugmented or augmented—(α) —(γ) —(β) —(δ) —(ε) —(η) —(µ) and and ——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" attributed
to I Al 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—aoristic
for — condition of non-initiality not
mentioned here by IM—(3-6) that they be
not on measure of (a) , (b) , (c)
—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
combination of two mobile likes possible in
four more measures of tril.— not used
—used—incorporation
generally prescribed in and —and
dissolution in —(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) and (b) —reasons for these alternatives—dissolution preferable
—(b) and (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 apocopation 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—Kasr 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 of wonder, and incorporation in —this proviso a correction of preceding rule as to “choice allowed in . . . imp.”— of wonder regarded, by majority of BB, as a pret. v.— and , by Hijazis, as a verbal n.—vowel of its final—prominent nom. prods. attached to it—pause upon double letter—outlets of letters.

§. 782. Outlet defined—how recognizable—ex.—Y’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) ْ and ّ, and (c) ْ and ۸—Hamza, ۰, ۰, and ۰ said by Lth to be hollow—and by Khl to be airy—his opinion on relative positions of ِ, ۸, ۸, ۷, and ْ—these seven letters, from outlets (1–3), guttural—(4) of ق—(5) of ك—difference in their outlets how recognizable—both these letters uvular— ۸ how articulated by Arabs of the desert—this articulation hereditary—way to account for it—(6) of چ, ۸, ۸, and ۸—their relative positions—their outlet where placed by S—(7) of ض—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 ض in relation to tongue and teeth—from which side uttered—called "long"—(8) of ل—no letter more extensive in outlet—its outlet where placed by S—(9, 10) of ر and ن—ن farther out than ل—ر a little farther in than ن—difference in positions of ر and ن demonstrated by language of IH—criticism of some of his commentators thus rebutted—
(11) of د، ص، ف and ب، ت، ض—tip of tongue not in contact with central incisors—س prior in outlet to ی—(12) of ص، ف and د، ت—these eighteen letters, from outlets (4-13), lingual—(14) of ف—(15) of ب، م، and م and گ—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 1712-1724
—their number not complete in other languages—no Hamza in foreign speech, except in inception—nor any ض—ب 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 | —proof of this —soft |—distinct from Hamza—secondaries 6—all chaste—why called “secondary”—(1) quiescent ن—named “single” and “stifled” —its outlet—(2) ی of Imāla—named یاء.
(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)

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)

like ك—ezs. of (1) and (2)—both the same—(3)

like ج—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)

like س—approximation of س to س not so good as substitution
of س for س—(6)

like ت—(7)

like ب—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)

between ق and (1) ك
(2) ج like ج—(3)

like
§ 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—number and specification—(4) lax—(5) intermediate—orig. rigid—number and specification—number of lax—specification—these three kinds how exemplified—why so exemplified—(6) covered—how defined by Jrb—number and specification—definition of covering—inapplicable to the other 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 ἄη—S's explanation of "airy"—faintness and expansiveness of й as compared with с and й—(b) "ascending" or "descending"—from alternative meanings of ἄη—
this letter also called "sonant"—(18) gabbled—why so named—reason given by IH—said in CHd to be ꞉, not ꞉ and ꞉—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—cause of incorporation—pronunciation without it comparable to gait of shackled—manner of incorporation—preliminary conversion—incorporation really in two likes—operations requisite for incorporation—modes of conversion and incorporation—rule and obstacle—nature of obstacle and ...

§. 736. Incorporation regulated by closeness of approximation—concurrence 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
(a) if both be mobile, incorporation disallowed if it produce confusion—allowed if it do not—(b) if first be quiescent, incorporation, (a) if it produce confusion, disallowed if approximation be incomplete—allowed if it be complete—

and no paradigm containing quiescent ن before or or, صنوان, زما—، and اس on إيس and ٩ on ٩ and ٩ another preventive of incorporation in

—pret. from ﻣلدة not ﻣردة—but

§ 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 ﻣش村级 into approximates—special qualities of these letters—cause of disallowance—letters of ﻡ村级 not incorporated into approximates,
but approximates into them—، and ي incorporated, one into the other—س and نلا—IH’s explanation of incorporation here—R’s criticism on it—incorporation of ض into ش، of أ into ل، and of ف into ب، transmitted from Readers—meaning of “incorporation” here—practice of Ks and Fr—and of IAl—(2) sibilants into other letters—what they are incorporated into—(3) covered letters into others, without covering — çözس—(4) guttural letter into more guttural—incorporation of، and into, gutturals—of approximate gutturals—criticism on statement of fourth case—incorporation of (1) ن into م—(2) six letters of tip of tongue into ض and ش—(3) و—and—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 ١ 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.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§. 739.</th>
<th>not incorporated into like or approximate —reason for its incapacity—alternative reason—nor incorporated into.</th>
<th>PAGE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1759—1760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§. 740.</td>
<td>Letters that are incorporated into their approximates—§ into ﺟ after or before it—separation better, and incorporation good—but not ﺟ into §—separation better—(\text{ة} \text{لا} \text{م} \text{لا} \text{ه} \text{م} \text{لا} \text{ه} \text{م} \text{لا} \text{ه})) —nor § into ١——only its like incorporated into it—no approximate.</td>
<td>1760—1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§. 741.</td>
<td>١ incorporated into (1) its like—(2) ﺟ after or before it—incorporation or separation good in former case—conversion of ١ into ﺟ good in former case, allowable in latter— ﺟ not incorporated into ١, except after conversion of ١ into ﺟ—instance transmitted with conversion of ﺟ into ١—(3) §, after conversion of both into ﺟ §—١ and §—dispute as to allowability of that when ١ is preceded by §—only its like incorporated into it—no approximate—treatment of ١ and § when combined—frequent among Banû Tamîm.</td>
<td>1761—1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§. 742.</td>
<td>١ incorporated into (1) its like—no difficulty in that—(2, 3) § and ١—not into ﺟ or ﺟ —but into § and ١, by converting them</td>
<td>1765—1766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into ħ — reason of such incorporation—and conversion—ṣ and ẓ regarded by Z as incorporated into ħ.

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

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

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

§ 747. ش incorporated into its like, (1) attached—ض incorporated into its like, (2) quasi-attached—ض incorporated into its like, (3) detached, when first ن is preceded by فatha—not Kasra—difference between the two cases—three letters incorporated into it—ض incorporated into it—(1) its like—ض incorporated into it—(2) ن incorporated into it—ض incorporated into it—(3) ن—because treated like letters of prolongation and softness.

§ 748. ض incorporated only into its like—incorporation into ش 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 ش—why these—and not ج.

§ 749. ل 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 —allowably into remaining twelve—or allowably into all thirteen, its incorporation being good into , bad into ن, and middling into remainder —exx. in verse—and in readings of Kur—such incorporation how graduated by R—only its like and ن incorporated into it—not , —لا and لى—why so written.

§. 750. not mentioned by IH—incorporated only into its like—not into any other letter—its incorporation into ل disputed—disallowed by S and his school—reported as practised by Ya'kūb and IAl—allowed by Ks and Fr—hardly known among Readers later than IAl—ل and ن incorporated into ر.

§. 751. Quiescent ن, including Tanwin, (1) incorporated into letters of —necessarily—with some exceptions—cause of incorporation——or only, preferably into all but ن —(a) with nasality into letters of —restriction on incorporation into م , ي, and —(b) without nasality into ل and , —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، م، و، and (b) ب—(c) other non-gutturals—(d) gutturals—retention of nasality with and ا, chaster than removal—existence of nasality in itself—retention of nasality by some Arabs with ل and ب، and omission by some with ب، and ا—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 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 م—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 ـ، ـ، ـ، ـ، ـ، ـ incorporated, (1) one into another—(2) all into ص، ـ، and ص، ـ، ـ and ص—why mentioned before ص، ـ، ج، and ص—restriction on incorporation of sibilants—what ـ meant here—inclusion 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 ـ when an attached nom. pron.—(3) all into ض، ش—this incorporation why allowable—more valid into ض than into ش into ـ in reading—(4) ص، ش، ـ، and ص incorporated, one into another—more often than ص، ص، and ص—covering properly retained on incorporation of ص into either of its fellows—last three not incorporated into first six.

§ 753. ـ 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 ـ—IAI's practice—his principle—allowability of incorporation not disputed after
mobile—disputed after quiescent—only its like incorporated into it.

§. 755. م and ، 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—ب and incorporated into it.

§. 756. incorporation of ت into it (1) ت—ئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئئей
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of ق—(3) it into approximate—allowable only with ص or ص—but not forbidden by analogy with any approximate—(4) approximate, or ض, into it—here converted into ف— but converse allowable with ت—incorporation omissible, except with ت and د—then ت (a) converted into ت after ض, ص, and ت— and into ت after ه and ت—(b) unaltered after س and ت—necessity for incorporation or conversion, except with ت and س—incorporation by conversion of ت into ت, and ت into ت—and even ض into ت—of ت converted after nine letters—into (1) ت after ص, ص, ت, and ت—reason for this substitution—then, (a) after ت, incorporation necessary—(b) after ت, separation allowable—and incorporation by change of first into second, or the converse—this last not named “incorporation” by Readers—ex.—(c) after ص, separation allowable—and incorporation, by conversion of second into first—ex.—(d) after ض, separation allowable—and incorporation by conversion of second into first—الضعيف anomalous—(2) د after د, ي,

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oxliv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and ד — reason for this substitution — then, (a) after ד, incorporation necessary — (b) after ה, display allowable — and incorporation by conversion of second into first — (c) after ד, display allowable — and incorporation in both its modes — rare — (1) and (2) the only changes of this which mentioned here by IM — (3) after ת or ת converted into ת — separation good — dispute about separation — (4) ס after ס — second why converted into first — separation good — most prevalent forms with ב, פ, ס, and ת — (2) ה and ה, (3) ת, and (4) ס — change of ת into ד after ג — and of ל into ת — attached of ת converted into (1) after ד, (2) ד after ד, פ, ס, and ת — (3) ת, and ת of pron. here assimilated to ת — reason for assimilation — consequent conversion — incorporation with ב, פ, ס, and ה — incorporation of ת, ה, and ה more frequent with attached than with detached ת — and separation better with latter ת than with former — conversion more frequent in ת of ת than in ת of pron. — better not to convert the latter — its
conversion said to be anomalous— Throne not incorporated into even if be mobile—reason in latter case.

§ 757. Combination of aoristic with its cause—which elided—remaining and not incorporated into and this elision where found—similar elision in aor. headed by two (2) incorporation—but not if first (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  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAGE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822—1831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- Incorporation of F into F and —conj. 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 conj. of —even when F is a.
§ 758. Irregular incorporation—§ 758 and § 761. for § 758 and § 761. and not convertible one into the other—nor congruous in quality—each therefore converted into § 758 for § 758 and incorporation the practice of Tamim—but not regular—§ 758. its dial. vars.—§ 758. anomalous—§ 758. 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 تَفَاعَلَ and تَفَعَّلُ with aoristic تُ—all allowable—or elision of one—condition of this elision—which رَبَّستُ (2) رَبَّستُ and ظَلَّتُ—elision of ظ—disposal of its vowel if ف be (a) quiescent—(b) mobile—object of Kasr or Damm of ف—elision more frequent in pret. than in aor. or imp.—ظَلَّتُ, ظَلَّتُ, ظَلَّتُ, and ظَلَّتُ used—elided variously said to be ظ or ل—vowel of ف—similarly ظَلَّتُ, etc.—meaning of
dial. var.—universality of this elision disputed—āḥṣain, etc.—āḥṣast, etc. —forms allowable in aor. and imp.—no elision when ʿ is pronounced with Fath—rare—other explanations of ʿ for ʿṣāṣ for ʿṣāṣ—ʿṣāṣ for ʿṣāṣ—ʿṣāṣ—best-known dial. var. ʿṣāṣ ʿṣāṣ—then ʿṣāṣ, aor. ʿṣāṣ ʿṣāṣ—ʿṣāṣ ʿṣāṣ—aor. ʿṣāṣ ʿṣāṣ—elision when approximates or likes are in separate words—exs.—ل of ʿbū elided before ل of art.—after elision of unsound letter—regularly in names of clans where ل is not incorporated—بِحَمْرُ —بِلْمُ —عَلَى لـ عَلَمْ —مَلْكُ —مَلِئ —mail; here elided, after elision of ل, before ل of art.—exs.—foregoing elisions due to impossibility of incorporation—but all irregular—يَبْسُحُ —سَلَقُ —حُسْنُ —عُرْضُ —regular and يَبْسُحُ —لْمُ —نَيْلُ —نَيْلُ —not of this class—first elided in three words—from frequency of
usage—their act. parts.—and pretz.—
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<td>of hypercatalectic Tanwin.</td>
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<td>2</td>
<td>سنين ( \text{pl. of سلعن} )</td>
<td>ii—iv</td>
</tr>
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<td>3</td>
<td>Conjunct ( \text{n. االن} ), and its gender.</td>
<td>iv—vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Affixion of sign of ( \text{pl. to v. when attribute of explicit n. in pl.} )</td>
<td>vi—vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( \text{Prop. and gen. made pro-ag. notwithstanding presence of direct obj.} )</td>
<td>vii—viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allowability of زيدا for زيدا ظرفته ( \text{and particularity of فارسا ما فارسا} )</td>
<td>vii—x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suppression of pron. expressing obj. required by second of two ops, in case of contest in government.</td>
<td>x—xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suppression of op. of unrestricted obj. necessary when inf. n. occurring as such obj. acts as substitute for its op.</td>
<td>xii—xiii</td>
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<td>9</td>
<td>Government of pron. in gen. by ْحَتِىٍ.</td>
<td>xiii—xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Analysis of ْيَعُلَ in wonder. Proof that ْيَعُلَ is a v., and ْيَعُلَ suppressible when indicated.</td>
<td>xv—xviii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Occurrence of ag. latent in ْيَعُم as vague pron. expounded by posterior indet. governed in acc. as sp.</td>
<td>xviii—xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ṣ of silence affixed, by poetic license, to lamented in continuity.</td>
<td>xx—xxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mood of aor. in apod. when v. of prot. is a lit. or id. pret.</td>
<td>xxi—xxiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Treatment of Hamza of ْل after Hamza, of interrogation.</td>
<td>xxiv—xxvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Transformation of ْو into ْسَى in ْنِمُم (for ْنِموُم) pl. of ْنَمُمُّ (for ْنَمُوُم).</td>
<td>xxvi—xxvii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L’Envoi. xxvii
§ 624. This augment is like the augment of disapproval [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: SUMER says "We have heard them say إِنَّهُ قدِيدٌ [497, 623] and for ثُمَّ نَعَلَ أَلَى and the l and ل when trying to remember أَلْحَارِثُ and the like;" and he says, "We have heard a trustworthy person say هَذَا سَيْفٌ, 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 s 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 (IY). 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] (IY). 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
[below], of their finals, such as pause, etc (R). 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 إمالة الشيء deflected the thing, inf. n. إمالة deflection, when you make it deviate to another direction (Jrb, Tsr). And [in conventional language (Tsr)] it is your taking the Fatḥa towards Kasra (Aud), so that the Fatḥa imbibes something of the sound of Kasra, becoming intermediate between Fatḥa and Kasra (Tsr). Then, if the Fatḥa be followed by an ِ, the latter is taken towards ی, [becoming intermediate between ِ and ی (Tsr),] as in أَفْتَي [below] (Aud), with Imāla of the Fatḥa and ِ (Tsr); and if [the Fatḥa be (Tsr)] not [followed by an ِ (Tsr)], what is pronounced with Imāla is the Fatḥa alone, [whether the Fatḥa be before the s of feminization, or not (Tsr),] as in ٍسَكَر LIV. 34. [64] (Aud). Imāla is of three sorts, deflection of the Fatḥa towards Kasra before (1) the ِ, which is then deflected towards ی [626—637]; (2) the s, as in رَكْحَة [638]; (3) the ر, as in ِكِبر [638]: so that “deflection of the Fatḥa towards Kasra” includes the three sorts; while the deflection of
the towards ی is necessitated by the deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra, because the pure l is found only after the pure Fatha, and the l is necessarily deflected towards ی in proportion to the deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra. Imāla is not the dial. of all the Arabs (R). The people of AlHijaz [below] do not practise Imāla (R, Tsr), except in a few cases. Those who practise it are Tamim, Kais, Asad, and the generality of Najd (Tsr); while the tribe most addicted to it are the Banu Tamim (R). It is also named كسرة pronouncing with Kasr, بسط flattening, and إسقاط 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. (Jrb, Tsr): so says Jrb (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) یع., vid. the ی and Kasra; (2) یع., vid. indication of a ی or Kasra (A). The causes are eight, (1) the l's being substituted for a final ی, as in 629 and 629 among ns., and and اَهَدَى among vs.; while such as 630, though its l is substituted (Tsr) for a ی, as
is proved by [its broken pl. (Tsr)] [242], is not pronounced with Imāla, for lack of finality: whereas such as [fem. of pl. (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 y in some variations [of the word], like the i of مَلْهَيْي, [where the i is a subst. for a, (Tsr)]; of أَرْطَيْي, [where it is an aug. added for co-ordination (Tsr)]; of حِبْلَيْي, [where it is an aug. added for feminization (Tsr)]; and of غَرَيْي, [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 y in some variations, like the du. and pl. among ns., and the pass. among vs. (Tsr),] as in the du. أَرْطَيْي, مَلْهَيْي [629], and حِبْلَيْي [229]; the pl. أَرْطَيْات, مَلْهَيْات, and (Tsr) حِبْلَيْات [234]; and the pass. غَرَيْي [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 نَكَلُهَا XCI. 2. [538] is for correspondence with the Imāla in the i of جَلَاهَا 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 سَعِي XCIII. 2. is for
correspondence with the Imāla in the ʿ of XCIii. 3. [63] are dubious; may, the Imāla in both cases is because of [the pass. (Tsr)] and ʿ (b) those [words] in which the conversion of the ʿ into ʿ is (a) peculiar to an anomalous dial., like the conversion of the ʿ of ʿ and ʿ[629] into ʿ in the saying of Hudhail, when they prefix these ʿ s to the ʿ of the 1st pers., ʿ and ʿ[129], or (b) caused by amalgamation of the ʿ with an aug. letter, like the conversion of the ʿ of ʿ and ʿ into ʿ in the dim., as ʿ and ʿ[280], or in the pl. on the measure of ʿ and ʿ [243], are excepted from [the operation of] that [cause] (Aud) mentioned, vid. "the ʿ s being replaced by ʿ in some variations"; so that none of those [words] is pronounced with Imāla (Tsr): (3) the ʿ s being substituted for the ʿ of that ʿ which, on being attributed to the ʿ [of the pron. (Tsr)], is reduced to ʿ with Kasr of the ʿ [and elision of the ʿ (Tsr)], whether that ʿ be converted from (a) ʿ [pronounced with Fath or Kasr, the first (Tsr)] as in ʿ and ʿ, and [the second as in (Tsr)] ʿ; or (b) ʿ, pronounced with Kasr, as in ʿ[630] and ʿ [in the dial. of all (Tsr),] and ʿ in the dial. of those who say ʿ with Kasr [482]: contrary to [the ʿ converted
from a, pronounced with Fath or Damm, as in (Tsr) such as as [in the dial. of all (Tsr),] and مات تاَل and طالَل in the dial. of Damm (Aud); so that these are not pronounced with Imāla, because you say طَلَث تَلاَل and มَتَت, with Damm of the ف, by transfer in تَلَت, and according to the o. f. in طَلَث and مَتَت [403, 482, 484] (Tsr): (4) the ّs occurring [immediately (Tsr)] before a ي [pronounced with Fath (Tsr)], as in بَيَعَتْهُ and سَبِّرتُهُ: (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 ّs occurring after a ي, (a) adjoining [it, with no barrier between them (Tsr)], as in بَيَان [with a single ي, and بَيَان 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 جَادَتْ يِدَاهُ [628] and شَيْبَانِ His two hands were bountiful, [the Imāla in the first being stronger, because the lowness of the sound is more apparent in the quiescent ي 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 دَخَلَتْ يِرَادُهَا She entered her house (Aud), provided that the ي and ّ be
not separated by a letter pronounced with Damm, as in ْبِينَتُها. *Her house was wide:* so says the author of the Aud in the Glosses (Tsr): separation by the s is pardoned because 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 ُشْرِیْہَتْانَ. These are thy two little sheep, because separation by the s is like no separation, and, when the s is dropped out of consideration, ُشْرِیْہَتْانَ is equal to ُشْبِیْہَتْانَ. (A): (6) the l's occurring [immediately (Tsr)] before a [letter pronounced with] Kasra as in ُکَوْلَ [628], and ْکَبِكُبَ [7]: (7) the l's occurring after a Kasra [627]: (8) desire for correspondence, [when no other cause exists (Tsr),] as in (a) رَأْیَتُ عَبَادَى [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 l, converted from the Tanwīn, is pronounced with Imāla for correspondence with the first (Tsr): and (b) the reading ُضْحِیْكیَی XCI. 1. *By the forenoon,* where the l, though [converted (Tsr)] from the طَهَرَهْكیَی of ضْحِیْكیَی, is pronounced with Imāla for correspondence with سَجَیْكیَی XCI. 2. *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 [l (Sn)] pronounced with Imāla"; and is mentioned last because of its weakness in comparison with the preceding causes: (b) the Imāla of the f on account of correspondence has two phases, (a) that it should be on account of the vicinity of an f so pronounced, like the Imāla of the second f in [above], which is for correspondence with the first f; (b) that it should be on account of the f's being the final of a phrase adjacent to a phrase whose final is pronounced with Imāla, like the Imāla of the f of تلا in XCI. 2. [above], which is for correspondence with what follows it, i.e. جلاها XCI. 3. [538] and يعضاها XCI. 4. [637], according to the opinion of others than S, vid. Mb and a party (A); (c) the f that has no cause [of Imāla] in it, (a) if preceded by the f pronounced with Imāla on account of one of the causes aforesaid, is pronounced with Imāla, as in عبادا [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 [above]; but, if they do not occur in the terminations, is not pronounced with Imāla (Tsr). These causes are all reducible to the 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 ی [628, 632], which appears to be the language of S; while IS holds that the ی 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 ی: (2) that, as S mentions, the people of AlḤijāz [above] pronounce the I with Imāla on account of Kasra, while they and many of the Arabs do not pronounce [the I] with Imāla on account of the ی; so that those who pronounce the I with Imāla on account of Kasra are more numerous than those who pronounce it with Imāla on account of the ی (Sn),] which shows Kasra to be stronger (A).

§. 627. The Kasra before the I [626] takes effect only when it precedes the I by (1) one letter, as in عبان tent-pole: (2) two letters, the first of which is quiescent, as in شَلَل [385] (M), because the quiescent is not minded, and is not a strong barrier, so that شَلَل becomes like شبَل; and similarly in إِنَّا لِلَّهِ وَإِلَيْهِ 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 I] by two mobile letters, as in أَكْلَتُ عَنْبًا I ate grapes, or by three letters, as in فَتَلَّتْ قَنَبًا I twisted hemp, it does not take effect (M); so that Imāla is not permissible, because of the distance
of the Kasra from the ١ (IY). And, as for their saying

He means to strike her [633] ٣٠ عِنْدَهَا, He is with her and ٨ لَدْ ٍدْرَهْبَانٍ He has two dirhams [or ٧ ٍدْرَهْبَانٍ thy two dirhams], it is anomalous (M), rare (IY). What makes it permissible is that the ٢, being faint, is not taken into account (M); so that, the ٢ being like the non-existent, ٣٠ يُصِبْرَهَا becomes like ٣٠ يُصِبْرَهَا (IY). For, when the ٢ drops out of consideration, ٣٠ يُصِبْرَهَا is equal to such as ٣٠ كِتَابٍ and ٣٠ عِنْدَهَا, and ٣٠ عِنْدَهَا and ٧ ٍدْرَهْبَانٍ دَرْدَهْبَانٍ (above) (A). But the exemplification by such as ٧ ٍدْرَهْبَانٍ دَرْدَهْبَانٍ requires consideration, because its Imāla may be on account of the ٧ 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 ٣٠. IH and others mention that the Imāla of such as ٧ ٍدْرَهْبَانٍ دَرْدَهْبَانٍ is anomalous: but F, in the Idāh, does not mention that the Imāla of ٧ ٍدْرَهْبَانٍ دَرْدَهْبَانٍ is anomalous, notwithstanding his explicit attribution of the Imāla to the preceding Kasra, not to the Kasra of the ٧ of the du. (Tsr). When the letter before the ٢ that is immediately followed by the ١ is pronounced with ٣٠ يُصِبْرَهَا, Imāla is allowed by no one, because, with the ٣٠, the ٢ cannot be like the non-
existent, since the letter before the \( \text{I} \) is never pronounced with دامم (R).

§. 628. The condition of efficiency in the cause of 

Imāla is that it should be part of the word containing the \( \text{I} \). But from that is excepted the \( \text{I} \) of the fem. pron. 

\( \text{أَدَّرَ جَيْبُهَا} \) and 

\( \text{kَمْ يَضَرُّبِهَا} \), which is pronounced with Imāla, though its cause is detached, i.e. part of another word. And others than IM mention that the \( \text{I} \) is sometimes pronounced with Imāla on account of the Kasra, when detached from the \( \text{I} \), although this Kasra is weaker [in exacting Imāla (Sn)] than the Kasra that is in the same word with the \( \text{I} \): S says “We have heard them say زيد has camels \[633\], pronouncing with 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 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 

\( 
\begin{align*} 
\text{لا} & \\
\text{ما} & \\
\text{لا} & \\
\end{align*}
\) 

with Imāla on account of a detached \( \text{I} \), the Kasra being excluded because it is stronger, as before mentioned, than the \( \text{I} \) [626] (A). They treat the detached \( \text{I} \), [which is converted from Tanwin (IY),] like the attached, [which is part of the word itself (IY),] as 

\( 
\begin{align*} 
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\end{align*}
\) 

I studied science and 

\( 
\begin{align*} 
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\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\end{align*}
\) 

I saw Zaid (M), with Imāla, like 

\( 
\begin{align*} 
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\text{I} & \\
\end{align*}
\) [627]
and [626] respectively (IY); and the accidental Kasra [of inflection after the I (IY)] like the original [Kasra of the e of قالع (IY)], as ٌمَّرَتْ ٌبَابًا I passed by his door and ٍأُحْدَتْ مِنّ مَالِيَّ I took of his goods or camels (M): except that the Imāla in such as [عَالِمُ or] [عَمَّامُ [626] and [627] is stronger than the Imāla here, because the Kasra there is inseparable; while in مَالِيَّ and ٌبَابًا it is accidental, disappearing in the nom. and acc., where there is no Imāla, as there is none in ٌأَجْرُ brick and تَأْبَلُ [247] (IY).

§. 629. The final ِ is either in a v., or in a n., and is either third or upwards. That which is in the v. is pronounced with Imāla, however it be (M), its Imāla being good, if it be converted from a َ، as in رَمَيٌّ and قّضَى: and allowable, though inelegant, if it be converted from a ِ، as in ِدَعا and ِغَزا, because, when this formation is transported by the Hamza to أَفْعَلٌ [488], its ُ، becomes a َ، as in أَدْعِيْتُ and أَدْعِيْتُ [685, 719, 727], so that you say ِأَمْرُي and أَمْرُي with Imāla; and also because, when it is turned into a pass., its ُ، becomes a َ، as ِغَزِي ِدُعْيٌ [626, 719]; so that they imagine what is virtually present to be literally present (IY). And that which is in the n. (M), if converted from a َ، is pronounced
with Imāla, which is good, as in (IY) and (IY) : but (IY), if not recognized as converted from a , is not pronounced with Imāla when third (M), as in and (IY) ; but is [preferably (IY)] pronounced with Imāla when fourth (M), whether it be (1) a J, as in , where the Y appears in the du. [626, 727]; or (2) an aug., added (a) for feminization, as in , where the l is converted into Y in the du. and sound pl. [626]; or (b) for co-ordination, as in , where you say in the du. (IY). But , [which is a n. of three letters, from the , (IY),] is pronounced with Imāla only because of their saying [in the sing.] , (M) : for the l in is that very Y which is in , but is converted into l in the pl. on the measure of the plural ; so that it is like [the r in] from the .

§. 630. The intermediate [l (IY)], if it be [an (IY)] in a v. wherein is said, like طاب and [and in the dial. of those who say , aor. (IY)], is pronounced with Imāla [626] (M), as in the reading XIV. 17. For him that feareth My judgment-seat, because the letter before the l [in and طاب] and is pronounced with Kasr in
[lung and] 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 ِ, [like َّ and َّ and ِابع and َّ], because it contains two causes, its being of the cat. of the ِ, and its [ ] being pronounced with Kasr in [ ] and َّ; whereas those [v.s.] which belong to the cat. of the ِ, contain only one cause, the Kasr alone (IY). Opinions differ as to the cause of the Imāla in such as َّ and َّ: Sf and others say that it is because of the accidental Kasra of the ِ [in some variations (Sn)] of the word; and this is apparently the language of F, who says "They pronounce َّ and َّ with Imāla, notwithstanding the elevated [letter, i.e. the ِ and the َّ (632) (Sn)], from desire for [indication of (Sn)] the Kasra in َّ [and indication (Sn)]: but IH.Kh says "The better opinion is that the Imāla in َّ is because the َّ in it is converted from a ِ, and in َّ because the ِ is pronounced with Kasr: they wish for indication of the ِ and Kasra, respectively" (A). But, if the intermediate َّ be in a n., what it is converted from is regarded: so that َّ [626] is said, [and َّ i.q. َّ, because they belong to the cat. of the ِ (IY); but not َّ.}
The language of IM implies that the is not pronounced with Imāla, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether it be converted from or or (Sn)]: but the author of the M distinguishes between what is converted from as in and , where he allows Imāla; and what is converted from as in and , where he does not allow it: while some distinctly declare that Imāla of the converted from when an in a tril. n., is anomalous; and this is apparently the language of S (A).

§. 631. They sometimes pronounce the with Imāla on account of a preceding so pronounced, saying I saw a tent-pole [626] and 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 [not pronounced with Kasr (IA)], restrains [the cause of (A) Imāla (IA, A) from taking effect (A), when the cause is (IA, A)] an expressed Kasra or [an existing (IA)] below (IM). For the letters of elevation are elevated towards the palate; so that, with them, the is not pronounced with Imāla, from desire for homogeneity [of sound (Tsr)]: while the , [though there is no elevation in it (Tsr),] is assimilated to the elevated [on account of}
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 elavation [784] (Aud, A), viz. the خ , the غ , the ص , the ض , the ط , the ظ , and the ق (Aud), which are the initials of these [mnemonic] words قُدُمْ صَادَ مَكْرَمٍ غَلَامٍ خَالِقُ ضُّلُحَةٌ Dirār, the manservant of my maternal uncle Talḥa, 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 ى" [above] is a distinct declaration that the letter of elevation and the ً not pronounced with Kasr prevent Imāla, when its cause is an expressed ى: and in the Tashīl and the Kāfiya he distinctly declares that; though in the Tashīl he says "the existing Kasra and ى", and in the Kāfiya "the expressed Kasra and the existing ى". He gives no ex., however, of that [ى (Sn)]: and what he says of the ى is not recognized in their speech:—nay, Imāla appears to be allowed in such as ٞعَبَيْانُ and ُطَفِيْبٌ, [where the letter of elevation and the
precede the \( R \) \((A)\); and similarly in \( \text{بِنَاس} \) \( \text{ثَيْنُر} \). These are \( \text{thy wells} \), where the letter of elevation and the \( R \), follow the \( ! \) \((Sn)\): and A.H. says "We have not found that" meaning, restraint of the \( \text{ي} \) by the letter of elevation or the \( R \); "but it prevents with the Kasra alone" \((A)\). This necessarily implies that the \( \text{ي} \) 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 \( \text{ي} \) \((Sn)\). The condition of the Imāla restrained by the preventive is that its cause should not be a supplied Kasra, \( [\text{as in} \; \text{خافّ} \; \text{، the} \; ! \; \text{of which is converted from} \; \text{الأ} \; \text{pronounced with Kasr (Tsr)}] \); or a supplied \( \text{ي} \), \( [\text{as in} \; \text{طابّ} \; \text{، the} \; ! \; \text{of which is converted from} \; \text{ي} \; \text{(Tsr)}] \); for here the supplied cause, being present in the \( ! \) itself, is stronger than the expressed \( [\text{cause (Tsr)}] \), which either precedes the \( ! \), \( [\text{as in} \; \text{بَائعٌ} \; \text{وَكِتَابٌ (Tsr)}] \); or follows it, \( [\text{as in} \; \text{عَالِمٍ وَكِتَابٌ (Tsr)}] \); and for this reason such as \( \text{خافّ} \; \text{، طابّ} \; \text{， and} \; \text{زَغٌ} \) are pronounced with Imāla (Aud), notwithstanding that the letter of elevation precedes \( [\text{the} \; ! \; \text{in} \; \text{خافّ} \; \text{and}\) طابّ, and follows \( [\text{it}] \; \text{in} \; \text{خافّ} \; \text{， and} \; \text{زَغٌ} \; \text{(Tsr)} \). The elevated \( [\text{letter}] \) restrains the Imāla of only the \( n. \), exclusively: Jz says "The elevated \( [\text{letter}] \) prevents Imāla of the \( ! \; \text{in} \; \text{the} \; n. \); but not in the \( v. \), as طابّ 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 ی or from the ل is not regarded; but it is pronounced with Imāla unrestrictedly” [629, 630] (A). The cause [of Imāla], however, in بَعْدِ طَابِ and بي 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 أpronounced with Fath, forming part of a $v.$ unsound in the ع, as in جَابُطابِ; or in the ل, whether أی, as in طَلْی قَلْی and لَأْی; or أو, as in غُرَبِ and غُرَبَاء, where this ل becomes أی, as we mentioned, in غُرَبَاء and غُرَبَب [629]: for these $v.$s contain two inducements to Imāla, vid. conversion from the ی, and strength of plasticity in the $v.$; so that the elevated [letter] is overpowered (IY). [But, in the case of جَابُ، Kasr of the ۚ in جَابُ (630) takes the place of conversion from the ی 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 مَالِخ: (2) separated [from it] by one letter, [because separation by one letter is like no separation
(Tsr),] as in ُقَسَمَٓمُ; unless the letter of elevation be (a) pronounced with Kasr, as in ْعِبَاءٓ, which they pronounce with Imāla (Aud), because the Kasra is constructively after the letter [of elevation], so that consonance of the sound of the ٰ with the Kasra is more appropriate, [since it avoids a rise in pitch after a fall] (Tsr); (b) quiescent after a Kasra, as in ْمُسْجِدَةٌ, 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 ٰ is that it should be (1) contiguous to the ٰ, as in ْسَاحِرٓ [633]: (2) separated [from it (Tsr)] by (a) one letter, as in ْنَفْسُ [633]; (b) two letters, as in ْمَنَاشِيطٌ [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 ٰ is stronger than prevention by the [letter of elevation] preceding [the ٰ]: and, for that reason, the [letter of elevation] preceding [the ٰ] 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
1] by two letters; while the [letter of elevation] following [the 1] is unrestricted [in these respects]. That is because a rise [in pitch] after a fall is more difficult, in their estimation, than a fall after a rise (Tsr).

§. 683. They treat the [preventive] detached [from the 1], i.e., belonging to another word, like the attached, which belongs to the same word (IY). This detached [preventive] is (1) contiguous to the 1, without any barrier, as in مُرَّتُ يَفَاضِلُι Kasim is one of us, like I passed by a learned man [632]: (2) separated from it by (a) one letter, as in يَبَال قَاسِم by the camels of Kasim [below], like بِبَاغِيَة In her hand is a whip, like مَاشِيَة [632] (Tar). S says (M), We have heard them say أَرَادَ أَن يَصْرِبهَا زِيد Zaid meant to strike her [627], pronouncing [the 1 in يَصْرِبهَا] with Imāla [because of the Kasra before it (IY)]; but Aَرَادَ أَن يَصْرِبهَا قِبْلُ He desired to strike her before, pronouncing with Fath, [notwithstanding the Kasra of the ۰ (IY),] because of [the preventive, vid. (IY)] the ق (S, M) in قِبْلُ (IY); and [similarly (M)] مُرَّتُ يَبَال قَاسِم [above] and يَبَال مُلَقِّى by the camels of Maliḥ (S, M) and مُرَّتُ يَبَال قَاسِم [above] and بِبَال مَنْقُلُ by the camels of Yankul, all with Fath, because of the ق, being assimilated to نَعْقِي and مَاشِيَة [632] (S). But some distinguish
between the attached and detached, saying بَيْنَ الْحَاضِرِ وَالْبَيْضِ with Imāla (S, IY), as though they did not mind the elevated [letter], since it belongs to another word (IY). The preventive of Imāla takes effect [even (Tsr)] if it be detached; but the cause of Imāla does not take effect except when attached (Aud), the distinction being that the preventive is stronger than the cause (Tsr). Therefore such as أَنَى قَالَ Kāsim came is not pronounced with Imāla, because of the presence of the ق, [even though it is in another word (Tsr)]; nor لَبِنَى مَالَ Zaid has camels, because of the detachment of the cause (Aud), since the ٰ 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 أَنَى قَالَ [above], notwithstanding their acknowledgment that the preventive does not take effect on the supplied ٰ [632], on which sort [of cause] the [letter of] elevation, if attached, would have no effect, [and à fortiori when detached (Tsr)]; while the good, [irreproachable (Tsr),] ex. is كِتَابُ كَاسِم the book of Kāsim, [since the cause of Imāla 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 Mukarraz [fi-nNaḥw (HKh)], after mentioning the causes of Imāla, what is to this effect “whether the Kasra be attached or detached, as in لَيْبَيْنِ مَالُ [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 ′], it does not prevent Imāla, except in what is pronounced with Imāla on account of an accidental Kasra, as in بِمَالِ كَاسِم [above]; or in such of the ′s appended to the prons. as are pronounced with Imāla [639], as in ُأَرَادَ أَنْ يَعْرِفُهَا قَبْلًا He meant to know her before” (Aud), where Imāla of the ′ [in حَامًا] is prevented by the ق of قَبْلُ after it, though the ق is detached [from يَعْرِفُهَا] (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 رَأَيْنِ فَرْأَش (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 Damm or Fath (Tsr),] as in هَذَا حُمَارًا This is a he-ass and رَأَيْتُ حُمَارًا I saw a he-ass. But some treat the ر posterior [to the
This is an unbeliever, like the contiguous (Aud) in prevention of Imāla (Tsr). The preventive of the preventive [626] is the ད་ (above), in the immediate vicinity of the མ: for this prevents the elevated [letter (Tsr)] and the ད་ from preventing (Aud) Imāla, because one characteristic of the ད་ 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

Few are pronounced with Imāla, notwithstanding the presence of the س [in the first (Tsr)] and the غ [in the second (Tsr)]; and

LXXXIII. 18.

[236, 598], notwithstanding the presence of the ད་ pronounced with Fath [before the མ (Tsr)]; and

XL. 42. The abode of stability, notwithstanding the presence of both (Aud) preventives, the elevated ད་ and the ད་ pronounced with Fath. In all of that, the ད་ pronounced with Kasr is contiguous [to the མ] (Tsr). But some treat the ད་ when separated [from the མ (Tsr)] by one letter, like the contiguous [in prevention of the preventive (Tsr)]: S heard Imāla [of قادر (Tsr)] in the saying [of Hudba Ibn Khashram (S)]
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 pronouned with Kasr is separated from the by the (Tsr). But those who say are more numerous than those who say, because the is a letter of elevation [632] (S). It is understood from the language of IM [and IHsh] that Imāla is (a tortūori (A)] allowable in such as ; for, since the is pronounced with Imāla, on account of the, pronounced with Kasr, notwithstanding that the requirer of abandonment of Imāla, vid. the letter of elevation or the, 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 , (1) difference between the n. and the p. [639]; and that is in the, and similar letters in the initial monograms of the chapters [of the Kur]: S says “And they say and and ,” i.e., with Imāla, “because they are names of what is uttered,” [i.e., the letters (Sn)]; so that they are not like and and and other ps. uninf. upon quiescence: (a) the
letters of the alphabet, that are at the beginnings of the chapters [of the Kur], if an I be at their end, are pronounced by some with Fatḥ, [i. e., not with Imāla (Sn),] and by others with Imāla; but, if an I be in their middle, as in ﻟﻠّا كَف, and ضاء, are pronounced with Fatḥ, without dispute: (2) frequency of usage; and that is in (a) ﺍﻟْمُتْرَفِجَ أَلْهَـاجَ [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 ﺍﻟْمُتْرَفِجَ أَلْاَجَ [below], in the nom. and acc.: so some of the GG mention: (b) ﺍﻟْمُتْرَفِجَ ﺍﻟْمُتْرَفِجَ, in the nom. and acc.: IB says "'Abd Allāh Ibn Dā'ūd transmits from IAI the Imāla of ﺍﻟْمُتْرَفِجَ 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 Ḥmād Ibn Yazīd alHulwānī, through Abū `Umar adDūrī, from Ks." Imāla on account of these two causes is anomalous; not regular, but confined to hearsay (A). That ﺍﻟْمُتْرَفِجَ أَلْهَـاجَ 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. (IY). And بَابُ ﺍﻟْمُتْرَفِجَ 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 ل in مال and باب to the ل of ع [630] and دنا, treating the ل [629]: but such pronunciation of مال and باب in the nom. and acc. is rare (IY). And they say للغة [blindness by night (IY)], للـ [hole of the fox or hare (IY)], and للـ [sweepings of the house (IY)], though these are from the و (M): the Imala being introduced into them by assimilation to what is from the ع, because the ل is a ل; for alteration gains access to the ل, since you pronounce عـُمـا with Imala [629], but not عـ [626] (IY). But, as for their saying للـ gain [in selling, though it is from the و, since they say in the du. رتأوي (IY)], it is on account of [their saying للـ, treating it as from the ع, together with the Kasra of (IY)] the ر (M).

§. 636. Properly فاعل from the reduplicated, such as جَدَّ جَدَّ serious and مَعَ مَعَ passer, pl. جَوَّان and مَوَّار, should not be pronounced with Imala, because the Kasra that was in it, necessitating Imala, has been elided on account of the incorporation [731] (IY). But some pronounce [that (IY)] with Imala, saying جَوَّان جَدَّ, [because the Kasra is supplied (IY),] from regard to the o. جَوَّان جَدَّ and جَوَّان جَدَّ, as they pronounce جَدَّ with Imala.
because it is constructively \(\text{حَوْف}^{1} \), or because it is reducible to \(\text{جُفَّت}^{1}\), though there is no Kasra in the actual expression; and similarly (IV)) as they pronounce هُذَا 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 (IV).

§ 637. And زَاَلْتَلْبِسَ رَضْحَاَمَا XCI. 1. [538], where [analogy forbids Imāla, because (IV)] the \(\text{ضُحَكَى}^{2}\) (IV)] is [converted] from the \(\text{و}^{3}\), is pronounced with Imāla for conformity with جَلَاَهَا XCI. 3. [538] and يُغَشَاَمَا XCI. 4. It covereth it [626] (M), both of which are so pronounced because the \(\text{i}^{4}\) in them is [converted] from the \(\text{ى}^{5}\), since you say جَلَُثَتْة I displayed it and, in the du., يُغَشَّيَّاَيِّا They two cover (IV).

§ 638. The Fatḥa is pronounced with Imāla before one of three letters, (1) the \(\text{i}^{6}\), which has been already discussed [626-637]: (2) the \(\text{ر}^{7}\), on condition that it be pronounced with Kasr, that the Fatḥa be on a letter other than མ, and that they, [i. e., the Fatḥa and the \(\text{Tsr}\),] be (a) contiguous, [with no barrier between the letter pronounced with Fath and the \(\text{ر}^{8}\) (Tsr),] as in مِّنْ أَكْبَرُ XIX. 9. Of old age (Aud): (a) there is no difference between the Fatḥa’s being on a letter of
elevation, as in ل.firebaseio VI. 145. And of kine; or on a ر as in لxFB. LXXVII. 32. With sparks; or on any other letter, as in XIX. 9. [above] (A, Tsr): (b) separated by a quiescent other than ى, as in من ن혀ر from 'Amr; [or, adds IUK, by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in insolent (Tsr)]: contrary to such as أَعْرَزْ بِاللَّهِ من آَللّهِ ُمن أَللّهِ ُمن قُبْعَ آَللّهِ 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 ى (Tsr)]; and to [such as] من خَلَِّيِك from others than thee (And), because the separation is by the quiescent ى (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 before it, as in ر أ 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 من آَللّهِ ُمن آَللّهِ II. 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 precedes 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 from loss is pronounced with Imāla (A, Tsr)

IUK says “Accuracy requires one to say that every Fatha on a letter other than i is pronounced with Imāla before a j pronounced with Kasr contiguous to it, or separated [from it] by a letter pronounced with Kasr, or by a quiescent other than i, when the j is not followed by a letter of elevation” (Tsr): (d) IM’s stipulation of finality in the j is refuted by the positive statement of S that they pronounce the Fatḥa of the b in I saw leaves blown off by winds with Imāla (Aud); while others mention that the Fatha of the e in hard may be pronounced with Imāla, though the j in that is not (A, Tsr) a j (A), [i.e.,] a final; and perhaps IM particularises the “final” because that is frequent in such cases (Tsr); so that the stipulation of the j’s being “final” is from regard to the prevalent [usage], and is not invariable (A): (e) it is deducible from the Imāla in the ex. [mentioned by S] that it is not stipulated, as a condition of Imāla of the Fatḥa on account of the Kasra of a j after it, that they should be in one word (Sn): (f) IM makes no restriction in his saying “Pronounce .......... with Imāla” [above]; and therefore it is known that the Imāla here is [used] in continuity and pause, contrary to the Imāla 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 Fatḥa 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 Fatḥa is not strong enough to cause Imāla of the ! on account of its Imāla [i.e., of the Imāla of the Fatḥa (Sn)]: but IKh asserts that those who pronounce the [second] ! of عباد with Imāla on account of the Imāla of the ! before it [631] pronounce the ! of here with Imāla on account of the Imāla of the Fatḥa of the ظ; 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 Fatḥa is neither on a
nor on an elevated letter (Jrb)]: and bad [when the Fatha is] on a ۷, as in ۷دَلَّiness, [because the Imala of its Fatha is like Imala of two Fatahas, on account of the reiteration of the ۷, so that the labour in pronouncing it with Imala is more (R)]: and middling [when the Fatha is (MASH)] on a [letter of (MASH)] elevation, as in ۷أٍ casket (SH), because, though the ۷ is treated like the ۷, it is not unrestrictedly like what it is assimilated to; so that the elevated letter does not prevent Imala altogether here, as it does there; but, with it, Imala is middling in goodness and badness (R): (b) the ۷ of feminization here includes the ۷ of intensiveness (A), because it is orig. the ۷ of feminization [265] (Sn), as in ۷عَالَمَة [294, 312], which may be pronounced with Imala; but excludes the ۷ of silence [615], as in LXIX. 19. [below], the Fatha before which is not pronounced with Imala, according to the correct [opinion]: (c) when there is an ۷ before the ۷, it is not pronounced with Imala, as in ۷صَلَّا prayer and ۷حَيَّة life: what is pronounced with Imala, however, is the Fatha, not the consonant, that is immediately followed by the ۷ of feminization; and, that being so, there is no reason for IM's excepting the ۷, since the ۷ is not included in the Fatha; but he does it here in order to dispel the notion that the ۷ of feminization makes Imala of the ۷ permissible, as it makes Imala of the Fatha: (d) "the ۷", and not "the ۷", "of
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 ș of such as رَحْمَةُ فَاطِمَةٍ [263], according to those who pause with the ț [646], in which case the Fatḥa is not pronounced with Imāla, as is distinctly declared by others than IM; and the [quiescent] ț of feminization attached to the v. [607], as in بُعْثَ she sold (Sn) : (e) Imāla of [the Fatḥa before (Tsr)] the s of silence also, as in كِتَابٍ 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 إذا [204] and ما [180], is not regular; except in the case of ما and نَظَرَ إلَيْهَا [628, 633], as in He passed by her and نَظَرَ إلَيْهَا He looked towards her, and نَظَرَ إلَيْهَا 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. ذا [171, 293], and of [the advs.] مَنْي
And some ps. are pronounced with Imāla, vid. بَلِيْ[556], the voc. يَا[554], and [the neg.] لا in their saying إِمْامَا لا [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)] لا[547], because of its being independent (A) in the reply, as [is stated] in [the commentary of] IUK (Sn); while Imāla of حَتَيِّ[501] is reported by S and those who agree with him, and is transmitted from Ḥamza and Ks. Imāla is not forbidden in what is accidentally uninfl., as in يَا حَبْلِيْ 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 عَسِيٌ[403, 459] is excellent" (M, A) because it is a v., and its ' is converted from a ى [629], as is shown by عَسِيْتُ and عَسِيْنا[462] (IY). The reason why the ps. are not pronounced with Imāla is only that their ' is not [converted] from a ى; nor is in the vicinity of a Kasra (A), in most cases, since the ' of إِلَيٍّ [500] is in the vicinity of the Kasra of the Hamza (Sn). Analogy
forbids Imāla in the case of the ps., because the ps. are prim. aplastic instruments; while Imāla is a kind of plasticity, because it is an alteration (IY). If, however, they are used as [proper] names, they are pronounced with Imāla (A), when the cause of Imāla exists, as in

used as a name, because the fourth in the n. is converted into ی in the du. [229]; contrary to یلا (Sn). And, according to this, the ی of یجم and یجم, and the یا and یا and یا [of یم and یم (Sn)], in the initial monograms of the chapters [of the Kur] are pronounced with Imāla [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 یا [546] and ی [in being ps. (Sn)], the Imāla in them is intended to notify that they have become annexed to the n.s., in which Imāla is not forbidden. Zj and the KK say that [the letters of] the initial monograms are pronounced with Imāla because they are abbreviated, Imāla being prevalent in the abbreviated; but this is refuted by the fact that Imāla is not allowable in much of the abbreviated: while Fr says that they are pronounced with Imāla because in the du. they are restored to ی, as two ت's and two ح's. And similar is the Imāla of the letters of the alphabet,
[which are not in the initial monograms of the chapters (Sn),] as ﷲ and ﷲ and ﷲ (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), َفِيَمَّ (Sn), and َلِقَطَسَّ مَّ (Sn), and in the mode hereafter mentioned [648]; and upon such as XXVII. 25. [2,59,574] and VI. 144, 145. Or what the wombs of the two females have
enclosed, where an expression is supposed to be one word, but is virtually more. For 

\[
\text{in the last [ex.]} \text{is not the cond. } \text{[593]; but is [compounded of] the copulative } \text{[541] and the conjunct } \text{[180], so that one pauses upon disjoined from . And, as for } \text{in XXVII. 25., according to the reading of Ks, with a single J, it is an inceptive and premonitory p. [551]; while is premonitory, or is a voc. p. whose voc. is suppressed [59]; and is an imp. v. ; so that one pauses upon disjoined from : 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 J, it is the subjunctival incorporated into the red. [566], for which reason the of the aor. is dropped [405]; while the resultant inf. n. [497, 551] is the obj. of , by suppression of the prep. [514], the sense being 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 , or upon ; not upon the , 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 في أياما [623] قال [Sn]; (2) quavering (A, Tsr, YS) as in في أوقات الملح [608] (YS, Sn); (3) demanding precise information (A, YS), and asking for specification of a vague [indet.] (Sn), as in أيون [185] (YS, Sn), quiescent in the ن (Jh), and فين , and in منوية [183, 497], منا, and مني (Sn); (4) disapprobation (A, Tsr), as in رجلينيه (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 زيت يضرب Zaid strikes or ضرب struck; and the p., as جير 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 \textsuperscript{4} [640, 649]; (5) change of the [nominal (SH, Fk)] \textit{i} of feminization into \textit{s} [646]: (6) addition of the \textbf{1} [648]: (7) affixion of the \textit{s} of silence [644, 648]: (8) [expression or (Tsr, Fk)] elision of the \textit{\textbf{1}} and (R, Tsr, Fk) \textit{i} [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 Tanwin into \textit{i} or \textit{\textbf{1}} [below]: (13) conversion of the \textbf{1} into \textit{i} or \textit{\textbf{1}} 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 purport] of the speech. And by “predicament” [of pause] we mean \textit{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

\begin{verbatim}
Transfer [No. 11 in the preceding list], and elision [No. 8], and quiescence [No. 1]; and they are followed by reduplication [No. 10], and Raum [No. 2], and Ishmām [No. 3], and substitution [No. 4, and possibly Nos. 5, 9, 12, and 13]. And, as for affixion of the \textit{s} of silence [No. 7], it is [only] to make the vowel plain
\end{verbatim}
(776)

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

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 the youth and pregnant; and [the defective not pronounced with Tanwīn (Sn),] as 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 ٌ or ُ 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 َ of feminization 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 ٌ., ْ., or ُ.; and the ٌ., when its final is a sound letter, and it is triptote, is in the nom., acc., or gen. (IY). Moreover the [ن.] paused upon is sometimes pronounced, and sometimes not pronounced, with Tanwin (Tsr). If the final of the word be quiescent [below], as in َٰٗ [217] and ﻣُنَ [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.] ﮕٍﮐٌ القرآن [234, 246] and ﺔُنَ [234] (R). When you pause upon a [ن.] pronounced with Tanwin [below] (Aud) and not made fem. with the َ [646], the Arabs have three dials., (1) elision of the Tanwin unrestrictedly, [i.e., in all three
cases,] which is the *dial.* of Rabi'ā [below] (Tsr); though apparently, says IA, this is not necessary in the *dial.* of Rabi'ā, since, in their poems, pause upon the acc. pronounced with Tanwīn is often with ū (Sn): (2) change of the Tanwīn unrestrictedly, into ū after Fatha, ū after Damma, and ū after Kasra, which is the *dial.* of Al'Azd [below]: (3) making a distinction between the [final] pronounced with] Fathā and [the final pronounced with] any other [vowel] (Tsr). The most preponderant and frequent of the [three (Tsr)] *dials.* is that its Tanwīn should be (1) elided after Damma and Kasra, [the letter before the Tanwīn being made quiescent (Tsr),] as This is Zaid and I passed by Zaid, [with quiescence of the ū in the two exs. (Tsr)]: and (2) changed into ū after Fatha, whether the Fathā be (a) inflectional, as in I saw Zaid; or (b) un-inflectional, as in Iq. Desist (Tsr),] and [187, 198] (Aud), i.q. Aَمَحَّبَتْ I marvel (Tsr). And they assimilate [594], with the acc. pronounced with Tanwīn, changing its ū into ū in pause. This is the saying of the majority: while some assert that pause upon it is with the ū, 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 رَنَعَ تنفِّخُوا
XVIII. 19. And ye shall not ever prosper then with the l (Tsr). When mobile, the final of the n. paused upon is either a š of femininization [646], or not (IA). In pause upon the mobile [final], that is not the š of femininization [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 ū of femininization in the v. in لاتٍ في لسابعة LIV. 1. The hour hath drawn nigh [607], and the ٧ of يَوْمَ يَوْمٍ 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 l [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 [n.] pronounced, and the [n.] not pronounced, with Tanwin; and to the inf. 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 خ (S, M, R, A, Tsr) above the letter (IY, R, A, Tsr) paused upon (R), as َضْفَنْطَكِمْ This is Ha-kam (M), and is made by S like this، (Tsr), meaning َخُفِيف light (IY, R, A, Tsr), or َخُفَف It has become light (A, Tsr), or َخُفْاف 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 َخ or َم, either of which is abbreviated from َخَيْر Cut off [the vowel], or Make quiescent; and apparently it is the head of َخ abbreviated from َإِسْتَرْجَح 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)] ُد, as though, when they saw it without any explanation, they thought it to be a ُد (IY, Tsr): (h) quiescence is allowable in every mobile, except [the final of] the acc. pronounced with Tanwîn, where the common dial. is conversion of the Tanwîn into ٌ; though Rabi'a
[above] treat the acc. like the nom. and gen., as

by AlA'sha Maimūn, praising ḫais Ibn Ma'dîkarib,

Unto the perfect man, ḫais, 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 عَصْمًا (AKB): and it is necessary in pause upon the ٰ of feminization [646] (Aud), where the remaining modes are not practicable (Tsr): (i) when the final of the word is Tanwîn [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 Tanwîn 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 Tanwîn i.e., the Damma 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 Tanwîn, 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, Tar); for a notification of the vowel in the o. f. (Jrb, Tar), together with a realization of part of the object of the pause (Jrb): so says Jrb (Tar); (b) it [is not confined to any particular vowel; but (Tar)] is allowable in all the vowels, contrary to the opinion of Fr, who disallows it in the case of Fatḥa, and whose opinion is adopted by most of the [Seven (Tar)] Readers (Aud), while AHm agrees with them in the disallowance (Tar): (c) when the [final] pronounced with Fatḥ has Tanwin, as in 'ayd and ُرَجُلَةٰ, there is no dispute that Raum is not allowable in it, except according to the rare dial. of Rabra, i.e., elision of the Tanwin, as in ُؤُخَدُ مِنْ الْبَلَمَةِ [above]: but, when it has no Tanwin, as in ُؤُمَّدُ ِالْبَرْجُلَةِ the opinion of the Readers, and of Fr among the GG, is that Raum of the Fatḥa in it is not allowable, because Fatḥ 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, Tar), like this, (Tar), as ُهُذَا خَالِدٍ
This is Khalid (M): (3) Ishmām: (a) this is peculiar to the [final] pronounced with Ḍamm (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 Raum [above], according to the technical nomenclature mentioned below as adopted by some of the KK (Tar): (b) it is really the indication of the vowel by the lips, after quiescence, without emission of any [audible (Tar)] 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 [Ḍamma]: 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 (Tar); and is therefore perceptible only by the seeing, not by the blind (Aud): (c) some of the KK apply the name Ishmām to Raum [above]: but this is really a misnomer, because in Raum, 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 (Tar): (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 ی, 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 (IY, A, R, A, Tsr), like this, 

اسلام

This is Ja'far (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 جَرْمَة sign of quiescence; as the sign of Raum [above] is not above it, to dispel the notion that is a نَصْبَة 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 (Tsər); (g) the object of it is to distinguish what [is mobile in continuity, but (Tsər)] is made quiescent in pause, from what is quiescent (A, Tsər) in every state (Tsər); (h) according to IH (R), the majority hold that there is no Raum or Ishmām in [three forms (Jrb)], the of feminization [646], the 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 Shit, after saying

[And, in a form of feminization, and the of the pl., and an accidental vowel, say, they (the pron. referring to Raum and Ishmām) are not to be applied. And, in the 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 were said, it would be plainer) is Damm or Kasr formed, or their bases, a, and a, as in II.70. They have understood it, XII.20. And they sold him, and in II.108. His Name, and in II.1.About it, XII.26. Unto Him, and in II.1. From his Lord (AAK), adds

\[While some of them, like AdDami 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 Ishmām are not allowable in the m of feminization [642] is that on the s there is no vowel to be notified by Raum or Ishmām, 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 m without conversion, as in [183, 646]: (j) as for the m of the
the majority hold that it should be made quiescent in continuity [161], as مَلَِّهِمْ and عَلِيْكَمْ; while Raum and Ishmām do not occur in the quiescent [above]: and, as for those who mobilize it in continuity, conjoining it with a  or  , the reason why they do not employ Raum or Ishmām, after elision of the  or  [in pause], as Raum of the Kasra in القاضى is employed after elision of its  [643], is that this Kasra does sometimes occur at the end of the word in continuity, as in يَوْمٌ يَدْعُ آدَّاٗ. LIV.6. On the day when the summoner [İsrāfil (K, B), or Gabriel (K)], shall summon, [which is read (K) with elision of the  (K, B), for the sake of lightness (B)]; whereas  and  إِلَّيْهِمْ and عَلِيْكَمْ, when you conjoin them with a mobile after them, do not occur with Damām [and Kasr, respectively,] of the م [i.e.,] with the م 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 إِلَّيْهِمْ أَلْكَثَابٍ VI. 114. [77] and إِلَّيْهِمْ أَلِسْلَاتِكَةٌ VI.111. [585], the final of the word in their case is the  and  respectively, which is elided on account of the two quiescents; and what is elided on account of two quiescents is in the predicament of the expressed: this is if we say that, before their conjunction with the quiescent, they were إِلَّيْهِمْ and إِلَّيْهِمْ, according to the reading of Ibn Kathir [161]:
while, if we say that, before that, they were كَلِفَتْنَهُمْ and يَلْهَمْنَهُمْ, with quiescence of the مُ in both, then the كَسْر and دَامْ are accidental, on account of the two quiescents; and there is no رَاعُ or إِشْمَام in the accidental vowel [below], as مَنْ يَقْرَأَ الْلَّهُ يُضَلِّلُهُ VI. 39. Whomsoever God willeth [to lead astray (B)], him doth He lead astray, and بَلْ لَقَدْ أَشْهَرَتُ مِنْ قَبْلَهُ VI. 10. And assuredly Apostles before thee have been mocked at, because رَاعُ and إِشْمَام 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 رَاعُ or إِشْمَام] (R): (k) the accidental vowel is the vowel of the concurrence of two quiescents [664], as in XCVIII. 1. [450], IV. 45. And disobeyed the Apostle, and فَلْيَتْنَ الْأُنْسَان لXXX. 24. Then let man look; and in بُيْمَةٌ [above] (MAR): and the reason why there is no رَاعُ or إِشْمَام 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 عَنَّا خَالِدَ This is
Khalid and He makes (Aud), with reduplication of the م in حلال, and of the ل in (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 ش (S, M, R, A) above the letter (IY, R, A), as هذه شديده

This is Faraj (M); this being the initial of شديد strong (IY, R, A), or شده It has become strong (IY), or شده It has been strengthened (Sn): but, in the language of the Tsr (Sn), its sign is (Tsr) the head of a ش (Tsr, Sn) above the letter, like this, ش (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 'Asim in مكون 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 letter (Tsr) paused upon should not be (a) a Hamza [642], as in حطة fault and رفأ young gazelle (Aud), because the Hamza in the position of the ج is not incorporated, nor incorporated into [737] (Tsr); (b-d) a ى, as in the judge, a و, as in يفهو calls, or an !,
as in ِضَخُّى dreads (Aud), because of the heavity of the unsound letter [642] (Tsr); (e) immediately after quiescence, as in ُعَمْرْ زَاَيْد and ُعَمْرْ ْأُنْمَر (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 [above], except according to the dial. of Rabî'a [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 ْالرَجُلَ, I saw the man, ِلَنْ يُصَبِّعَلَ 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 ُفَصْبَأ [in the saying of the poet أَوْ كَا لَحْكِمَيْنِي آَمَح (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 ِ, 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

فَقاْ نَبَيْكَ مِن ذَكَرٍي حَبيْبٍ وَمَنْرَيٍّ

[115], whereas you do not say مَرَّتُ بُعْرِيْرُ I passed by 'Amr, except according to the dial. of the Azd [above] of As Sarât; and as in

آذِنْنَا بِبَيْنِهَا أَسَاءَوْ رَبّ نَآرٍ يَبدِلُ مِنْهُ اثْثَاوْوُ

(R), by [Al Harith (EM)] Ibn Hilliza [al Yashkuri (EM), The beloved (N)] Asmá 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 جَأْتُنِي أَسَاءَوْ Asmá has come to
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me.[642]; and you say in poetry عَرَّجُ لي الْرَجُلُ, 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 جَأَرْنِي غُلَامًا 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

بِبَارِلِي وَجَنَّةُ أُر عِيْهِل

[by a man of the Banu 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 آوُ كَالْحَرِيقُ الْمُحَ] [below] is orig. quiescent, but is mobilized for the sake of the letter of unbinding, as the ن of الآنَدَرَبٍ 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 AlAndar, a city in Syria, i. e. خُمْرُ آلْآنَذِرَيْنِ, where three s are combined, so that they are lightened by poetic license, or the wines of the Andarūn, said to be cities in Syria abounding in wines (EM),] ought to be quiescent, as in مَّرْتَ بَأَلسِّلِيِّينَ.

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 الشَّكْرَتَى the tree, with the followed by the conj. ; but الشَّكْرَتَى occurs, with the quiescent s [646] ; while الشَّكْرَتَى is frequent only in the poems of post-classical [poets]: and, according to this theory, the saying القَصَبَ [below] is not “an anomalous poetic license” [above]; as the mobilization of the ن in the above [above] and the mobilization of the ر in the saying

لِعَبَ الْبَرْقَاءُ يِهَا وَفِيَهَا * بَعْدَى سُوَائِيُّ الْمُرَ وَالْقَطْرُ

[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 'Ajjaj at Tamimí (Jsh)] says

"لَقَدْ خَشَيتَ أَنْ أَرَى جَدَبًا # فِي عَامِنَا ذَا بَعْدًا أَخْصَبًا إِنَّ الْدَّبَّا فَرَقَ الْمُدُورِ دَبَّا # وَهَبَتْ الرُّمْحُ يُمَرُّ قِبَاءَ تَتَرَكْ مَا أَبْقَى الْدَّبَّ سَبْسُبًا # كَانَ السَّيْلَ إِذَا أَسْلَحَبَا أَوْ كَأَلْحَيْدُقُ وَقَافَ الْجَعْبَا # وَأَلْحَيْدُقُ وَالْجَعْبَا تَأْلَقُهُمَا"

[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 جَعْفَرٍ جَعْفَرٍ and the rarity of Ja'far came to me, and of جَعْفَرٍ جَعْفَرٍ. [above]: (R) but [Jib 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 قَتْرَكُ مَا أَبْقَى آنَدَا سَبْسِبًا [above], because the letter of its inflection ought to be mobile in pause, its Tanwin being converted into ٰ, 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 Rab'ia [above] (R): (5) transfer of the vowel of the letter [ paused upon] to that which is before it, as in the reading [of ی‌الصَّبِر] قَتْرَكُ مَا أَبْقَى آنَدَا سَبْسِبًا CIII. 3.
And enjoined, one upon another, patience, [with transfer of the Kasra to the ب (Tsr)]; and the saying أَنَا أَمْنُ مَارِيَةً آَلِهَةٍ [498, 641] (Aud), with transfer of the Damm of the ر to the ق 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 خ with Damm, Fath, 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 concurrency 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 ] and the incorporated letter, which do not receive a vowel (Tsr); and should not sound heavy, [as in the case of the ] and ظ, to which the vowel is not transferred, on account of the heaviness (Tsr): (4) that the vowel [intended to be transferred
(797)

(Tsr) should not be Fatha [642] (Aud), according to the soundest opinion, as held by the majority of the BB, because, if the [final] pronounced with Fatha was [orig.] accompanied by Tanwin, the transfer [of its Fatha] would entail elision of the t of, [i.e., substituted for (Sn)] the Tanwin [640]; while the [final] unaccompanied by Tanwin 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 (Tsr)] and the incorporated letter [in (Tsr)] do not receive a vowel, [since they are necessarily quiescent, except that the quiescence of the t 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 Damma [in (Tsr)], and upon the preceded by a [letter] pronounced with Kasr [in (Tsr)]: (4) I learnt knowledge, because the vowel is Fatha (Aud): for they transfer Damma and Kasra, because they dislike to elide them,
en account of their strength; while, Fathā being light, they pardon its elision: so says Jrb (Tar): but that [transfer of Fathā (Tar)] 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. (Tar); 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 I saw Bakr (A), vid. Rabī‘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) This is knowledge, because in Arabic there is no [368], with Kasr of its first [letter], and Damm of its second (Aud): (6) and [643], because the [final which the vowel is] transferred from is not sound (Tar). The last two conditions [mentioned by IHsh, vid. that the vowel should not be Fathā, and that the transfer should not lead to an unprecedented formation (Tar),] are peculiar to [the n. whose final is] other than Hamza: so that transfer is allowable in such as (1)

XXVII. 25. Who bringeth forth the hidden, [where you say (Tar),] though the vowel is Fathā, [because, if you said with quiescence, without transfer, you
would find it sound manifestly heavy (Tsr): (2)

This is a buttress, [where you say | with Kasr of the ]

, and Damm of the \( \text{د} \) (Tsr),] although the transfer leads to the formation \( \text{فعل} \) [above] (Aud), because the Hamza is heavy; and, when the preceding [letter] is quiescent, the utterance of the [quiescent (A)] Hamza is difficult (T'sr). The opinion of the KK [above] is that pause with transfer is allowable, whether the vowel be Fath\( \text{أ} \)., or Kasra, and whether the final be Hamza or any other letter; so that, according to them, you say | I saw the striking and | I saw the buttress; while the opinion of the BB is that transfer is not allowable when the vowel is Fath\( \text{أ} \), except when the final is Hamza; so that, according to them, is allowable, while [is disallowed: but the opinion of the KK is better, because they have transmitted it from the Arabs (IA). Those who do not authorize \( \text{فعل} \) [368], with Damm [on its first (Tsr)], and then Kasra [on its second (Tsr)], but assert that \( \text{ذ} \) is transferred from the v., do not allow transfer [of the vowel] in such as \( \text{بَقَفُينَ} \text{by a lock, because, after the transfer, it becomes } \text{بَقَفُينَ} \text{with Damm of the } \text{ق} \), and Kasr of the \( \text{ف} \): but allow it in such as \( \text{بَطَهَ} \) with slowness, because the final is Hamza (Aud); while 77 a
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] Tamīm (IY, A), who, in the case of [the n. whose final is] Hamza, make no distinction between Fatha, and Ḍamm or Kasr, of the initial; but say ِهْٰذَا ٱلطَّرَّو. This is slowness and من الْبَطْرِ This is slowness [642] and مَرْضِي ِهْٰذَا ٱلْبَطْرِ I passed by the buttress, as they say مَرْضِي ِهْٰذَا ٱلْبَطْرِ This is the hidden [and مَرْضِي ِهْٰذَا ٱلْبَطْرِ I passed by the hidden (M)]: and do not avoid reduction to the formation ْنُعَلِ, which has no precedent in the language, or ْنُعَلِ, which has no precedent among ns.; because such a formation [here] is accidental, not the [original]: formation of the word (IY). But some [of Tamīm (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 Ḍamma to the Kasra of the ف, and of the transferred Kasra to the Ḍamma of the ف (MASH), making Kasra follow Kasra, and Ḍamma follow Ḍamma (IY, Jrb), as ِهْٰذَا ٱلْبَطْرِ with two Kasras.
and with two Ḍammās [642] (M, Ḣrb, MASH): while some of them alliterate; but, after alliteration, change the Hamza [into a letter homogeneous with the alliterative vowel before it (Sn)], saying ُهُدَا َرِدَي مَع كُفُور 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, Ṣ), 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 AlḤijāz [642] is not mentioned by [Z or] IH in this section (R). When the vowel of the Hamza is transferred, the Hijāzīs 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 ُهُدَا أَلْحَبَ 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 Rājīz says 

\[\text{النفر (Mb); [and]}\]

the poet says

\[
\text{أَرْتَى حَجْجًالَ عَلَى سَاقِهَا ۝ فَهَشَّ الْفُوْرَ لِذَلَّ الْحَجْجَ}
\]

\[
فَقَلَّ رَبِّمُ أَخْفَ عَنِّ صَاحِبِي ۝ أَلَا يَلِيَ أَصْلُ تَلَّكُ الْحِجْلَ}
\]

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 

\[\text{الْجِلِّ} [368] ; \] and, similarly (IY), the poet says

\[
\text{تَحْفِرُ هَا الْأَرْتَرُ ۡوَ الأَلْيَدِ الْشَّعْرُ ۡوََ الْنَّبَلُ سَتُونَ كَانَتَها الْجُمَُّ}
\]

The strings of the bows and the hairy hands drove them, the arrows being sixty, as though they were live coals, meaning \[\text{الأَحْجُرُ} \] (M). As for the acc., (1) if the n. be pronounced with Tanwīn, transfer is not authorized in it, except in the dial. of Rabī'a [above], because of their eliding the Fāṭha also: (2) if it be not pronounced with Tanwīn, transfer is (a) disallowed by S, who says “They do not say رَأَيْتُ ۡالْبَكْرٌ,” [“because it is in the position of Tanwīn” (S), which is
understood by R to mean] "on the ground that the *art.* is accidental, the *o. f.* being Tanwīn, so that the [n.] made *det.* by the *art.* is in the predicament of the [n.] pronounced with Tanwīn"; [and by IUK and others to mean that the *acc.* not pronounced with Tanwīn is made to accord with the *acc.* pronounced with Tanwīn, for the sake of uniformity]; (b) allowed by others than S, because the *acc.* not pronounced with Tanwīn 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 Tanwīn 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 Tanwīn is like the *acc.* not pronounced with Tanwīn 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 [201] is not said, nor [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 مَنَعْتُ and عَنْهَا, for the sake of making the Ḍamma plain (R). The poet [Ziyād alAʿjam (S, IY)] says

(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 أَضْرِبْ (Mb, A, N), with quiescence of the ب, and Ḍamm of the ُ (N); and Abu-nNajm says

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

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 ِي [elided in ِبَعْرِ], when the م becomes mobile, because its vowel does not really belong to it, but is only the vowel of the ُ (Mb). And some of the Banū ‘Adr, of Tamīm, mobilize the letter before the ُ with Kasr, on account of the two quiescents, saying ضَرَّبَتْ She struck
him and She said it; but the first [mode, vid. transfer of the Damma from the s to the quiescent before it, as and ,] 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 (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 s to the , which was mobile (MN, Sn) before (Sn), orig. (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 ; but, when he pauses upon the s , he transfers its [vowel, vid. the (Jh)] Damma to the preceding , which he then mobilizes (Tsr) with the vowel of the s (Jh). And another peculiarity of this dial. is pause upon the s of the 3rd pers. fem. by elision of the , and transfer of the Fatha of the s to the mobile before it, as in the saying

Misfortunes that I was fearing for, or on account of,
Lakhm, meaning آخانها (A). And it is said in the Nihāya "For ُضِرْبَةُ ْهُمْ َيَُبْعِثُ He struck him you say ضِرْبَةُ ْهُمْ َيَُبْعِثُ in poetry; and the vulgar use it in prose" (Tsr). It is allowable to pause upon a single letter, like [the الف and (MAR)] the aoristic letter, which is then conjoined with a Hamza followed immediately by an !; but sometimes is restricted to the !: the poet says

[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., وإن شَرَأْ نَضْرُرُ and نَعَصْتُ وَأَعْصَتْ: and it is sometimes related نَعَصْتُ, and it is sometimes related نَعَصْتُ, as though another ! were added to the !, like the impletion of Fathā; and then the first, being mobilized because of the two quiescents, were converted into Hamza, as in دَأْبَةُ [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 AlHijāz (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, Ḍamma 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 Ḍamma of the Hamza in the case of the tril. pronounced with Kasr of the ف, as ُهُدَأ ُلَوْنُر
and its Kasra in the case of the tril. pronounced with دامن of the ف, as مَرَّتْ بِالْبُطُورُ, هَذَا الْبُطُورُ, and رَآيْتُ الْبُطُورُ; and مَرَّتْ بِالْرَّدِيْنِ, هَذَا الرَّدِيْنِ, and رَآيْتُ الرَّدِيْنِ [641]. For, since they see that, in the gen. of handy, transfer leads 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 كَسَر or دامن of the ف; but, in both [formations], make [the vowel of] the ع imitate [that of] the ف, in the three cases, [nom., acc., and gen.,] saying مَرَّتْ بِالْبُطُورُ, هَذَا الْبُطُورُ, and رَآيْتُ الْبُطُورُ; and مَرَّتْ بِالْرَّدِيْنِ, هَذَا الرَّدِيْنِ, and رَآيْتُ الرَّدِيْنِ [641]. This is a counterpoise, nor 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 كَسَر or دامن of the ف; but, in both [formations], make [the vowel of] the ع imitate [that of] the ف, in the three cases, [nom., acc., and gen.,] saying مَرَّتْ بِالْبُطُورُ, هَذَا الْبُطُورُ, and رَآيْتُ الْبُطُورُ; and مَرَّتْ بِالْرَّدِيْنِ, هَذَا الرَّدِيْنِ, and رَآيْتُ الرَّدِيْنِ [641]. For, since they see that, in the gen. of handy, transfer leads
to the two discarded measures, they make [the vowel of] the Ӛ imitate [that of] the ٣ in the gen. of بُطُهِ, and in the nom. of رِدْنِ; 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 Ӛ imitate [that of] the ٣ in the three cases. And, besides quiescence, in these two [formations], where [the vowel of] the Ӛ is made to imitate [that of] the ٣, 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 Ӛ to [that of] the ٣; 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 ﴾This is the bruise and slowness and the buttress, and مُرَتْ بِالْبُطُهِ ﺑِلْبُطُهِ, and فُرَتْ ﺑِلْبُطُهِ, with quiescence of the Ӛ in the whole [of them]: while, in the acc., quiescence of the letter before the ٣ not being possible, since the ٣ occurs only after Fāhā, they say رَآيْتُ اَلْرَتَا and [below], with transfer and conversion; so that here the
Hamza is made plain by its conversion into ʿ, as some make the ʿ in ʿحَبْلَى plain by its conversion into Hamza [643], because [here] the ʿ 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 ʿ: (2) some transfer the vowels to the ʿ in the whole [of these formations]; and afterwards regulate the Hamza, in respect of conversion, by the vowel of what precedes it, saying ʿُهُدَا ʿبَطُر and and ʿَلِينَيْتُ بَعْلِيَة and and ʿَلِينَيْتُ بَعْلِيَة مُمَرَّتُ بِụُلْبِيَة the ʿُهُدَا ʿبَطُر and and [above]. This conversion, however, is not an alleviation of the Hamza, as in ʿبِير well, ʿرَأس head, and ʿمُؤُمِّن 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 ʿَلِينَيْتُ ʿبَطُر ʿهُدَا ʿبَطُر and and ʿَلِينَيْتُ ʿبَطُر ʿهُدَا ʿبَطُر and and ʿَلِينَيْتُ ʿبَطُر ʿهُدَا ʿبَطُر مُمَرَّتُ بِụُلْبِيَة, making the ʿ, inseparable from the first [formation], and the ʿ from the second. And, in the case of these [formations], whose ʿ 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 

e of femininization [640]. All of this is when the 

letter preceding the Hamza is quiescent. But, if it be 

mobile, as in 

\( \text{ךָאַשׁ} \) \( y \) oung gazelle, 

\( \text{ךָאַמּ} \) mushrooms, and 

[below], you pause upon such a formation as you 

pause upon 

\( \text{ךָאַמּ} \) he-camel, 

\( \text{ךָאַמּ} \) man, and 

\( \text{ךָאַמּ} \) 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 redupli­

cation [640]; and except transfer, because of the mobility 

of the penultimate [641]. When the letter before the 

Hamza is pronounced with Fat\( \h \), some of the Arabs, I 

mean, of those who sound [the Hamza] true, regulate it 

[in respect of conversion] by its own vowel, from eager­

ness to make [the Hamza] plain, because they account 

the Fat\( \h \)a [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 

This is fresh herbage, 

\( \text{ךָאַמּ} \) I saw fresh 

herbage, 

\( \text{ךָאַמּ} \) I passed by fresh herbage, [with 

Fat\( \h \) of the \( \text{ךָאַמּ} \), and quiescence of the \( \text{ךָאַמּ} \) and \( \text{ךָאַמּ} \) (Sn),] con­

verting the Hamza pronounced with Damm into \( \text{ךָאַמּ} \), the 

Hamza pronounced with Fat\( \h \) into \( \text{ךָאַמּ} \), and the Hamza 

pronounced with Kasr into \( \text{ךָאַמּ} \), because, after Fat\( \h \)a, the 

unsound letters are not considered heavy, when quiescent.
But, when the letter before the Hamza is pronounced with Ḍamm, as in مُكَموُمٌ, or Kasr, as in إِنْنٌ [below], it is not possible to regulate the Hamza [in respect of conversion] by its own vowel, because the does not occur after Ḍamma or Kasra, nor the quiescent ى after Ḍamma, nor the quiescent ٰ after Kasra; and moreover the Ḍamma and Kasra [on the penultimate] manage to make [the Hamza] properly plain: so that they retain the two Hamzas in their [original] state, [saying مُكَموُمٌ and إِنْنٌ]; 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 Ḥijāzis], 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 ﺟَphpُ and ﺟَphpُ; and here quiescence, Raum, Ishmām, and reduplication [641] occur: while, in the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, the Tanwin is converted into ﺟَphpُ and ﺟَphpُ: (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 ﺟَphpُ, in the three cases; a, in
and a ی in اُنْنَى: and here only quiescence occurs; not Raum or Ishnām, as we said in the case of the ی of femininization [640]; while reduplication is impossible, because it occurs only in the sound [640] (R). The people of AlHijāz say the fresh herbage [and 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 Fatḥ; so that it is [converted into ی (IY),] like [the Hamza in] رَّأس head [658] (M) and قَالَ 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 ی or ی, respectively; so that (IY)] they say for ۳أَکْمُر above (M, A); and for اُنْنَى I give (M), from ۳هَنَّا the ۳رَّجل gave to the man, aor. اُنْنَى for ۳أَکْمُر full (A); ۳أَکْمُر being (IY) like ۳جُنَة pounce-box, and [۳ذَيْب] like (IY) (M).

§. 643. The unsound ی. is that which has for its final an unsound letter, vid. ۳أَکْمُر (M, A); 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 (IY),] like the final of كَبِيَّة gazelle [and صَبِيَّة boy (IY), and of دَلْوُر bucket [and يُذَر enemy, not with the t, because what precedes the t 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 Banû Sa'd substitute a ج for the double ي in pause, because the ي is faint: while it proceeds from the same outlet as the ج [732]; so that the ج, but for its hardness, would be a ي; and the ي, but for its softness, would be a ج: and therefore they say تَمْيَيْج for فَكَيْبَيْج, [311] for تَبَيِّنَيْج for تَبَيِّنَيْج Fukaimi, [311] for تَبَيِّنَيْج Tamimi, and thus for عَلِي for عَلِي, for عَلِي Ali: the poet says هَذَا يُيْجَي آمَن, [694], meaning عَلِي (IY). [When the penultimate of the unsound ن is mobile, the ن is defective or abbreviated.] When the defective [16] is paused upon, its ي must be expressed in three cases, (1) when it is curtailed of the ب, as when you use the aor. of فُلْفَلْيَة fulfilled or رَفْعَيَة stored up as a [proper] name, in which case you say [in the nom. (Tsr)] هَذَا يُيْجَي This is Yafî and هَذَا يُيْجَي This is Yafî, [and in the gen. مُرْتُ يُيْجَي I passed by
Yaa” and يَبَعِي by Ya’a (Tsr), with expression [of the ی in the nom. and gen. of both (Tsr)], because their o. f. is یَبَعِي and يَبَعِي [482, 644, 699]; and then their ف 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 ی, as in م’ act. part. of یَعِي shewed: for its o. f. is یَعِي, on the measure of یَعِي; and then the vowel of its ی, 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 n. then subjected to the same alteration as قَلِي (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 ی and its ی, and [from] its being left with a single quiescent rad. (Tsr); so that you say هَدَا مُرِي This is a shewer (IA, A): (3) when it is an acc., whether it be pronounced with Tanwin, as in رَبِّنا إِنَّا سَيْقَنا مَنادِيًا III. 190. Our Lord, verily we have heard a summoner; or not, as in گَلَّإ ذا بَرُقَت 79a
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 ی must be expressed in both [e.g., as ی and ی], because it is fortified [against elision] in the first by the ِ of the Tanwin, and in the second by ُ (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 Tanwin, its ی is made quiescent, as یرايتُ قاضي ِ I saw the judge; and, if it be pronounced with Tanwin, an ِ is substituted for its Tanwin, as یرايتُ قاضي ِ I saw a judge (Jrb). If, however, the defective be a nom. or gen., its ی 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 Tanwin, [there is a dispute as to which of the two modes is preferable: and, according to S (Tsr),] the preferable [mode] is elision, as ِ هُنَّا قاض This is a judge and ِ سوَرَتُ بقاض I passed by a judge (Aud). This is the opinion of S and the moderns, because the ی is not expressed in continuity; so that, when pause upon the defective is intended, its vowel and its Tanwin 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 Tanwín, which is the necessitating cause of elision [16], is constructively remaining (Jrb, Fk). But [and] مَرْتُ بِالقَابِسِ هَذَا قَابِسًي and لَتُلْكَ قُرُبُ الْجَانِبِ هَذَا نَبِيًّا are allowable, with expression of the ي, which is preferred by Y; and, in accordance therewith (Tsr),] Ibn Kathîr reads وَلَكَلِّ قُرُبٍ هَادِي ّي XIII. 8. And every people hath a guide, دُوَّارٌ مِّنْ زَأْيِ XIII. 12. Nor have they, beside Him, any protector (Aud), and وما عَنْدَ اللهِ بَكِي ّي 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 Tanwín is not in the word (Jrb). And in the [defective] not pronounced with Tanwín, [vid. the synarthrous (Tsr),] the preferable [mode] is expression [of the ي (Tsr)], as مَرْتُ بِالقَابِسِ This is the judge and هَذَا أَلْقَافِي I passed by the judge (Aud). But pause with elision is allowable, as مَرْتُ بِالقَابِسِ and هَذَا أَلْقَافِ; and, in accordance therewith is the pause of the majority [of the Readers] upon أَلْقَافِ ّي and َلَنْ يَلْبِنَّ دِرَيْمَ الْتَّلَقِّي XIII. 10. The Great, the High [645] and لَيْبِنَ دِرَيْمَ الْتَّلَقِّي 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 Kathîr 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 ی [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 GG (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 جواری 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 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 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 [above], as This is a staff, ََٰ I saw a staff; and ََٰ I passed by a staff, because of the lightness of the ََٰ (IV). The abbreviated pronounced with Tanwin is paused upon with the ََٰ (Jrb, MN, A,
which must be expressed, in the three cases (Tsr), as 

\[1 \text{ saw a youth} \quad \text{[below]} \quad (\text{MN, A})\]. The GG dispute about this \(1\) (IY, R). As to this \(1\) there are three opinions, (1) that it is a subst. for the Tanwin, in the three cases (MN, A, Tsr), the elision of the converted \(1\) [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 Tanwin after Fath into an \(1\) " (IM),] because the Tanwin is after a Fatha (A): (2) that it is the converted \(1\), in the three cases; that the Tanwin is elided; and that, when it is elided, the \(1\) returns: this is transmitted from IAl, 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 Khl (A, 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 \(1\) in pause, [as in سدى LXXV. 36. neglected, with Imāla, in the reading of Hamza and Ks (Sn); and by the \(1\)'s being accounted a rhyme-letter" (MN, A): whereas the subst. for the Tanwin 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 سَرِى (MN, Sn), because سَرِى is pronounced with Tanwin (MN); not in [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 Fatḥa and the ِ are lighter. Do you not see them flee to the ِ from the , or ِ preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684]?
And sometimes they flee to it from the [و or ی] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as دَعَا and رَضِى (R) and نَهَا (S, IY), for دُعِى and رُضِى (NY) and نُعِى (IY).

And he also says that they lighten عَضْدَ by eliding the vowel of their ع بس; but do not elide the vowel of the ع in جَبَل he-camel (R), because of the lightness of فَتُحَة (IY). Sf [above] says, which is the truth, "This passage indicates that the opinion of S is that the ۱, 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 مَرْرَت يَقَافُ and هَدَاء قَافِع [above], you elide in pause the ی 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 ی 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 ی, in every state, is lighter than Tanwin: but (2) that, in the abbreviated, you restore in pause, in the three cases, the ۱ elided on account of the two quiescents, because the last quiescent, vid. the Tanwin, has disappeared, [such restoration being] because the ۱ 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 conduces 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 l, which is the J, 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) alÍdah (HKh). The fruit of this dispute appears in parsing: for, on the theory that the l is a subst. for the Tanwin, the abbreviated is infl. with vowels assumed upon the l elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and, on the theory that the l is converted from the [ or] ي, the abbreviated is infl. with vowels assumed upon the [ l] present, because it is then the seat of inflection (Sn). As for the abbreviated stripped of Tanwin, like أَعْلَى higher and أَفْتَى the youth [above], the l in pause is the one that was in it in continuity, without dispute: and is sometimes elided by poetic license, as

\[
\text{80 a}
\]
[645, 648] (R), by Labid [Ibn Rab'a al'Amiri (MN)],
When a clan of Lukaiz was present, the kinsfolk of Marjûn, and the kinsfolk of Ibn AlMu'alla, 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 Tanwîn is like its form in continuity; and that its t is not elided, except in poetic license, as in

[above], meaning "أبِي الْمُعَلَّى (A). As for the diptote, like حَبَّٰلٰ and سُكْرٰى [18, 272], and what has no Tanwîn affixed to it, like ملَّع* and لَعفَا [16, 326], its t, vid. the original t, which was [sounded] in continuity, is retained, because there is no Tanwîn 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 û, because û is plainer than t; which is the dial. of Fazârâ and some of Kais: (3) conversion into , because , is plainer than û; 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 Tanwîn, according to the different opinions before mentioned
(Ts'r). S transmits, in pause, (1) ُهَلْلَاءُ حُبْلًا This is a pregnant (female), with the Hamza, meaning حُبْلًا، (2) رَأَيْتُ رَجْلًا I saw a man [below], meaning رَجْلًا، where the Hamza in رَجْلًا is a subst. for the 1, 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 رَجْلًا is substituted for the 1, not for the Tanwin, is that you say رَأَيْتُ حُبْلًا I saw a pregnant (female), pronouncing with Hamza, although there is no Tanwin in it; and for that reason حُزَّةُ هِيَمُهُ. He strikes her [below] is transmitted (IV). Conversion of the 1 [substituted for the Tanwin (Jrb)] into Hamza, [as in رَأَيْتُ رَجْلًا (Jrb),] is [of] weak [authority]: as [likewise (Jrb)] is conversion of every [other (R)] ٌ (SH) into Hamza (Jrb), whether it be for feminization, as in حُبْلًا (R, Jrb); or co-ordination, as in مَعْرُوٰى [273, 375] (R); or anything else (R, Jrb), as in عَصَا (Jrb), [and] as in يَضْرِبُهَا [above], where some of the Arabs convert it into Hamza (R). And so is conversion of the 1 of [feminization in (Jrb)] such as حُبْلًا into Hamza, or ، or ى (SH), where IH’s saying “Hamza” is not needed, with his [previous] saying “conversion of every 1” into Hamza (R). All of this is in pause: for, when you continue, you say حُوَوُ يَضْرِبُهَا يَا
He strikes her, O fellow, and I saw a pregnant (female) yesterday (IY).

§ 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 (IY). Pause (1) upon the ind. and subj. of the v., whose $ is unsound, is with retention of its finals [without elision (IY)], as, [in the ind. (IY),] يُغَرُّو $ يَخْفَقَى $ He raids, يَرَى $ He throws [645] (M), and $ He dreads; and similarly, in the subj., لَنْ يُغَرُّ He shall not raid, لَنْ يَخْفَقَى He shall not throw, and لَنْ يَرَى 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., هُوَ يُغَرُّرُ يَا فَتَى يُخْفَقَى يَا فَتَى and يَرَى يَا فَتَى $ He raids, and throws, and dreads, O youth; and, in the subj., لَنْ يُغَرُّرُ يَا فَتَى لَنْ يَخْفَقَى يَا فَتَى لَنْ يَرَى يَا فَتَى and He shall not raid, and throw, and dread, O youth [404]: but, when you pause, you make [the final] quiescent (IY): (2) upon its apoc. and imp., is [in two modes (IY),] (a) with affixion of the s., [which is the better mode (IY),] as, [in the apoc. (IY),] لَنْ يُغَرُّهُ $ He did not raid [below].
He did not throw, and لَمْ تَكْشَفَةُ He did not
dread (M), orig. لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ, and لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ (IY); and [similarly, in the imp. (IY),] 
رايْتُ [below], 
Threw thou, and لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ Dread thou (M), orig. لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ [481], and لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ: (a) the لُثُّs are elided [in the apoc.] 
because of the apocopeation; while the vowels before them remain, indicating the elided [letter]; the دَامَمَ, 
فَثَةَ, and كَسْرَا being an indication of the elided ْء, َاء, 
and ُى, respectively: and similarly in the imp.: but, when 
the ِنِّ is paused upon, elision of the vowels is entailed, 
so that, grudging that pause should take away the 
vowels, and thus the indicator and the indicated should 
[both] be removed, they affix the َسُ 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 لُثُّ, as لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ [below], 
[and لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ (IY)]; and لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ [below], لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ, [and 
لَمْ يَكْشَفَهُ (IY)]; except in what is reduced, by omission 
of the َسُ, to a single letter; for here affixion [of the َسُ 
(IY)] is necessary, as وَقَقَ ٌثَمَّ Guard thou, [imp. of ٌثَمَّ, 
أوْرَ. ُيِقَّي (IY).] and ُيِقَّي 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 َسُ of silence [615, 646] (أوْدَ), 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 apocopation, as in لَمْ يَخْفَسْهُ [above], لَمْ يَخْفَسْهُ, and (a) hence لَمْ يَخْفَسْهُ. II. 261. [647] (Aud), according to the saying that it is from سنة year, sing. of سِنَوْنَ [234], and that its ل is an elided ل; the o. f. being لَيَخْفَسَوْهُ; but the ل being converted into ل because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with فاث [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 مب (Tsr): or (2) on account of uninflected-ness (Aud), as in the imp. v., according to the saying of the BB [431] (Tsr), as أُحَرْرُ [above], إِخْشَةُ, and فِيْهِدَاءُ هُمْ أُقْتِدِيْةُ VI. 90. [647] (Aud), imp. of لَيَقْتِدِي, 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 يَخْفَسْهُ [above], لَمْ يَخْفَسْهُ, and لَمْ يَخْفَسْهُ, and أُحَرْرُ [above], إِخْشَةُ, and إِخْشَةُ, without the s of silence; and this is the dial. of some of the Arabs: S says (Tsr), IIU and Y told us that
(S, Tar); but this dial. is the rarer of the two dials. [615] (S). And the s is not necessary (Tar), except in one case, vid. when the v. [subjected to elision (Tar)] remains with one letter, like the imp. of ُوُعَيْنَ، aor. ُيَعْيَنَ [482, 643, 699], where you say ِعَ (Aud), with elision of its ِف and its ِل, 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 (Tar). And similarly, says IM [in the Alfiya and elsewhere, following others (Tar)], when the v. [after elision (Tar)] remains with two letters, one of which is aug., [because the v. then remains with one rad. (MKh),] as ُكُمِّيَّتُهُمْ َلِهِ "He did not collect": but this [that IM says (Tar)] is refuted (1) by the common consent of the Muslims that pause upon such as ُرَكِّمُ أَلْلَهُ XIX. 20. [450] and ُرَكِّمْتَ وَقَّيَ X L. 9. And whomsoever 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 (Tar): and (2) by the fact that the s is not necessary in the ِل governed in the gen. by a ِت, because the ِت becomes like part of the ِل, 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 وَآلَّلِيْلِ إِذَا يَسَرُّ LXXIX. 3. [below], مَا كُنْنَا نَبِّيْنَ xviii. 63. What we were desiring, يُوْمُ الْقِتَالِ 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 أَلْكَبِيرُ الْقِيَامَةِ XIII. 10. [643] (S); and in rhymes (S, R), as in the saying of Zuhair وَأَرَأَىَ نَفْرِي مَا خَلَقَتْ الْحُق [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 ňs. 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 i in [the ind. of] the defective v., as يَغْزُو [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 لَآ أَدْرُ I shall not know, [transmitted by Khl
and S (K on XI. 107), and the texts XVIII. 68. [above] and بُلُوطَ يَابَّ َلا تَكْلِمْ نَسْسَ 107. On the day, when it shall come, no soul shall speak (R), the latter being read by Ibn 'Amir, 'Aṣim, 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 لا یُرَمَ I shall not throw. This is as they say لم یَئِنَّ زِیدٌ یَلُمْ یِءَرَب, in the sense of لم یَهْنَ was not [450]; but not لم یَرِب, in the sense of لَمْ یَهْنَ was not mean. When, however, the ی and ی mentioned occur in terminations of versicles, in continuity, it is allowable to elide them, contenting oneself with the vowel of the preceding [letter], as in وَاللَّهُ إِذا یَسْرُ LXXIX. 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 versicles, whose ي's 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 versicles, and in rhymes, is elided in them. The
poet [Zuhair, praising Harim Ibn Sinān alMurri (IY, AKB, MAR) for decision, and execution of his resolve (IY),] says

وَلَأَنَّ تَفْقِرَ مَا حَلَقْتُ وَبَعْضُ الْقُومِ يُطْلِقُ ثَمَّ لَا يُفْرِقُ

(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, وَآَرَكَ تَفْقِرَ مَا حَلَقْتُ أَلْمَ And I see thee cut out what thou hast measured; etc. [above] (MAR): which is thus recited [يَفْرِقُ ], with the ُא made quiescent, and the rhyme bound. S 's saying "and what should preferably not be elided" [above] means the defective ُن, as التَّقَّسِي [643], the ُي of which is sometimes, though rarely, elided in continuity, otherwise than in terminations of verses and in rhymes [above], as يَوْمُ الْتَّنْدُّ وَيَوْمُ هَمَّ بَارِزُونَ [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), and وَجِفَّ أَلْجَوَابُ وَجَدَرُ رَاسِبَالْيِ XXXIV. 12. And bowls like huge watering-troughs [149], and cooking-pots standing firmly (R), read with elision of the ُي [from أَلْجَوَابِي ], 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 š in continuity is better than elision of the ʿ of such as ʿt̄rə, because the š of such as ʿr̄ə the thrower is elided in continuity, otherwise than in terminations of versicles, without anomalousness, as ʿyəm ʿal-tən-kən ʾri̇yəm ʾsəm ʿyārəzən [above]; while the ʿ of such as ʿr̄ə is not elided, in the like [position], except anomalously, as we have mentioned. And, when you pause upon the defective n. whose š is elided in continuity, elision of the š is necessary. But, when you pause upon the defective n. whose š is retained in continuity, elision of its š is allowable, not necessary: S says (R), Retention of the š and ʿš [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 š, however, is not elided, either in terminations of versicles, or in rhymes [below], except by poetic license, as in رَغْض مُرْجِعِي [643], because of the lightness of the š and the heaviness of the š and ʿš. S uses language whose meaning is that, in rhymes, you elide the rad. š and ʿš in imitation [of the elision] of the aug. š and ʿš following ʿammə and ʿkasra, and resembling the š and ʿš in the pause of the Azd of AsSarət [640]. He means that you elide the ʿš from ʿt̄rə [above] in imitation of the elision of the š in the preceding verse, vid. ʿlənət ʾaš-ṣāgi.
[193]; so that, since elision of the ى of the َعْرَبِ is allowed, because it is like [the ى in] the pause of the Azd of AsSarāt in [640], the َرَد. ى imitates it in elision, since the rhymes must proceed uniformly; and similarly with the َع, as in the saying [of Zuhair (Jh, MAR)]

When I was, in relation to Salmā, during eight years, on the verge of a matter not bitter, and not sweet (MAR)], where you allow elision of the َع, though it is َراد., because, when you intend binding [the rhyme], you elide the َأَعْجَب, arising, on account of the unbinding, in the َتَقُلُ in the preceding verse

صَحَّا الْقَلْبِ عَن سَلْمَى َوَقَدْ كَانَ لَا يَسْلُو
و أَقْفَرْ مِن سَلْمَى اَلْتَعْدِيْقُ وَالْتَقُلُ

[My heart has recovered from its passion for Salma, when it was near being insconsolable; and AlTa‘ānīṣ and Ath Thikl have become empty of Salma (MAR)]; while this َأَعْجَب., is elided only because it is assimilated to the َأَعْجَب. ى in the dial. of the Azd of AsSarāt in جَآرُو جَآرُو Zaid came to me [640]. The ى, however, is not elided in rhymes [above] (R): you say

دايَنَتْ أَرَى وَالْدِيْنُ تَقُضَى # فَمَتَلَّتْ بَعْضُهَا وَأَرَى بَعْضًا
(S, R), by Ru’ba Ibn Al‘Ajzāj—so says IBr (MN),
I lent to Arwā, when debts were being discharged. Then she put off payment of part, and paid part (MN, N), because the | paused upon, in such as صَيَّلَ، is not elided in the best-known [dial.], as the , and ى arising, in pause, in the dial. of the Azd of AsSamūt [640], are elided by most of the Arabs (R); and therefore, as the ى of بَعْضًا is not elided, so the ى of [below] is not elided (S). S says (R), The elision of the ى of [such as (R)], [and of the , of such as صَيَّلَ، in rhymes (R),] induces many of Kais and Asad to elide the , and ى that are [the sign of (S)] the pron.: though neither of them is so often elided as the ى of (S, R), and the , of صَيَّلَ، 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 س in

ٍ هَلْ يَعْجِبُ عَلَّمَ الْحَرَّمٍ ظَرَّةً

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

لا يُعَدِّي اللَّهُ إِخْوَانًا تَرِكُوهُمْ لاَ أَدُرُّ بِعَدَّ غَدَّةٍ الْبَيْنِ مَا صَنَعَ

[Let God not curse, or destroy, brethren that I have left, not knowing, after the morn of separation, what they have done! (MAR), meaning صَنَعْ (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.
(MAR)], and quiescence of the ع (R): and ['Antara says (S)]

يَا دَار َعَبْلَةَ بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ نَكَلَمٌ وَعينِي صَباَحًا دَارَ عَبْلَةَ وَأَسْلَمٌ (S, R) O home of 'Abla in AlJiwá, 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 وَأَسْلَمٌ] (S), [which] also is recited with [elision of the ى and (MAR)] quiescence of the م (R); and AlKhuzaz Ibn Laudhán says

كُلُّبَ الْعَتِيقَ وَمَا شَيْ بَارِدًا * إِنْ كُنتَ سَكِئًا غَبَرِقًا فَاذْهَبْ 187], meaning نَاذَهْبَ (S). But the ُ [of the pron. (R)] in [such as (R)]

خَلُقْيَ عَطِرًا بِالْتَّفَرْقِ أَوْ قُعُأٌ [recited to us by Khl (S), My two friends, fly with separation, or fall, or, in one MS, دَفَأ stop (MAR),] is not elided (S, R), as it is not elided from تَنقَضُى [above] (S), because of what we have mentioned (R), vid. that the ُ paused upon, in such as تَبدَأ, is not elided in the best-known [dial.] (MAR). I do not know any instance where the ُ of the pron. is elided in terminations of versicles, as it is in rhymes; but the ى of the pron. is elided in terminations of versicles, as XXIX. 56. [420] (R).
§ 646. When the .OrderByDescending of feminization is paused upon, the  is kept, [being preserved from conversion here (Tsr.),] if it be attached to (1) a p. [263, 402], as in  [263, 402, 540] (Aud),  [505], and  [537] (Tsr) : (a) [109] is paused upon, by Ks [alone (Tsr)], with the  (A, Tsr), irregularly (Tsr); and, by the remainder [of the Seven Readers], with the  : (b) IM says in the CK “In my opinion, it is allowable to pause with the  upon  and  by analogy to their saying  in the case of  (A); but this is open to the objection that (Sn) the [similar] saying of AH “As for  ,  and  , they are commonly regarded as analogous to  , so that they are paused upon in both modes,” is refuted, because (Tsr) pause upon  with the  is not regular, and (Sn) what is irregular is not to be copied (Tsr, Sn) : (2) a v. [263, 402, 607], as in  She stood (Aud) and  She sat : (a) the  is kept, in the p. and v., from fear of confusion with the pron. in  [168, 505] and  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  Duraiba, and then made it a dim., saying  Duraiba, you would pause upon it with the  , because it would have been transferred from the [the cat. of] the v. to [that of] the n.” (Tsr) : (3) a n., when
the ت is preceded by a sound quiescent, as in ﷹ أَخْطَتِ and ﷶ بَنَتّ [263] (Aud), because the ت 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 ﷶ تَفْقُل [368] and ﷶ جَذَرُ [307, 689] (Tsr). And it may be retained [in its own form (Tsr)], or be changed [into ئ (Tsr)], if it be [attached to a n., when the ت is] preceded by (1) a vowel, [which is only Fatha (Tsr)], as in ﷶ قَمْرَة date and ﷶ شَجْرَة tree (Aud), to distinguish it from the rad. ت, as in ﷶ رَقْتَ time [below] and ﷶ بَيْتَ tent (Tsr) : (2) an unsound quiescent, [which is only an ﷸ (Tsr),] as in ﷶ صَلَا prayer (Aud), ﷸ كَرْيَ poor-rate, alms, and ﷸ ذَات [below] (Tsr) ; and [as] مُسْلِمَات female Muslims (Aud) and ﷸ أُرْلَات [below] : because the unsound quiescent [in ﷶ صَلَا, 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 ﷸ [in مُسْلِمَات etc.] proceeds from Fatha, and is on a par with the mobile letter, for which reason, with it, two quiescents [may] concur [663], as in ﷸ كَوَارِب beasts [256], contrary to what is the case when the quiescent is sound (Tsr). There is no dispute that the verbal ت of feminization is a ت in pause, and also that its o. f. is ت [607]. But, as for the nominal [263], its o. f. is disputed.
For S, Fr, IK, and most of the GG hold that the \( \mathfrak{a} \) is the o. \( \mathfrak{s} \), as in the \( \mathfrak{v} \): but that, in pause, it is converted into \( \mathfrak{s} \), to distinguish the nominal from the verbal \( \mathfrak{a} \); or the nominal [ \( \mathfrak{a} \)], which is for feminization, as in عضور [385], from that which is not so, as in \( \mathfrak{a} \) "malignant and عكَّبَت [399, 678]: while the reason why it is converted into \( \mathfrak{s} \) is that, in the \( \mathfrak{s} \), there are more faintness and softness than in the \( \mathfrak{a} \); so that, in the state of pause, which is the position of rest [640], the \( \mathfrak{s} \) is more appropriate, for which reason, in pause, the \( \mathfrak{s} \) is added to what does not contain it, I mean the \( \mathfrak{s} \) of silence [615, 644], as in ًالْأَلْبَةَ [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 feminization it is the sign; contrary to the verbal, which is affixed to the \( \mathfrak{v} \), to indicate the feminization of its \( \mathfrak{a} \). [607]; and alteration is more appropriate in what is original, because of its stability. But Th says that the \( \mathfrak{s} \), in the feminization of the \( \mathfrak{n} \), is the o. \( \mathfrak{f} \); and that, in continuity, it is converted into \( \mathfrak{a} \), because, if it were left in its state, as a \( \mathfrak{s} \), one would say رأيت شُكْرِمَا I saw a tree, with Tanwin; and, in pause, the Tanwin would be converted into \( \mathfrak{l} \), as in ًالْأَلْبَةَ [640]; so that, in pause, it would be liable to be mistaken for the [attached gen.] \( \mathfrak{a} \) ها [161]: and therefore, in continuity, the \( \mathfrak{s} \) is converted into 82a.
...and afterwards, when one comes to pause, it returns to its o. f., vid. the s. And, according to S also, the reason why the Tanwin [in the acc. of the n. made fem. by the s] is not converted into t, after conversion of the w [into s], is fear of confusion (R) with the fem. حا (MAR).

But the preferable mode is pause with the ث in (1) the sound pl., like ضُمَلَى (Aud) and ضِلْطَاتِ (17) (Tsr): (2) what resembles it, vid. (a) the quasi-pl. n., [which has no sing. of its own crude-form (Tsr),] like ُأُولَاتِ [17] (Aud), which has no sing. of its own crude-form [257], but only a sing. of its sense, vid. ُذَاتِ [below] (Tsr): (b) the pl. used as a name, (a) actually, like ِعِرَانَاتِ and أَذْرَعُاتِ [17] (Aud), which are actually pls. of عَرْقَةِ 'Arafa, the halting-place of the pilgrims, and أَذْرَعَةِ Adhria, a town of Syria (Tsr): (b) constructively, like ُهَيْهِتَ which is constructively pl. of ُهَيْهِتَ [below], which is constructively pl. of عَرْقَةِ, [its o. f. being ُهَيْهَتْ, the l of which, vid. the ى, is elided; and its measure being ُتَعْلِمِ (Tsr): and is afterwards used as a [verbal n., literally] name of a v. (Aud); so that its sense becomes بَعْدَ Far off is! [187]: though ُهَيْهِتْ is said [by some] to be a sing., its o. f. being ُهَيْهِتْ, on the measure of ُتَعْلِمِ, reduplicated, like ُتَمَلَّتَ [332] (Tsr). The reason why the [well-known, usual (Jrb), preferable (Tsr),] mode is
pause with the作物 [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 ى with the، because, if added [with the ى], it would be converted into Hamza [683], therefore they add the ى with the ى. because the ى [sometimes] becomes a subst. for the ى, as in [ ْنَكْسَة and (Jrb)] تُتَكَسَّبَة [689]; and it then becomes the sign of feminization, and does away with the necessity for saying السَّلَبَات as pl. of السَّلَبَة; so that, since this ى 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 س (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 ى (A) into س (A, Tsr)] has been heard in the sayings [of some of them (A), transmitted by Ktb from تَفَيّض, كَيْفُ الْبَنُونَ وَالْبَانَةَ How are the sons and the daughters? (R, Jrb, Fk),] كَيْفُ الْأَخْرَجُةٌ وَالْأَخْرَجَا How are the brothers and the sisters? [690], and كَفَّرُ الْبَنّةَ مِنَ الْمُكْرِمَةَ The burial of daughters is one of the noble deeds (Aud, A), with change of the ى of the pl. into س,
[in pause (Jrb),] by assimilation to the pure ﺭ of femininization (Jrb, Tsr): while ﺭ have been heard (A); and ﺭ XXIII. 38. [187, 195, 504] is read by Ks and Bz (Aud), with change of the ﺭ into s (B, Tsr). Some report that this is the *dial.* of Tayyi; but [IHKh (H.Kh),] the author of the Ifṣāh [bi Fawā'īd al-Īdāh (H.Kh),] says that it is anomalous, not to be copied (A). As for ﺭ [above], it has two *dial.* vars., Fāth and Kasr of the ﺭ [195]. Those who pronounce [the ﺭ] with Fāth make ﺭ a *sing.*, and pause upon it with the s; while those who pronounce the ﺭ with Kasr make ﺭ a *pl.*, and pause upon it with the ﺭ (IV). The [statement] reported from Ks is that those who pronounce the ﺭ with Kasr pause upon ﺭ with the s; while those who pronounce the ﺭ with Fāth pause upon ﺭ with the ﺭ or s (Tsr). But [the GG say that (Jrb)] ﺭ, if held to be a *pl.*, is paused upon with the ﺭ; and, if held to be a *sing.*, is paused upon with the s (M, Jrb, Tsr): so in the [M and] Jrb (Tsr). IH, however, says, in the CM, that [this is matter of assumption, since (Jrb)] ﺭ, being a verbal *n.*, cannot be truly said to be *sing.* or *pl.*; while that [pause upon it with the ﺭ or s] is only because of its resemblance in form, not in number, to [a *n.* ending in] the ﺭ of femininization (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 عَرَّاق; but that pause upon it with the ت is rare, because it is co-ordinated with *vs.*, on account of its being a verbal *n.*; while conversion of its ت into ت is nevertheless allowed, because it is assimilated, in form, to such as كَرَاق clucking (R). When a man is named كَرَاق, according to the *dial.* of those who change [the ت into ت in pause], it is like كَلْمَة [18], being diptote because of the quality of proper name together with feminization; but, when كَرَاق is used as a name, according to *dial.* of those who do not change, it is like عَرَّاق [17], being *infl.* like the *perf.* *pl.* *fem.* when used as a name (A). And apparently كَرَاق [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)] إِسْتَأْصَتْ أَلْلَةُ عَرَّاقَتَهُمَّ God extirpate their roots! or عَرَّاقَتَهُم their root! (M). For عَرَّاق 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 عَرَّاق [392] (R), like سُعُلَة [248, 272] (Jrb), the ت in it being for co-ordination with [سُعُلَة] [392] (IY), as is the case in مَعَرَى (IY, R) and دُنْرَى [272, 375], according to those who pronounce them with Tanwin
(IY); and pause upon it is with the ٩ whereas عُرَقَتُ roots, pronounced with Kasr [of its ٧ (R, Jrb) in the acc. (R)], is [held to be (IY)] a pl. (IY, R, Jrb), the ٠ in it being the one accompanying the ٧ of the pl. fem., as though it were pl. (IY) of عِرَقُ root (IY, R), the masc. being pluralized with the ٧ and ٧, notwithstanding the occurrence of a broken pl. for it, i.e., عِرَقُتُ, as is said, notwithstanding ٨٠٠٠ in the pl. of ٨٠٠٠ [261] (R); [or] of عِرَقُه (Md, KF); and pause upon it is more properly with the ٧, as in the case of مُسَلَّمَاتُ [above] (R). And, in other formations [than the sound pl. and what resembles it (TsX)], the preferable [mode] is pause with change (Aud) [of the ٧] into ٧, for distinction between the ٧ of feminization and the rad. ٧, as in ٨٠٠٠ [above] and مَوْتُ death, this being the reason assigned by S: or, as is said (TsX), for distinction between it and the ٧ of feminization affixed to the ٧ (Jrb, TsX, Fk), as in ٧٠٠٠٠ [607] (TsX); while they do not reverse [the distinction, assigning the ٧ to the ٧, and the ٧ to the ٧], because, if they said ٧٠٠٠٠ for ٧٠٠٠, the ٨ would be confounded with the objective pron. (Jrb, TsX, Fk): so says Jrb, confining himself to this reason; [and he is followed by Fk] (TsX). But [Akh asserts that (R), in the less chaste mode (Fk),] some [of the Arabs (M, R, Jrb)] pause [upon such as ٧٠٠٠٠]
with the ā (M, R, Jrb, Fk), without change, as رَحْمَتُ (Fk), which is a wide-spread dial., transmitted by Akh (IY), whence [their saying وَعَلَيْهِ السَلامُ وَرَحْمَتُ and upon him be peace and mercy!], and (IY, Jrb] the saying of the poet بُلْ حَرَّمَ تِبْهَا، إِلَّا (M, Jrb) : while an [additional] instance of pause with omission of change [into ی (Tsr)] is the reading of Nafi’, Ibn ‘Amir, and Hamza XLIV. 43. [below] (Aud), with the ی (Tsr); and the [other (IY, Jrb)] poet [Abu-nNajm (Tsr, YS)] says

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 ی into ی in [all three of] them (Tsr). What is meant by is بُعْرَمَا, a ی being supposed to be substituted for the ی (IY, Jrb, MN, Tsr, YS), so that it becomes بُعْرَمَا, since the ی is sometimes substituted for the ی, as in [175, 181, 690], meaning هَنَا (IY) and قُدْ زَرَّتَ الْحَرْمَ (Jsh); and the ی being then changed into ی, to correspond with the remainder of the rhymes (IY, Jrb,
MN, Tsr, YS): this is the reasoning of [IY and] Jrb (Tsr). Or, [as IJ mentions (Tsr),] the I is changed into s; and the s then changed into ٓ, by assimilation to the ٓ of feminization; so that it is paused upon with the ٓ (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)] إن شَكَّرَتِ آنَثَى الرَّقَمٍ XLIV. 43. Verily the tree of AzZakkum [above] (A, Fk), أَسْمَأَهُ وَبَيْضَتْ رَحْمَتَ رَبِّكَ XLIII. 31. What! shall they part out the mercy of thy Lord? (Fk), إِمْرَاتُ نَورِي ٍ، وَأَمْرَاتُ لُوطٍ LXVI. 10. The wife of Noah and the wife of Lot, and the like (A), are written in the Codex (A, Fk) with the ٓ (Fk). Our master, the Sayyid, relates that every إِمْرَاتٍ, mentioned in the Kur with her husband, is written with the extended ٓ (Sn). Therefore Nafi’, Ibn ‘Amir, ‘Asim, and Hamza pause upon them with the ٓ; while Ibn Kathir, IAI, and Ks pause upon them with the s (A). The ٓ, if written as a s [in the Codex], is paused upon: by all the [Seven] Readers with the s: but, if written as a ٓ, is paused upon by some with the s, for observance of the o. f.; and by others with the ٓ, for observance of the ‘Uthmani orthography: so says our master, the Sayyid (Sn). Most of those [Arabs] who pause [upon such as رُحْمَةٍ] with the ٓ 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., رُأَيَتْ أَمَّة I saw a handmaid, like رُأَيَتْ أَمَّة [640], with the ا; but رُأَيَتْ أَمَّة, as in [above], because it is made to accord with أَمَّة with the s, which is the o. f. in pause (R). But some of them pause upon the [n.] made fem. by the s, when it is an acc. pronounced with Tanwin, as they pause upon the [n.] bare [of the s], when it is an acc. pronounced with Tanwin [640] (Sn). There is a dispute about كُبَتْ [above] in such as عَلِيمُ بِذَاتِ 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 الو, because, being pre. [115]; it is always intermediate; while Ks and Jr say that it is paused upon with the s, because [the الو in] it is a الو of feminization, so that you say سُكَتْ: so says Hf (Tsr). The الو not for feminization is not altered [in pause], the saying of some فَعَدُّنَا عَلَى الْفَرَا. 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 Ḥabbā al-Asadī (MN, Jsh)] says

لَا رَأى أَنَّ كَلَّةَ دَمَةٍ وَلا شَيْعٍ # مَلَّ إلى أَرْطاَ حَفَفَ فَالْطَمَتَ # [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 gluttony of his appetite, [in the pursuit of the gazelle (MN),] he turned aside to an Arṭa tree of a curving tract of sand, and lay down (MN, Jsh) to sleep (Jsh), where he substitutes a ١ for the ٩ of دَمَةٍ, and retains it in continuity (IY); [and] hence أُوْلُ الْحَرْقِقِ الْعَمَّ [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) قُلْتِهِ # أَرْطَأَ # [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., قُلْتَهُ # مَهْرَبَةٍ [321, 648], where they substitute ١ for the ٩ [of قُلْتِهِ ] in pause, and then throw the vowel of the Hamza [of أَرْطَأَ ] upon the ١, and elide the Hamza, on the principle of the reading فَدَأَ أَفْلِحُ الْمُسْتَنَّونَ XXIII.

1. The believers have prospered [16], which occurs only in continuity (IY): (2) XVIII. 36. [521] (M, R), in the reading of Ibn 'Amir (IY, R), with retention of the ٌ, orig. لَيْكَنَ [أَنَّا (K, B)], the vowel of the Hamza
being thrown upon the ن of لَئِنْ, the Hamza elided, and the ن incorporated into the ن; whereas analogy requires the أ 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 أ [of أُنَا] is excellent here, because, the Hamza being elided, the أ becomes a compensation for it”, meaning in أُنَا (IY): (3) [similarly (IY)] II. 260. [166] (IY, R), with retention of the أ of أُنَا [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 أ: without Raum or Ishmām—and reduplication [640], transfer [640, 641], and importation of the أ 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)] لَمْ يَتَّسَأَلَ وَآَنْظُرْ II. 261. It hath not been altered by the lapse of years: and look [644] (IA, Aud, A) and نَفْهَاً هَمْ آتَتْنَا فَلّVI. 90. Then by their guidance
suffer thou thyself to be led: say (Aud, A), with expression of the \( \mathfrak{s} \) of silence in continuous speech (Aud).

(b) [above] (Tsr): ما أَفْتَنَى عَنْي مَالِيَةُ هَلْكُ (c) قَلْتَ هَرْبَعَةً عَنْي سُلْطَانِيَةُ خَلْدُ. LXIX. 28–30. My wealth hath not availed me: my power etc. [615, 648]: (d) the saying of some of Tayyi هذاْ خَلْدَ يَا قَتَى This is a pregnant female, O youth, because it is only in pause that this \( \mathfrak{t} \) is changed into, [643] (A): (2) in poetry, [640] (IA, Aud, A), where the \( \mathfrak{b} \) is doubled, notwithstanding that it is conjoined with the letter of unbinding (IA, A): (a) it is orig. القَصَّبُ, with a single \( \mathfrak{b} \); but, being assumed to be paused upon, the \( \mathfrak{b} \) is doubled, on the principle of their saying in pause, هذاْ خَالِدُ [640], with reduplication; and then the letter of unbinding is put, vid. the \( \mathfrak{t} \); while the reduplication of the \( \mathfrak{b} \) remains (Aud) in continuity, by assimilation of continuity to pause in respect of reduplication (Tsr): (b) آَوَّلَا نَادِيَ آَلَهُ [183] (A), where there are two anomalies, (a) affixion of the \( \mathfrak{m} \) and \( \mathfrak{n} \to \mathfrak{m} \) in continuity (MN); whereas analogy requires \( \mathfrak{m} \to \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{t} \), because, in continuity, the form of \( \mathfrak{m} \) does not vary [in number or gender] (Sn): and (b) mobilization of the [affixed] \( \mathfrak{n} \), which is [properly] quiescent (MN). The GG say that the poet, in such as عَيْشٞ[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 ل 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

أَبيَضَ ٱلْمَيْنَى ٱلْبِيْضَةَ Give me a white one, meaning (S, R); but affixing the s as he affixes it in هَنَا, when he means هَنَّ [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 ۰ or a ۴ or ۡي (Sn),] as in

[608]. But the Hijāzis retain the letter of prolongation, unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether they intend to quaver or not (Sn),] saying ۢؤُلْتَابُ while the Tamīmīs, if they [intend to (Sn)] quaver, do likewise, [i. e., retain the letter of prolongation (Sn)]; and, if not, put Tanwīn as a compensation for it, [in order to discontinue the
quavering (Sn),] unrestrictedly, [i. e., after a Դαմմα, Fatḥa, or Kasra (Sn),] as in

سُقِيَتْ الْفِيَّةَ أيْنَهَا ِّالْحَيَاةُ

[1],

يَا صَاهِ مَا شَاءَ الْعِيْنُ الْذُّرِّينُ
[by Al ‘Ajjāj (S),] O my companion, what has excited the streaming eyes?, and

لكَّنْ تُؤْلِى بِرَحمَانِي َوَكَانَ قَدِينٌ

[577, 608] (A).

§. 648. The second [position (Tsr) of the s of silence] is the interrog. َّا 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 ًّا (Tsr),] as in همْ and فِيمْ [where it is governed in the gen. by a p. (Tsr),] and in مَّجَِّيَْمَِّيْنَ ِّجَِّثِّيْنَ 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 ًّا must be elided, to distinguish it from the enunciatory, [which is the conjunct and the cond. (Tsr),] مَا ِّسَأَلْتُ عَبْبًا ِّسَأَلْتَ عَنْهَا I asked about what thou askedst about [or ِّعَنْ مَّثْلٍ ِّمَا آلمَ ِّبِنَا ِّتْفَرَحَ أَفْرَحْ about the like of what etc., where is conjunct.; and in ِّكُلُّا At whatever thou rejoicest, I will rejoice and
Whenever thou comest to me, I will honor thee, where 

ما is cond. (Tsr)] : so that, when you pause upon it, you affix the ٠, for preservation of the فatha indicative of the [elided (Tsr)] [below]. And the ٠ is necessary if the genitival op. [of the interrog. مَا (Tsr)] be a n., as in مَجِبٍ آلٍ. How did he exact? [640], where you say مَجِبٍ and حَبَّة ; and preferable if it be a p., as in يُبْتِسَءُ لَوْن. 

LXXVIII. 1. [181], where [it is reported (K) by] Bz [that Ibn Kathîr (K)] reads [عَمَّةٌ (K),] with the ٠ (Aud) of silence (K, Tsr), either because he treats continuity like pause [647]; or because he pauses [upon عَمَّة Of what (question they among themselves)] ؟, and begins afresh with يُبْتِسَءُ لَوْن عَيْ النِّبَيَّ الْعَظِيمِ. 

They question among themselves of the great tidings, a [previous] يُبْتِسَءُ لَوْن , [on which عَمَّة depends,] being understood, because expounded by what follows it (K).

The difference is that the ٌ مَا 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 ٌ مَا [644]; for which reason the ٠ is [merely] allowable, [not necessary, because the conjunction of ٌ مَا with the prep. prevents it from being considered unil. when the ٠ is elided] : whereas the pre. n. is independent in its
sense, so that the n. [م] with it is like a separate [word]; and it is uninf., for which reason the s is necessary with it [615] (Tsr). The third [position (Tsr)] is every [word] permanently uninf. upon a vowel of uninflectedness [159], and not resembling the infl., like the ع of the 1st pers. [161], hence, 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 هي م CI. 7. 

What it is, and بلالیة LXIX. 28. and سلطانية LXIX. 29. [below]; and the poet [Hassān (MN, Tsr) Ibn Thābit al Anṣārī (MN) as Sahābī (Tsr)] says

إذا تعرَعَ فينا الفلام نما إن يقِل الله من هوى

[below] (Aud) When the lad grows up among us, it is not said of him "Who is he?", إن لى being red., as in

ماتما إن طَبِنَ الم [563] (MN). But the s is not affixed to such as (1) Zaid came, because زِین is infl.; [and the vowel of inflection, being known through the op., does not need to be made plain by the s of silence (Tsr)] : (2) Strike thou and لَم يَضَرْ He struck not, because the v. is quiescent; [and the s is affixed only to make the vowel plain (Tsr)] : (3) لا رَجَل [99] (Aud), with Fath (Tsr), and [48] and سَيْر فَبُدْ [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. (Tsr)]: while [201] is anomalous, the is affixed to what is accidentally uninf., since belongs to the cat. of and : so say F and IM; but as to this there is a dispute [before] mentioned [201] (Aud); and some say that the in is a subst. for the , the o.f. being (Tsr): (4) the pret. v. [403], like [the trans. (Tsr)] struck [and rode (Tsr)], and [the intrans. (Tsr)] sat [and stood (Tsr)], because of its resemblance to the aor. in its occurring as an ep. [144], conj. [177], enunc. [26], d. s. [80], 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 aprotetic voc. [48], the advs. cut off from prothesis [201], and the pret. v. [403]: and as to [affixion of the 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 He sat; and disallowance if ambiguity result, as in [below], because the is liable to be mistaken for the obj. (Tsr). In pause upon the uninf. [ns. (IX)], you say (1) نا [84a]
with the ꞌ́ [161, 497]; or ꞌا with the ꞏ [690] (M), in place of the ꞌ, because their outlet [732] is one, whence the saying of Hātim ُهدا خردي ۚ آنة This is my way of bleeding, mine [696]: (a) this ꞌ, in its being imported, in pause, to make the vowel [of the final] plain, is like the ꞏ in LXIX. 19. [22, 638, 647, 679] and LXIX. 20 [647]: (b) hence their saying, in pause, Ɥ حَا ُهَل [with the ꞌ], or Ɥ حَا ُهَل with quiescence; but, when they continue Ɥ حَا ُهَل [191] with Fatha of the ꞌ, without an ꞌ: (c) the Arabs do not pause; upon any thing in their language, with the ꞌ, to make the vowel plain, except in these two positions, I mean ُهَلأ and ُلَا [615] (IY): (2) ꞌُهَل with quiescence, or Ɥ حَا ُهَل with affixion of the ꞏ (M): (a) pause upon the pron. ꞌُهَل he [161] is mostly with the ꞏ, to make the vowel of the ꞏ plain; and so is pause upon ꞝ she: you say ꞝُهَيْه, not eliding anything from it, as you elide in the case of the decl. [643]; and the poet says Ɥ ُهَيْه ُهَي مَّع ُهَيْه, cited by S: but some of the Arabs pause with quiescence, saying ꞝُهَر and ꞝُهَي, contrary to Ɥ ُهَن, which is not paused upon with quiescence; so that, in answer to "who did?", one does not say Ɥُهَن I, as one says ꞝُهَر he or ꞝُهَي she: for Ɥُهَن, in addition to the paucity of its letters, has for its final Ꞛ ن, which is faint, and is not a letter of inflection here, like the final of ꞛ
hand and َبَلَد blood; so that, on account of the faintness of the َن، the paucity of the letters, and the fact that the final of َبَلَد is not a letter of inflection, an َل is imported in pause, and is inseparable from that [expression], contrary to َعَرَف and َعَرَف, 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 َعَرَف and َعَرَف] with Fatha [above]; while those who make [the َو and َي] quiescent [below] pause only with quiescence, not otherwise (IV) : (3) َهَنَّا here or َهَنَّا [175]; and َهُرَلَة these or َهُرَلَة [174], when it, [i. e., َهُرَلَة (IV),] is abbreviated (M): (a) this َو in َهَنَّا and َهُرَلَة is affixed, with the َل, in pause, because of the faintness and lowness of the َل; but the better [mode] is to pause without a َو: (6) those who prolong [the final َل of َهُرَلَة], and add a Hamza, [saying َهُرَلَة,] pause upon the Hamza with quiescence: (c) this َو does not follow any of the quiescents, except the َل, because of its faintness; so that you do not say َهُرَلَة for َهُرَلَة, nor َهِيَه for َهِيَه [above], according to the dial. of those who make the َو and َي quiescent [above], because the َل, being faint, on account of its remoteness [732], is more in need of being made plain (IV) : (4) I honored thee or َأَكْرَمْتَك َوَأَكْرَمْتَك [below] (M): (a) in the case of the َل of the pron. [161], as in َأَكْرَمْتَك I honored thee [masc.] and َأَعْطَيْتَك I gave thee [fem.],
there are two modes, pause with quiescence, as & أَكْرَمَتْكَ [above] and & أَكْرَمَتْكَ [above] and & أَكْرَمَتْكَ, from avidity for the vowel, because the و 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 و and in the masc., and a ى in the fem.; and then affix the ى of silence [to the ى or ى], saying & أَكْرَمَتْكَا in the masc., and & أَكْرَمَتْكِ 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 ى (M): (5) my manservant and ى ضَرَّبَنِي & He struck me [below], with quiescence, or ى غَلَامِيَةَ and ى ضَرَّبَنِيَةَ, with affixion of the ى [to make the vowel plain; pause upon the ى being in two modes (M)], according to those who mobilize [the ى with Fath (M)] in continuity [161] (M); whence the reading of the majority مَا ضَرَّبَيْنِي عَيْنِى مَالِيَةَ ۡعَيْنِى سَلَطَانِيَةَ LXIX. 28, 29. [615, 647] (M): and ى غَلَامُ ى ضَرَّبْنَى and ى ضَرَّبْنَى ى غَلَامُ, according to those who make [the ى ] quiescent in continuity, whence the readings of IA and & أَكْرَمَنُ LXXXIX. 15. My Lord hath honored me
and Ρ_ARCH. 17. *My Lord hath degraded me, [with pause (IW)]; and the saying of Al A‘shâ [Maimûn Ibn Kâis (MN, Jsh)]

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

And LXXXIX.

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 يُثْبَثُ الدُّمَوَرُ أن يَأْثِرُ and أَنَسَى: (a) those also who make the ي quiescent pause in two modes, the better being retention of the [quiescent] ي; while the other is elision of it, as هُدَا عَلَمَم. This is my manservant and ضِرْبَنَ [above], meaning عَلَمَم and ضِرْبَنَ: (b) elision of the ي in the case of [the pron. attached to] the v. is good, because the ي, 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 Kur: whereas, when you say هُدَا عَلَمَم.
[above], pausing upon it with quiescence, one does not know whether َغُلَٰكُمْ is meant to be pre. to the ى, or to be aprotthetic, 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 'Āmir and the KK read َأَكْرَمٌ and َأَبْنَانٍ, without a ى , in continuity and pause; and the like is reported from IAl [above]; while Nāṣi' agrees with them in pause (B): and [Z says in the K that] َأَكْرَمٌ and َأَبْنَانٍ [above], with quiescence of the ِن, are read in pause, according to those who omit the ى in continuous speech, deeming the Kasra sufficient without it (K): (6) َضَرِّبَكُمْ He struck you, َضَرَبَهُمْ He struck them, عَلَيْهِمَّ upon them, and ِبِهِمْ by them; and ِبِمِنْ from him and َضَرِّبَهُ He struck him [above]: with quiescence, according to those who, in continuity, affix [the conj. to the م or َس], or [simply] mobilize [the م or َس with Damm or Kasr] (M): (a) as for َضَرِّبَكُمْ and َضَرِّبَهُمْ, and ِبِهِمْ and عَلَيْهِمَّ and ِبِهِمْ you pause upon them with quiescence of the م, not otherwise; and elide the ِى or ى from it [161], because they are aug., and are often elided in continuity [161], as َضَرِّبَكُمْ تَبَلّ He struck you before, َضَرِّبَهُمْ يَا نَفْتُ He struck them, O youth, عَلَيْهِمَّ ذَٰلِكَ إِلَى الْسَّرَّمَ IX. 99. May misfortune fall upon them!, and ِبِهِمْ يُسْتَعِنُّ Of them is help sought, for a kind of lightening, from frequency of usage, because of
the heaviness of the combination of two ِّ in ِّ and ِّ [below], and of two كسرا with the ِّ in ِّ [below] and the like (IY) : [for] according to those who do not affix the conj., in continuity, to the ِّ of the pl., there is no dispute that pause upon it is with quiescence; while, according to those also who affix the conj., in continuity, elision of it is necessary in pause, because what is often elided in continuity, vid. the ِّ and ِّ, must be elided in pause, as in ِّ and ِّ [below] (R) : (b) they differ in opinion about the ِّ in such as ِّ [above], and the ِّ in such as ِّ [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 ِّ 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 ِّ and ِّ are not part of the n. [161] : (c) similarly pause upon ِّ and ِّ also is with quiescence [of the ِّ] (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 ِّ of ِّ [and the ِّ of ِّ, and by conversion of the ِّ of ِّ into ِّ] (R); [so that] the o. f. of ِّ and ِّ is conjunction of [the ِّ in] them with a letter of
prolongation, as "ضَرْبَّهُم" and "مَنْهُمُّ", that being proved by the existence of [the letter of prolongation corresponding with] it in the *fem.*, as "ضَرْبَهَا" and "مَنْهَا" (IY): the "s" occurs, [says S (IY),] with what follows it, here in the *masc.*, as it occurs, with the "t" following it, in the *fem.* (S, IY): (e) Zj holds that the *conj.* after the "s" 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 "الْقَابِلَةِ" [643]; and, as for the necessity for elision of the *conj.* in pause, and not of the "ى" of "الْقَابِلَةِ", it is because the *conj.* is one of those things that, in the state of continuity, have a share in elision, as in "تَنْتِ" III. 5. and "فَيِّه" 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 "s" be preceded by a quiescent, as in "مَنْهَ" and "عَلَّيْهِ", they do not put the quiescent, or "ى" in continuity: so that they do not say, according to the most frequent [*dial.*], "مَنْهُ" and "عَلَّيْهِ", because the "ى" and "س" are heavy; and because the "s", 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 "ى". 
or ی [conjoined with the ی]: and, when the ی is preceded by a letter of prolongation and softness, elision of the ی or ی is [held by S to be] better than retention, because the ی proceeds from the same outlet as the ی [732], and the ی resembles the ی and ی, so that it is as though they fled from the combination of likes, and therefore elided the ی or ی; and, for that reason, یلَّهُت VII. 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)], یلَّهُت VII. 175.

And they sold him [640] for a mean price, and یلَّهُت LXIX. 30. Take ye him [615, 647], and put a collar of iron upon his neck are the better of the two readings: and, according to that [opinion], یلَّهُت and یلَّهُت are more appropriate than یلَّهُت and یلَّهُت with elision; so that یلَّهُت 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 یلَّهُت III. 5. [below] and یلَّهُت A calamity afflicted him; and this [opinion] is adopted by Mb and Sf; and, according to me, is correct, because, the ی being faint, یلَّهُت and یلَّهُت virtually contain [a combination of (Jh on
the pron. \( \xi \) ] two quiescents, like \( \text{کیف،} \) and \( \text{این} \) (IY): \( S \) prefers retention of the conj. after the \( \xi \), when the preceding quiescent is a sound letter, as in \( \text{منهور} \) and \( \text{اصابتهم} \); and elision of it, when the preceding quiescent is an unsound letter, as in \( \text{نشتری} \) VIII. 14. Then taste ye it, \( \text{عصاة} \) VII. 104. His rod, and \( \text{فیه} \) II. 1. About it: but \( \text{Mb} \) [followed by \( \text{Sf} \) and \( \text{IY} \)] makes no distinction between the sound and unsound quiescents before the \( \xi \); 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 \( \text{مینه آیات} \) III. 5. and \( \text{فیه آیات بیشات} \) 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 \( \xi \)] from \( \text{عليها} \) upon her and \( \text{منهَا} \) from her, though there also contain a quasi-combination of two quiescents, because of the lightness of the \( \xi \); so that this is the counterpart of their omission, in the most frequent [\text{dialect}], to convert the Tanwin, in pause, into a letter of prolongation in the nom. and gen., and their conversion of it into \( \xi \) in the acc. [640]: (h) if the \( \xi \) be preceded by a mobile, as in \( \text{پی} \) and \( \text{غلامة} \) [161], the conj. is indispensable, except when a poet is constrained
to elide it, as in the saying [of Ḥanzala Ibn Fātik (S)]

وَأَيْقِنَ أَنَّ الْخَيْلَ إِنْ تَلْتَيْسَ يَهُ وَيْكُنُ لَفِي سِيِّلِ الْخَيْلِ بَعْدَهُ آيَ

[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 AlMutanaabi

[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 ﺛ in ﺛ, 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 رَفُضَ مَرْجَمِ آلِحَ [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, Abū Bakr, and IA] يَرْتَبِ يَلْبِكَ III. 68.

Will render it unto thee and (B) ] لا يَرْتَبِ يَلْبِكَ III. 68.

Will not render it unto thee, with quiescence of the ﺛ (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 لْهُوَ يَقِى [161], by common consent, and in عَلَيْهِ 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 عَكَلْمَي عَلَيْهِ [above]; so that they invariably elide this letter, whose elision is often authorized in continuity, as in مَنْهُ and عَلَيْهِ: 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 ِّدَام or ِّكَّسَر, as in II. 273. *Knoweth it and يَعْلَمْ by his manservant*; and similarly when it is preceded by a , or ٰ, as in II. 70. [640] and مِنْ ِّيَأْتِيْرِ ِّسِطِّيْرِ 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 ِّدَام or , it is as though you pronounced the final, pausal, letter with ِّدَام, or put a , at the end, since the s is like the non-existent, on account of its faintness; and if, immediately after the ِّدَام or the , 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 ی: 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 ڑ, is not pronounced with any vowel but Damm; while that which is preceded by a Kasra or ی, is not pronounced, in the most frequent [dial.], with any vowel but Kasr [161]: (k) when the s pronounced with Damm follows a Fataḥa, as in ِلْيَن غَلَامَة verily his manservant, or a sound quiescent, as in ُمُنُه [above], Raum or Ishmām is allowable, without dispute [640]: (l) some allow them after the s of the pron., unrestrictedly, whether it follow a۷۷ or ی or any other consonant; and whether it follow a Fataḥa, Damma, or Kasra: even though they be not so plain as they ought to be (R): (7) هَذِی هُذِی, [even] according to those who say ِهِذِی هُذِی آَمَّةَ آٓللہِ This is the handmaid of God
(M): (a) the $v$ in [تَهي and (R)] $هَئِن$ is [not an aug.; but only (IY)] a subst. [690] for the $ي$ [263] in [تَهي and (R)] $هَئِن$ [171, 174] (IY, R), the proof of which is that you say دَيَا in the dim. of ذِي [293], as you say in the dim. of ذِي: nor is the $v$ in $هَئِن$ for feminization, like the $v$ in خَلْلَة and حَمَر [265], because the $v$ in خَلْلَة and حَمَر is aug., and you find it a $v$ in continuity [646]; whereas the $v$ in $هَئِن$ is a $v$ in continuity and pause, and is the $ع$ of the word: (b) the reason why it is pronounced with Kasr, and conjoined with the $س$, is that, being in a vague indecl. n., it is assimilated to the $س$ of the pron., which [like this $س$] is preceded by a Kasra, as in مُرَٰرُ يَ بِع I passed by him and نُظَرْت إلَى غُلَامَيْه I looked at his manservant (IY): [thus] the $س$ after the $س$ is on account of the assimilation of the $س$ to the $س$ of the masc. pron. preceded by a Kasra, [from the impletion of which a $س$ is engendered,] as in غُلَامِيَّه $بَيُّ$ and غُلَامِيَّه, in the most prevalent [dial.], as before explained [161]; except that the $س$ of the pron., notwithstanding its being preceded by a Kasra or $س$, is sometimes conjoined, according to the people of AlHijāz, with the $س$, as خَلْيَمُ $يْهُم$ and عَلَيْهِم [161], because the [attached] gen. pron. is orig. the detached nom. [pron.], as above mentioned; whereas [the $س$ in] هَئِنَّ يَ تَهي or $هَئِن$ is not conjoined with a, at all
S says "I do not know any one pronounce it with ꌘ, because, though they assimilate it to the ꌘ of the pron., still it is not the pron.; so that they assimilate it to the most frequent pronunciation, which is Kasr of the ꌘ, when preceded [like this ꌘ] by a Kasra." (IY): (c) some of the Arabs assimilate it to the ꌘ of the pl. [161]; and therefore do not put the conj, saying ꌘ in continuity and pause (R): [for] I have heard some Arabs, whose Arabic is trustworthy, say ꌘ, making [the ꌘ] quiescent (S); but this, though the ꌘ, is rare in usage: and some of them elide the ꌘ from it in continuity, but preserve its Kasra (R): (d) pause [upon it (R)] is with quiescence of the ꌘ (IY, R), and omission of the conj. (R), not otherwise (IY), without dispute (R), the ꌘ being elided in both dials.: 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 ꌘ [in continuity] elide it in pause, as they elide it from ꌘ and ꌘ [above]; and, since elision of the ꌘ is permissible in ꌘ and the like, notwithstanding that its augmentativeness is disputed [above], the elision here is more appropriate, because the augmentativeness is certain (IY) and ꌘ [and ꌘ (IY)], with quiescence; or ꌘ and ꌘ [and ꌘ (IY)], with the ꌘ (M): (a) the
\( \text{870} \)

\( \text{s} \) is preferable in the case of these \( ps. \), because the \( l \) in \( m \) is elided, while the Fat\( \text{h} \)a remains as an indication of the elided; and therefore, grudging that pause should elide the Fat\( \text{h} \)a, and thus the indication and the indicated should [both] be removed, they affix the \( s \) of silence, upon which the pause falls, while the Fat\( \text{h} \)a is preserved [above], as is done in \( \text{أُبَرَّة} \) and \( \text{أُتُوبة} \) [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 \( \text{يِبَّ أَبَا ءَلَّاسُوُودَ} \) \( \text{الْحَمُّ} \) [181]; but that belongs to the cat. of treating continuity like pause, by poetic license, as in \( \text{عَيْيَبَلْ} \) \( \text{الْفَصِّيَّة} \) and \( \text{640, 647} \) (IY), as \( \text{يُشْهِرُ بَعْثَة} \) [321, 647, 663] has been heard (K on LXI. 2): (a) \( \text{مَكِيَّة} \) \( \text{مَلاَح} \) \( \text{Like what art thou?} \), [pause being (IY)] with the \( s \), not otherwise (M): (a) \( \text{مَكِيَّة} \) \( \text{مَلاَح} \) and \( \text{مَكِيَّة} \) \( \text{مَلاَح} \) are \( ns. \), detached from what follows them; while \( m \), after elision of the \( l \), becomes \( \text{unil.} \); 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 

[corroboration is light and weak; so that, when preceded by a Fatha, it (IV)] is changed, in pause, into [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 (IV). You say for لَسْفَعَنْ in XCVI. 15. [153, 497, 610, 684] (M); and, in the imp., for [614, 684] (IV). Al A’shâ [Maimûn Ibn Kâis (Jsh)] says, [in an ode praising the Prophet (IV, Jsh),]

"قَالَ"...لَا تَقْرِبْهَا ولا تَأْخُذْنَ سَهْمًا حَدِيدًا لِتَفْصِيلَ"  

"وَذَٰلِكَ النَّصْبُ الْمَنْصَرِبُ لَا تُنْسَكْنَهُ ولا تُعْبِدَا الْشَّيْطَانَ وَآللَّهُ فَامْبَدْأُ [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 قَامِبُدْنَ (Jh, IV), but pausing with the ٍ, as you say [640] (Jh); and hence the saying of the other

أَبُوكُ يَزِيدُ وَالْوَلِيدُ وَمَسْ يَكُنُّ هُمَا أَبْوَاهُ لا يَذْيِلُ وَيْكَرْمًا

"Thy sire is Yazid, and thy grandsire is Al Walid; and whoso is such that they are his sire and grandsire will not be lowly, and shall surely be noble, meaning..." and it is said, on the saying of Imrâ al-Kâis 86a
that the meaning is: *Do thou tarry*, because, say they, the address is to one, that being proved by his saying

[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 ٰ, treating the state of continuity like pause [647]: while some explain L. 23. [193, 233] as *orig.* ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ Do thou cast, arguing that the address, in that, is to an Angel, the Keeper of the Fire (IY). And, [if what precedes this ٰ be pronounced with ّامم or Kasr, as (IY)] in ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ Will ye surely strike, O my people? [and ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ Wilt thou surely strike, O woman?], then, if you pause (IY), you say ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ Will ye surely strike, O my people? [and ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ Wilt thou surely strike, O woman?], by restoring the ٰ of the pl. [and the ٰ of the 2nd pers. sing. ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ (M)]. For the predicament of this ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ is [like] that of the Tanwîn [above]: therefore, as you substitute an ٰ for the Tanwîn in the acc. [497, 640], so you substitute an ٰ for this ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ, when what precedes it is pronounced with Fath; and, as the Tanwîn 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 ﺪ, 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 ﺪ 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 ﺪ, 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 ﺪ or ﺪ for the single ن [of corroboration], when preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm or Kasr, respectively, by analogy to the ﺪ [preceded by a letter] pronounced with Fath, saying ﺪ for ﺪ and ﺪ for ﺪ Do ye dread, and ﺪ for ﺪ Do thou [fem.] dread, which is analogous to [the practice of] those who substitute [ا ﺪ or ﺪ] for the Tanwin [640] in the nom. or gen., [respectively]. But S does not allow that (IY).
CHAPTER IV.

THE OATH.

§. 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 عَلَمَ اللَّهُ [below], and أَلْيَتْ أَقْسَمْتُ God has known or عَلَمَ اللَّهُ God knows, or nominal, as لَعْبَرْ اللَّهُ [27, 29] or لَعْبَرَ أَبْيَلَة Assuredly thy father's life or لَعْبَرَ اللَّهُ Assuredly God's life, and أَمَأَنَّ اللَّهُ God's oath [29] or أَمَأَنَّ اللَّهِ [below] or أَمَأَنَّ اللَّهَ [651], and Aَيَّمُ اللَّهِ God's trust [below], and أَقْسَمْ اللَّهِ [29], whereby a prop., aff., as لَأَفْعَلْ Assuredly I will do, or neg., as لَأَفْعَلْ I will not do [652], is corroborated [654] (M). The verbal prop. in the oath is أَحَلفُ 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] مَرْتَ (S, IY) to Zaid in your saying مَرْتُ بِزَيْنِهِ [503] (IY), except that the v. [sometimes]
occurs understood in this cat. [651, 658], and that the oath is a corroboration” (S). There are some vs., such as [لَا تَعْبَرْ إِبْكَ (Jh, KF)] أَحْلَفُ I testify, [meaning أَعْلَمُ I know, and I have sworn [above], that contain the sense of the oath, and are therefore treated like أَحْلَفُ, the v. occurring [as a correl.] after them, as after زَّالِلُهُ By God. The nominal prop. is لَعْبَرْ إِبْكَ and لَعْبَرْ and لَعْبَرْ اللَّهُ, where is an inch., the ٰ in it being the ٰ of inception [604]; while the enunc. is suppressed [29, 651], constructively قَسَّى my oath or حَلْفُي, 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 زَيْتُ لَكَانَ كَذَا [29], because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the correl. (IV). The meaning of يَبِينُ اللَّهِ is what God has sworn by, vid. وَالْمَسْرَقَاتِ XCII. 1. [588], وَالْمَلِلِ XCII. 1. [498, 657], وَالْمُسْقِي XCIII. 1. By the forenoon [657], and the like; or the oath that is [sworn] by His Names, as زَبَّرُ الْكَعْبَةِ [below], By the Lord of the Ka'ba, وَالْمُسْقِي By the Creator, and the like; and the sense is يَبِينُ اللَّهِ يَبِينُ God's oath (is mine oath) [29] (R).
And hence أَيْمُنُ اللَّهِ (IY). According to S (R), أَيْمُنُ اللَّهِ (IY, R), which is peculiar to the oath (ML), inasmuch as it is not used elsewhere, being thus distinguished from أَيْمُنُ اللَّهِ 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 n., pl. of يَقِيمُ oath, by common consent (DM),] 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 يَقِيمُ, contrary to the opinion of the KK [below] (ML): derived from يَقِيمُ (IY, R, ML), i. q. بَرَكَةُ God's 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 لَعْنَ أَيْمُنُ اللَّهِ [above], constructively يَقِيمُ or كَسَمُ, and the like (IY), i. e., بَرَكَةُ اللَّهِ يَقِيمُ, 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 أَيْمُنُ اللَّهِ By the oath of God (DM)]; (b) IM, who allows it to be pre. to the الكَعْبَة [653] and the ل of the pron. [651]; and (c) IU, who allows it to be an enunc., the suppressed being the
inch., i.e., (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 ُنِعَلُ with Kasr of the Hamza among ns. or vs.; and it also seems improbable that ُنِعَلُ should be an original sing. (R). According to the KK [651], اِمَنُ is pl. of ُبِيِسَ َنَذَر (R, DM), so that اِمَنُ َنَذَر is like ُبِيِسَ َنَذَر [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 ُلَ [below] (R). Their argument is that this measure is peculiar to the pl., like ُكَلْبٌ ُنَفْسُ and ُكَلْبٌ ُنَفْسُ [237] (DM), which is refuted by the fact that Kasr of the Hamza [below], and Fath of the م, are allowable, [so that اِمَنُ is said (DM)]; whereas the like [pronunciation] is not allowable in the pl., such as ُكَلْبٌ ُنَفْسُ and ُكَلْبٌ ُنَفْسُ [above] (ML), so that ُنَفْسُ is not said (DM): and by the saying of [Abū Miḥjan (ITB, Syt)] Nuṣaib [Ibn Rabāh 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 ٣ 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 ُعْمَرٌ] in ُعْمَرُ ٌلَّهُ [above]; and hence ُفُرَّقَ فَرِيقُ أَلْقَامٍ هَمْ [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 p., and is therefore pronounced with Fath [of the Hamza], by assimilation to the Hamza prefixed to the determinative ل [above]: but ُ has transmitted ٌ إِمََّـتُ ٌلَّهٌ [651] with Kasr of the Hamza [above]. As for ٌ in ٌ إِمََّـتُ ٌلَّهٌ, it also is governed in the nom. by inchoation, the enunc. being suppressed [651, 655] (IY). What is meant by إِمََّـتُ ٌلَّهٌ 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 Qur has إنَّا عَرَضْنَا إِمََّـتَ ٌلَّهٌ عَلَى السَّمْوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وأَلْبَابِ ٌقَابِلٌ أَن يَصْبِلْنَهَا وَأَشْقَفِنَّ مِنْهَا وَحَمَّلْنَاهَا
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 in عَلَى عَهْدِ آلِلَّهِ عَهْدُ [below] is governed in the nom. by inchoation, while عَلَى is its enunc.; the form being like نَفْسِ عَدَرِ زَيدٍ [28], but the sense being I swear by God (IY). One property of the two props., [the oath and its corre]. (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 أَحَلَفُ بِآللَّهِ [above], without the other, it is like your saying زَيدٍ 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 كَلِمَتُآللَّهَ Thou hast perished, by God,
(assuredly thou hast perished), meaning 'وَأَنَا طَلَّبْتُ إِنَّ فَقَلْتُ (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 زَيْدٌ بِعَلْوَة قَاتِمٍ Zaid, by God, is standing [below] (WIH, R, Jm) and قَامَ بِعَلْوَة زَيْدٍ Zaid, by God, stood, and, in the Nahj al-Balagha, قَدْ بِعَلْوَة نَقَرَ آلَة They have, by God, met God [575, 577] (R); or (2) is preceded by what indicates it (IH), as زَيْدٌ قَاتِمٌ بِعَلْوَة Zaid is standing, by God [below] (WIH, R, Jm) and قَامَ زَيْدٌ بِعَلْوَة 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-compensation 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 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., لَيْبِعُكُلْنَانِ وَلَيْعَاقِبَتَنَّ 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 قَانِمَمُ زَيْدُ وَاللَّهُ قَانِمَمُ [above]: (a) if you say لَعَقَّامِمُ زَيْدُ وَاللَّهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ قَانِمَمُ or 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 ﺟَازَةُ رَأْسَاءَ ﺟَازَةُ رَأْسَاءَ 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., لَتْبُعْتُنَّ, 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 لَتْبُعْتُنَّ فَعَلَ or لَقَدْ فَعَلَ or لَأَنْفَعْلَ occurs, when not preceded by a jurative prop., there a jurative prop. is supplied, as لَأَعْفَعَلْنَّ عَدَاءًا شَكِيدًا XXVII. 21. (By God,) assuredly I will punish it with a severe punishment, III. 145. And, (by God,) assuredly etc. [432], and LIX. 12. [599, 652]; while it is disputed whether such as إنْ زَيْدَا قَانِمٌ [below] and لَزِيَّدَ قَانِمٌ or لَقَآَمْ 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 عَوْدُ أَلْلَهَائِيْسِينَ and لَا أَعْفَعَلُ عَوْدُ [206], from the frequency of the usage of عَوْدُ with the oath, together with the fact that its sense is أَبَدًا ever [206] and لَبَتْنَهُ deciendy, 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.] عَوْدُ لَا إِثْبَانَكَ [498, 546], as عَوْدُ لَا إِثْبَانَكَ.
Never indeed will I come to thee and

Never will I come to thee, the object being that

should supply the place of the oath. But sometimes

it it used otherwise than in the oath, as

هَذَا نَشَأْتُ بِهَا أَوْلَيْتُ مِنْ حَسَنٍ

لا رَئَتُ عَوْضَ قُرْبِ الرَّيْبِ الْعَيْبِيَّ مَكْسُودًا

(R), by Rabî‘a Ibn Makrûm ad-Ḍabbî, 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. i. q. تَعْمَمُ جَبِيرُ [556], the connecting

link being that assent is a corroboratio and confirmation,

like the oath: you say جَبِيرُ لَآ أَفْعَلَنَّ Yea, assuredly I will

do, as though you said تَعْمَمُ وَاللهُ لَآ أَفْعَلَنَّ Yes, by God,

assuredly I will do. But sometimes جَبِيرُ is put without

any oath, as in رَتَّلَنَّ عَلَى الْفَرْدُوسِ الْحَجِّ [556]. It is

uninfl. upon Kasr, but is sometimes pronounced with

Fath; and sometimes it is pronounced with Tanwîn, by

poetic license, as in فَأَكْلَتْ آسِبَتْ آلِهَةٍ [556], which is cited

as evidence by those who hold it to be a n. [556].

Sometimes the mention of the oath is deemed sufficient,

without mention of the sworn-by [below], as in

فَأْقَسَمَ لَوْ شَيْءٍ أَتَنَا رَسُولُهُ ﺔُسْرَانُ وَلَكِنَّ لَمْ نُجِدَ لِلَّهِ مَدْفَعًا
[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., فَأَقُسُمُ بِمَا يُقَسَّمُ يَدْ 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 َلَا أَسْتَبْنَكَ Assuredly I will strike thee, because the ٍن has [certain specified] positions, and does not occur in pure enunciation, as َيَضْرِبُ رَبُّكَ [612]; but, as for such [phrases] as َلَقَدْ سَمَعَ آللَّهُ III. 177. Assuredly God hath heard and َلَيْدُتْ تَأْتَمُ [above], there exists no evidence that they are correls. of the oath, contrary to the opinion of the KK [652]. And sometimes َحَقَّا يَقِينًا certainty decidedly, and what resembles them, stand in the place of the oath, as َحَقَّا لَا فَعَلْنَ Truly, I will assuredly do. And so does َكَلَّا ۡلِلَّيْبَدِلَنَ ۡلَقَلَّا [598], when not [denoting] reprehension, as َلِلَّيْبَدِلَنَ CIV. 4. Now, assuredly etc. [406]. And so also does the obligation of a vow, as َبَلَهُ عَلَىٰ كَذَا لَا تَعْلَنَ Such a thing is a vow to God, binding upon me, assuredly I will do; or of a covenant, as َعَاهَدَتْ آللَّهُ لَا تَعْلَنَ I have covenanted with God, assuredly I will do, and َعَلَى عَهْدِ آللَّهِ لَا تَعْلَنَ [above] (R). The object
of the oath is corroboration of what is sworn to, whether aff. or neg., as By God, assuredly I will stand and By God, assuredly I will not stand, where you corroborate 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. [above], and the like, such as and and and (IY). The corroborated [prop. (IY)] is the sworn-to (M). If it be a v., the oath applies to it, as 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 By God, verily Zaid is departing and By God, assuredly Zaid is standing, where the oath corroborates the departure and the standing, not Zaid (IY). And the n. where to 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
[652] (IY), by Zuhair Ibn Abl Sulma Rabî'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], وَآلَدَارِبَاتِ ذَرَّاً Ll. 1. By the winds scattering the dust about (K, B)], وَآلسَّآهِ ذَاتِ الْحُبْكِ, Ll. 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 (M), meaning أَحْلَفُ بِاللهِ (I swear) by God, the jurative v. being often suppressed [650], because it is known, and can be dispensed with, as بِاللهِ إِنِّي أَشْرَكْنَ لَظْلَمَ عَظِيمًَ 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 ٌأَقْسَمْ لَا نَعْلَكِنَّ I swear (by God), assuredly I will do, meaningُ أَقْسَمْ بِاللهِ ,
because it is frequently used, and the person addressed knows what is meant: the poet says ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ أَنَّ الَّذِي ۤ أَقَامَ ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ [564, 652], and another says ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ [650, 652]:

(a) the jurists say that, if a man said ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ I make oath or ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ I swear or ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ 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 ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ 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 ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ Whoso is about to swear, let him swear by God, or let him hold his peace [650] (IY): (c) the enunc. [of the inchoatival prop., as (IY)] in لعَرَّ [29, 650] and its congeners (M), and ُقَاتَسِمْ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ [650], [the pre. ns. in] all of which are inchs., whose enuncs. are suppressed, for abbreviation, because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the correl. (IY), the sense being لعَرَّ مَا أَقَامُ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ Assuredly thy life (is what I swear by) (M), [or] مِثْوَا أَقَامُ ۤ لُرَ ۤ أَلْحَنُّ (is part of what I swear by) (K on XV. 72), [or] قَاتَسِمْ ۤ قَاتَسِمْ ۤ (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 88a
the life of any other than the Prophet (peace be upon him)!" (IX): (a) if the n., that you make an inch., be specifically assigned to the oath, as in [650] and لَعْبَرُكَ [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 أُقَسِّمُ يُؤَرَّف، while the correl. supplies the place of the enunc.: but, if it be not specifically assigned to the oath, as in يَبْيِنُ اللَّهُ وَعَهْدُ اللَّهِ وَعَهْدُ أَمَانَةٌ اللَّهِ [29, 650], you may suppress the enunc., as لَعْبَرُكَ God's trust (is what I swear by), assuredly I will do and عَهْدُ أَمَانَةٌ اللَّهِ God's covenant etc., and يَبْيِنُ اللَّهُ God's oath etc.; or express it, as عَلَى أَمَانَةٌ اللَّهِ God's trust is binding upon me, [assuredly I will do] and عَلَى عَهْدُ أَمَانَةٌ اللَّهِ God's covenant is etc., and عَلَى يَبْيِنُ اللَّهُ God's oath is etc.: and similarly you say الكُبْرَةُ لَعْبَرُكَ The Ka'ba (is what I swear by), assuredly etc., and المُصْحَفُ الكُبْرَةُ يَبْيِنُ اللَّهُ The Holy Book (etc.), or المُصْحَفُ الكُبْرَةِ لَعْبَرُكَ The Ka'ba is mine oath, assuredly etc. [and المُصْحَفُ يَبْيِنُ اللَّهُ The Holy Book is mine oath, etc.]: (b) Fr says that, if the inch. be an abstract n. [3], as in إِيَّاسٍ اللَّهِ لَعْبَرُكَ, then the correl. of the oath is its enunc.; and there is no need to supply another enunc., because لَعْبَرُكَ is
also is an oath, so that the former is [identical with] the latter: but this is of no account, because the continuance is the sworn-by, while is the sworn-to; and this cannot be [identical with] that: and so may one say of and the like (R): (d) the 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 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 (IY): (b) as for and with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza, together with Damm of the م, they are contracted from , with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza [650]; and sometimes is said, with conversion of the Hamza pronounced with Fath into س. [690]; and sometimes the is elided, together with the ص, so that, إِمَّ اللَّهِ and , with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza, are said: (c) what is contracted from is
used only with the word 

\[\text{ألَّام} \]

is used therewith [650] (R): (d) Y asserts that the \[\text{يُمْ} \]
is \text{conj.}; and so the Arabs treat it, pronouncing the \[\text{يُمْ} \] with Fath, as they pronounce the \[\text{يُمْ} \] with Fath [668]: and similarly [the Hamza of] \[\text{يُمْ} \]: the poet says [650], which we have heard from the Arabs thus [recited] (S): (e) the \[\text{فَمِن} \] of \[\text{مُّنِّ} \] [653]: (f) the jurative \[\text{ضَرَبَ} \], without compensation, in \[\text{اللَّهُ} \] [503, 514, 515, 655]; and, with compensation, in \[\text{اللَّهُ} \] [656]: (2) substitution of a \[\text{ث} \] for the jurative \[\text{ضَرَبَ} \], [i. e., the (IY),] in \[\text{قَالَ} \] [506, 653] (M), as XII. 85. [454] and XII. 91. [575] (IY): (3) their preference for Fatha over Damma, which is better known in \[\text{عَمَّرُ} \] [29, 650]: (a) \text{continuance, life, has} three \text{dial. vars.}, (a) \[\text{عَمَّرُ} \] with Fath of the \[\text{ع} \], and quiescence of the \[\text{م} \]; (b) \[\text{عَمَّرُ} \] with Damm of the \[\text{ع} \], and quiescence of the \[\text{م} \]; and (c) \[\text{عَمَّرُ} \] with Damm of both [\[\text{ع} \text{and} \text{م}\] : (b) you say \text{َأَطَالَ اللَّهُ عَمَّرُ} \text{God prolong, or lengthen, thy life!} or \text{َعَمَّرُ or} \text{َعَمَّرُ} \text{God prolong, or lengthen, thy life!}: but, when you come to the oath, you use only the [\text{dial. var.}] pronounced with Fath of the \[\text{ع} \], because it is the lightest of the three \text{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 *I have besought God to prolong thy life or I have entreated thee by thy confession of God's eternity, عَمَّرْتُكَ اللّهُ،* [below], *I adjure thee by thy faith, hast thou drawn Laila close to thee, a little before dawn, or hast thou kissed her mouth?* (Jsh). It is [sometimes] headed by *لَا نَعْلَتْ إِنَّلَا نَفَعْلَى* I have adjured thee by God [above], etc. [95] or *لَا نَعْلَتْ* [559]. But *فَعَلَكَ أَنَّ لَا آخَرَ* [Part I, p. 42 A] is red. [564]. And sometimes one says in adjuration *لَا نَعْلَتْ* (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 *إِنَّ* [when the correl. is aff. (WIH),] and the neg. p.
(M, IH),  ما or  لا (Jm), when it is neg. (WIH), as  بِنِعْلَتْ  لاَنَأْنِعَلٌ By God, assuredly I will do and  مَا كَفَّلْتَ I have not done and  لا أَنْعِلْ 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  لا [600] and  إنَّ [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  ف [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  وَآَلِلَّهُ إِنَّ رَبِيدًا [427]; or the  لّا, as  وَآَلِلَّهُ لَرَبِيدٌ قَايَمٌ [650]; and sometimes by both combined, as  وَآَلِلَّهُ إِنَّ رَبِيدًا لَقَايَمٌ, for corroboration, and for connection of the correl. with the oath (WIH): the Kur has  حَمْمُ وَآَلِزَكَابِ الْبَيْضِيِّ إِنَّا أَنْرُنَّاهُ
XLIV. 1, 2. Hā- bait. By the clear
Scripture, verily We revealed it in a blessed night
C. 1, 2. [518, 469, 650], and [the corroboration in] the
correl. [headed] by ّن ّن falls upon the pred. [650],
because it is in the sense of the v. (IY): (a) the aff.
nominal [prop.] is headed by ، 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 ، 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 ّن [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 ّن is prefixed to: (d) the opinion of the
KK is that the ل in the like of ل ّن ّن ّن [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 ل ّن ّن ّن 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 网 and 网, as By God, Zaid is not standing or [107], and 网 in the house
If it be a verbal [prop.], then, (1) if aff.,
(a) when its v. is a pret., it is attended by the ل , with 网 and 网 [427]; or without it, as 网
[below]; and sometimes by 网 alone, as XCI. 9. [433, 575, 600] (WIH), 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 网 [577], as 网 [600] (R) : [for,]
when the ل is prefixed to the pret., the phrase is not
good unless 网 be with it, as 网 [above],
because 网 approximates the past to the present, as
By God, assuredly ye have come to do evil in the land and in the case of , however, the alone is put, since is not prefixed to them, because of their aplasticity [575], as

by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulma, , being [governed in the acc. as (EM)] an inf. n. [corrob. (AKB)] of [39, 40] in the preceding verse [650], assuredly such that 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) [above] is allowable, but not frequent, whence [23] (IY), the in being [the of] the correl. of an oath understood, constructively [below] (IY): [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 is not put because of the length [of the sentence]; and the connection is affected by the , without , because of the exigency of the
metre (AKB): but [the suppressed] must be supplied after the J, because the J of inception is not prefixed to the bare pret. [577, 604]; and restriction to the J is more frequent than the converse: (d) as for such as [564, 651], the opinion of S is that is subsidiary [to the oath], like the J [599, 601] in (By God,) if thou come to me, assuredly I will honor thee; and, in that case, the J in is [the J of] the correl. of the oath [600], not [the J of] the correl. of [602] (R): and similarly the correl. would belong to the oath, if were absent, as in By God, if thou stoodest, assuredly I would honor thee (AKB); so that, in [650, 651], the correl. of the oath, [constructively, as mentioned by Fr and others, on the evidence of (AKB),] is suppressed (R), not the correl. of , 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 J, with the of corroboration, as [613]; and, extraordinarily, without it, as (WIH): (a) the aff. aor. is mostly headed by the J, and terminated by the , as By God, assuredly I will strike; unless the J be prefixed to a prepos. reg. of the aor., as in III.
152. [75, 613], which contains the ج 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 ج, the "ن" being deemed sufficient, as in [600]: (c) according to the BB [613], it is not allowable to content yourself with the ج, 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 ج and "ن" to be interchangeable; the poet [Zaid alFawâris Ibn Ḥusain Ibn Dirâr adDabbî (T, AKB)] says
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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)] لَيْتَنُّ تَلُونَ قَدْ [613] (R), where the sense is assuredly my Lord (now) knows (AKB); and you say لَوْلَا لَيْبَلِي يُصَبِّلِي By God, assuredly Zaid is praying, where you must content yourself with the ل, and do not put the ن, because it is the sign of the future (R): (c) BD says “If the aor. be in the sense of the present, it is corroborated by the ل, without the ن, because the latter is peculiar to the future, as وَاللَّهُ لَيْفَعَلُ زَيْدًا أَلْقَانَ 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 وَاللَّهُ إِنْ رُضِيَ لَيْفَعَلُ آلَّلَنَ 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 لَأُقَسُمُ بِبَيْوَمْ أَلْفِيَامَةِ LXXVI. 1. Assuredly I swear etc. [566] and the saying of the poet cited by Fr لَيْتَنُّ فَقَلَ آلَّلَنَ [above]” (AKB): (2) if neg., (a) when its v. is a pret., it is attended by the ل مَ قَلَمْ زَيْدُ [546] or لَ مَا قَلَمْ [547], as وَاللَّهُ مَا قَلَمْ زَيْدُ By God, Zaid has not stood or لَا قَلَمَ will not stand (WIH): (a) the neg. pret. is [headed] by لَ مَا قَلَمْ, as وَاللَّهُ زَيْدًا مَا قَلَمَ [above] (R): the Kur has لَا قَلَمَ
VI. 23. By God, our Lord, we have not been polytheists and [تَحْتِفُونَ بِاللهِ ما قَالُوا] IX. 75. They swear by God, they have not said (IY): (b) if negatived by لا or إن [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 alMuḥāribī (AKB)] حَسَبُ الْبِحْيَانِ أَلَّهُلِّي [547, 615], i. e., لَا تُعْدِّبَهُمْ; so that repetition of the لا is not obligatory, as also it is not obligatory when لا is prefixed to the deprecatory pret., as in لَا رَحْمَةُ أَلَّهُلِّي 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], لا must be repeated, as in LXXV. 31. [547]; though, in poetry, it sometimes occurs not repeated, as in نَآَئِي أَمْرٍ فَلَا أَقْتَحَمَ الْعَقْبَةَ [547]; while in xc. 11. Yet he hath not attempted the mountain-road it is not repeated because of the repetition in the exposition of ذلك رَفَحَةٌ أو إِطْعَامٍ فِي يَوْمٍ ذَي مَسْفَة يَتَنَاذَذ في مَقْرَةٍ العَقْبَة أو مَسْكِينًا ذَا مَتْرَةٍ xc. 13-16., [i. e., هِي فَلَا آخَرُ (It is) (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 لا, in xc. 11., in place of كَمْ being good, on account of the multiplicity of what is meant by العَقْبَة (B),] as though فَلَا فَلَا رَفَحَةٍ ولا أَطْعَمُ
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 ِلَّا َلَمْ أَنْفَعْنَ بِجَرْجُونَ By God, assuredly I will not do; or without it, as ِلَّا أَنْفَعُلُ I will not do (WIH): (a) the aor. is negatived by َما or ِلا or ِلا ِإِنْ (R): an instance of the correl. [headed] by ِلا, in the Kur, is LIX. 12. [599, 650], where ِلَّا َلَمْ أَنْفَعْنَ and َلا َبَنَصْرَنَّهُمْ 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] (IV): but َما and ِإِنْ, when not restricted by [something indicative of] future time, apparently denote negation of the present [546, 550]; so that Mb [above] does not allow ِلَّا أَنْفَعُلُ By God, I do not stand or ِلَّا أَقُومُ [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 َلَمْ or َلَنْ 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 لَنْ or لَمْ is very rare, as in the saying of Abu Ṭālib [549], and in نَعْمَ وَخَالِقَهُمْ لَمْ نَقْتِمْ عِنْ مِثْلِهِمْ مُنْجَبَة.* 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., إن لَيْ بَنِيَنَ (Verily I have sons), the neg. prop. being afterwards begun (ML on لَنْ). If the sworn-to be the correl. of a future condition preceded by an oath, the cond. instrument is often conjoined with a ج pronounced with Fath, named subsidiary [599, 601], i.e., subordinating, and specifically assigning, the correl. to the oath, not to the condition [427], as وَلَيْلِهِ لَيْنَ أَيْتَيْنِيْ لَا يَنْتَكَ. By God, if thou come to me, assuredly I will come to thee, where إنْ أَيْتَيْنِي without a ج is allowable. If, however, the oath be suppressed, and supplied, the subsidiary ج 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) لَأَ (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 (IY, R), as XII. 85. [447, 454, 547], i. e., لَا تُقَلْعُ (IY, WIH); whether the aor. be لَا يَرَال and its sisters [447, 454], as in فَقَلْتُ يَبِينَ اللَّهُ الْعُمَّ (454, 547, 655) (R), orig. لَلَّهِ يَبِينَ الْعُمَّ (AKB); or any other, as in لَلَّهِ يَبِينَ الْعُمَّ [504, 653] (R), constructively لَلَّهِ يَبِينَ (AKB), [and] in the saying of the [HudhalI (IY)] 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 (IY). 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 لَا يَرَال and its sisters, as فَقَلْتُ تُسْعِي الْعُمَّ لَا تَنْفَلُ (454) (R), constructively لَا تَنْفَلُ (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 وَاللَّهُ لَا تِلْقَّوُنَّهُ " (By God,) ye
will (not) find him”; and Dm says that apparently his opinion is more probable (AKB). As for the saying, however,

\[
\text{ فلاً وَأَبَيَ دَهْمَةٍ} \quad \text{زَرَّتَ عَرْبَةً} \quad \text{عَلَى} \quad \text{فَوْقَهَا} \quad \text{مَا} \quad \text{قَتَلَ أَلْرَنْدَ} \quad \\
\text{قَدَح.}
\]

[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. \( \text{وَأَبيَ دَهْمَةٍ} \) (AKB). Properly \( \\) or \( \\) should not be separated from \( \\) and its sisters by an adv. or its like, though that is allowable in the case of other vs., as \( \\) Not to-day didst thou come to me, nor yesterday, because the neg. p. is compounded with \( \\) and its sisters to import affirmation; and \( \\) [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 ...

\[
\text{وَلاً أَرَا أَنا} \quad \text{ذَرَّال} \\
\] [1] and \[ \\] [above].” His Commentator IMH says that \( \\) 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 نَّكَ‏ُّلَا وَأَبِي دَهْسَا‏هَا لَ‏زَلْتَ
Then no, by Abu Dahmá 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 لَا is sometimes understood with oaths, as نَّكَ‏ُّلَا وَأَبِي دَهْسَا‏هَا لَ‏زَلْتَ [above] and نَّكَ‏ُّلَا وَأَبِي دَهْسَا‏هَا لَ‏زَلْتَ (AKB). The sign of affirmation may not be suppressed in the aor., because it is mostly two signs, the لَ‏ and the نَّ, 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 لَا, not مَا, because لَا is used more than مَا in negation of the aor. (R). IU holds the verse [last cited] to be a case of suppression of the neg. مَا; but quotes its first hemistich differently, saying "And hence the suppres­sion of the neg. مَا, which is very rare, as in لَعَبْرُ أَبِي دَهْسَا‏هَا لَ‏زَلْتَ" By the life of Abu Dahmá, she has (not) ceased to be exalted above her people, so long as a striker of fire has twisted a fire-stick!, meaning مَا لَ‏زَلْتَ": and so is it quoted, and explained, by IUUK in
the Commentary on the Tashil, except that he says "i.e., لَ زَالَتْ she shall (not) cease", [which involves "shall twist"] (AKB). None of these [four] ps. [above] may be suppressed, except ۗ alone, because (1) ۗ is op.; and may not govern, when understood, on account of its weakness: (2) ۗ also is op., in the idiom of the people of AlHijaz: (3) suppression of the ج would necessitate suppression of the ن with it (IY).

§. 653. The oath and the sworn-by have certain instruments among the preps. (S). The jurative instruments are five ps., vid. the ب [503], the ر [506], the ع [506], the ل [504], and م [499] (IY). The jurative ps. are preps.; but are named "jurative ps." because of their prefix to the sworn-by (CAj). The ب is the original jurative p. [503, 654], because it is a prep., meaning adhesion; which attaches the idea of swearing, and makes it adhere, to the sworn-by, in أَحْلَفُ بِاللهِ [650], as the ب conveys the [idea of] passing to the passed-by in مَرَّتْ بَيْنِي [503]. The ب, then, is one of the preps. [498], on a par with م [499] and نى [502]; and, for that reason, we say that it is "the original jurative p.", the others being only made to accord with it. The v. is sometimes suppressed [651], for abbreviation, because of the frequency of the oath, and because they content themselves with the indication of it by the
prep., as يَلْعَلُنَّ (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، and the، and two preps., vid. the ل and م in your saying بَلَّ لَا يَوْحَرُ أَللَّهُ. By God, the end shall not be delayed! [498] and مَنْ رَبِّي لَا يَلْعَلُنَّ By my Lord, assuredly etc. [499], from desire for peculiarity [654] (M). The، is a subst. for the ب [506], because they mean to allow themselves some latitude [in the choice of a p.], on account of the frequency of oaths [651]; while the، 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، 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، 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، is a subst. for the ب؛ and is op. with the government of the latter, unlike the rest of the cons., because the con.، is itself inop., being only indicative of the suppressed op. [131, 538], for which reason, instead of قَالَ مَرْيَمُ وَعَصَمُ Zaid and ‘Amr...
stood, you may say Qa'am 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 , is not like that, because it is not combined with the ب ; so that, when you say, and by Zaid, this , is not the jurative (IY). The و and the ل contain the sense of wonder (M), as XII. 91. [575, 651] and [508, 652] (IY): and sometimes the و occurs otherwise than in wonder (M), as XXI. 58. [498, 611] (IY); but not the ل : S cites لله يَبْقِيُ آلَح [above], by 'Abd Manat alHudhalî (M). The و is a subst. for the ل [506, 651], being often substituted for it, as in تُرَأْت [689], which [substitution] is so frequent as to be almost regular (IY). The ل occurs in the sense of the ل , being peculiar to the word لله [504], in great matters. And so does مَن , pronounced with Kasr, and sometimes with Damm, of the ل , Kasr being more frequent; and peculiar to the expression زَيِّي my Lord [499]. It is held (1) by S to be a prep., standing in the place of the ب ; the Damm of the ل being to indicate the alteration of its meaning, and its exclusion from its cat., as you say of the proper name شُعْبُن أَبِن مَالِك Shums Ibn Malik, with Damm of the ش : (2) by some of the KK to be contracted from آيُس when
pronounced with Damm, and frompronounced with Kasr of the \( \text{م} \); but this requires consideration, because is peculiar to 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 [or ], because contraction of the infl., and its reduction to two letters, do not necessitate uninflectedness, as [we see] in hand and blood. And one should rather say that in their sayings with Damm, and with Kasr, of the \( \text{م} \) and \( \text{ن} \), [used] with the word alone, is [identical with] the prep. used with; the \( \text{ن} \) being made to imitate the \( \text{م} \) in Damm and Kasr, because of the two quiescents [664, 666]: and that with two Fathas is [identical with] [in] [499], with Kasr of the \( \text{م} \) and Fath of the \( \text{ن} \), the \( \text{م} \) being made to imitate the \( \text{ن} \) [in Fath], from desire for lightening; although the Fath of the \( \text{ن} \) arises accidentally, because of the two quiescents. It is said, however, that all three [vars.], i.e., with Damm, Kasr, and Fath of both \( \text{م} \) and \( \text{ن} \), [used] with the word , are contracted from . As for the abridgment of , with
two Dammamas, from ايمس, it is plain. But, as for those [var.s.] with Kasr or Fath of both letters, I see no reason for their being contracted from it, because ايمس, according to the GG, must be in the nom. [650, 655], by reason of hearsay; and, since contraction does not necessitate uninflectedness, whence comes the Kasr or Fath of the ن? If, indeed, ايمس آمين الله occurred, in the three cases, nom., acc., and gen., as يبين الله occurs in the nom. and acc., according to all, and in the gen. also, according to the KK [655], then one might say that the م was made to imitate the ن in Fath or Kasr. And مَنْ آللَّهِ with two Fatḥas may be contracted from يِبِينَ اللَّهِ, by making the م imitate the ن [in Fath] after the contraction; but not مَنْ آللَّهِ with two Kasras, by making the ن imitate the م [in Kasr], because the vowel of inflection is not removable for the sake of alliteration. Sometimes مَنْ آللَّهِ with Damm, and مَنْ آللَّهِ with Kasr, of the م are said, being contracted from مَيْنَ and مَيْنَ [651], according to what S says. It is said [by others] (1) that they are contracted from ايمس, in which case there is a difficulty in [accounting for] the Kasr of the م: (2) that the one with Kasr is contracted from يِبِينَ: (3) that both are subs. for the, [687], like the ت [above], because the م and مت are labial [732], for which reason
they are peculiar to the word ﷽ ﷴ ﷱ ﷷ, like the ب [506];
but this requires consideration, because the word of one
letter does not occur, in ḥtheir language, pronounced with ﷨ mamma (R).

§. 654. The ب, because of its originality [503, 653],
enjoys three privileges, not shared by any other [jurative
p. (IY)], (1) prefixion to [the explicit n., as ﷴ ﷴ ﷶ ﷲ ﷸ ﷲ ﷷ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ 
By God, assuredly I will do; and (IY)] the pron., as ﷴ ﷴ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ 
By Him, assuredly I will worship Him
and ﷴ ﷴ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ 
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 ﷴ ﷴ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ 
is not allowable, nor ﷴ (IY): the poet says

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 ﷴ ﷴ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ 
أَقْسِمُ ﷴ ﷴ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ 
أَحْلِفُ ﷴ ﷴ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ 
[650] (M), and ﷴ ﷴ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ 
whereas you do not say ﷴ ﷴ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ 
أَقْسِمُ ﷴ ﷴ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ 
أَحْلِفُ ﷴ ﷴ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ 
and the like (IY): (3) [that you apply it to denote (IY)]
conciliatory [and propitiatory (IY)] adjuration of
the man [addressed (IY)], as ﷴ ﷴ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷶ ﷲ 
(I adjure thee) by God, only that thou visit me [95, 559, 652]
and ḳayna tu ḳibār (I adjure thee) by thy life, inform me (M); whereas you do not say ʿālāl, nor ʿālāl, because that occurs only in the [non-adjuratory] oath (IY). These conditions, and the ps. for which they are prescribed, are combined by some one in the [following mnemonic] verses

In the case of an explicit [n.], with suppression of the jurative v., together with omission of adjuration, swear with the ʿālāl; and these conditions are prescribed in the case of the ʿālāl, and add its being made peculiar to ʿālāl; and make the ʿālāl general (CAj). Ibn Harma says

[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 ʿālāl is dependent upon a suppressed v., as though he said "I ask thee of the power of God, thy Lord, if thou enter, then say to him...", which is suppressed because indicated by the circumstances of the case; and the sense is ʿāsāl ʿālāl ʿādīd ʿālāl (IY): and the [other (IY)] poet says ʿāsāl ʿālāl ἐδίδησκε δινέκ, as though he said...
(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 حَيَّ حَيْيٌ فِي الْبَرْيَةِ كُلِّهَا أَيَا لَّا لَّهُ هَلْ لِي بِيَبْنِي مِنْ عَقْلٍ

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 هَلْ لِي بِيَبْنِي آَلَمَ?, 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 (IV). 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 عمَّرْتُك [652], عمرْتُك, "عَمَّرَتْكَ "عمَّرْتُك, and قَعِيدْكَ, [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 requisite, the oath is adjuratory". IU expresses himself strangely, saying, in the small Commentary on the Jumal, "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 يَلَّلِّيْنَ اللَّهُ [above] and يَلَّلِّيْنَ اللَّهُ [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 Īdāh, "As for these two verses, they are not oaths, because the two props. [هَلْ نَفَسْتُ اَلْحَرْمَ and إِنَّ دَخَلْتَ اَلْحَرْمَ] 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 أَسْأَلُ اللَّهُ بَاللَّهِ and أَسْأَلُ اللَّهُ بَاللَّهِ [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 By God, 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 تأللهين قام آله, nor that, when they express the v. wherein the oath depends, it is not one of the jurative عس, 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 conciliatory [or adjuratory] oath (A.KB). The correl. of the non-adjuratory oath must be enunciatory [above]; and the correl. of the adjuratory oath originative, as in (I adjure thee) by thy Lord, hast thou drawn etc? and

يَقُولُ أَيُّهَا الَّذِي اِخْتَلَفْتُ أَرْضَيْكَ ذَا صَبَابِي
أَبِي غَيْرَ مَا يُرِضِيكَ فِي الْسَّرِيرِ وَالْجَهَرِ
[(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 أنتم منِّي أَنْفِعُكُمُّ (By) God, assuredly I will stand is said, transmitted by S, meaning وَأَنَا أَنْفُعُكمُّ (IY on §. 656). The [jurative p. (IY)] ب is (1) [often (IY)] suppressed [514, 651] (M), as عَلَّمْ يَا للَّهُ (with the acc. [651]: (a) they hardly ever suppress this p. in the oath with [expression of] the v.; and do not say أَعُوَّسُ اللَّهَ, nor أَحْلفُ اللَّهَ; 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، 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

آَلَ رَبِّ مَنْ تَلَّيَ لَهُ اللهُ دَارُ

[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 بِاللهِ (IY); another says نَفَقَتْ يَبيِبَيْنَ اللهِ (454) (M), orig. أَحْلَفُ بِيِبِيبِيْنَ اللهِ (AKB); and another says

إنَّمَا الْحَسَبُ تَآَدُمَةُ بِنَحْيِ # فَذَالِكَ أَمَانةَ اللهِ الْآتِمَ

[below] (M) Whenever thou seasonest the bread with meat, then that, (I swear by) God’s trust, is the dish called أَحْلَفُ بِآمَانَةِ اللهِ (N), which [last verse], they say, is spurious: (d) if you wish, you understand a trans. v., such as I mention, أَذْكُرُ 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 يَيِبَسُنُ أَمَانَةَ اللَّهِ (here) are also related in the nom., [The] Then said I, God's oath (is mine oath, or what I swear by) and then that, God's trust (is binding upon me) (IY),] as inches whose enunc. is suppressed [29, 650, 651] (M), the full phrase being فأَنَّ أَمَانَةَ اللَّهِ الْحَقَّ (M), and similarly فأَنَّ أَمَانَةَ اللَّهِ كُرُومَةٌ لَّي (IY): (2) understood [503, 515, 651] (M), for a kind of abbreviation, because frequently used (IY), like the لَّهُ أَبُوَّكَ (M) and لَّهُ أَبُنَّ عَبَدَكَ, meaning لَّهُ أَبُنَّ عَبَدَكَ لَّهُ أَبُوَّكَ [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 ى, and also because the o. f. of the prep. ل is Fath [504]. And sometimes they say لَّهُ 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
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 p., 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 (By) the Ka'ba, assuredly etc., and (By) the Holy Book, assuredly I will come. The inch. whose enunc. is suppressed, if conjoined with the J of inception, as in [650], must be in the nom.; and so, says Jz, must [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 [650, 653], may be governed in the acc. by the jurative v. understood, as (I swear by) God's covenant and (by) the Holy Book, and similarly (I swear by) Thee, assuredly etc.; and, in such expressions, the acc. is more frequent than the nom.; while 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], نَا لَحْقُيُّ وَآَلْحَقِيُّ 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 إنَّ عَلَيْكَ اللَّهُ أَنْ أَلْحَقُ أَلْحَقًا الله An الله in Verily incumbent upon thee, (I swear by) God, is that etc. (K), or, in another version, أُمَانَةَ [154]; and like أُمَانَةَ in فَذَلَّل أُمَانَةَ اللَّهِ أَلْحَقُ أَلْحَقًا الله [above], and [الله in أَلاَّ رَبَّ مَنِّي [above], and [الله in قَلْبِي أَلْحَقُ أَلْحَقًا الله] [above] (N): (b) the nom., the first being an inch. whose enunc. is suppressed like لَعَمِرُ [above], i.e., نَا لَحْقُي قَسَبَيى [27]: (c) the gen., Then, (by) the truth, etc., the first being a sworn-by whose jurative p. is understood, like وأَلْحَقَيْ أَقُولُ اللَّهِ لَفَعَلَنَّ 503,515,651; while وأَلْحَقَيْ أَقُولُ اللَّهِ لَفَعَلَنَّ i.e., And I say (not aught save) الحَقِيْيِ, is a lit. imitation of the sworn-by, its sense being corroboration and strengthening: (a) this construction, [by which the second حَقِيْيِ 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 \( \text{الله} \) [552], the interrog. Hamza in \( \text{الله} \) [below], or the disjunction of the conj. Hamza in \( \text{الله} \) [651] is put as a compensation for it (M). And they say \( \text{الله} \), meaning \( \text{يالله} \) [556] (IY). The word \( \text{الله} \) is exclusively distinguished by receiving [the premonitory (AKB)] \( \text{الله} \) or the interrog. Hamza as a compensation for the [suppressed] prep. (R). The language of Kh in the CAj, [where he says "The is sometimes, though rarely, changed into \( \text{ها} \), as \( \text{الله} \), with the disj. or conj. Hamza, and, in both cases, with retention or elision of the l",] apparently means that the \( \text{ها} \) here is [not a premonitory, but] a jurative p. [653]; and that it is a subst. for the \( \text{ب} \) [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 ps. (Amr on \( \text{ها} \)). And similarly, in \( \text{الله} \), 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 الله 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 الله، like the في، [which is a subst. for the، (506, 651, 653)]. When you put the premonitory لَا as a subst. [for the jurative p. (AKB)], you must put the word دَى after the sworn-by, [whether لله be governed in the gen. by the supplied p. (AKB)], as in لَا لَا للهِ ۚ دَى [552] and إِيُّ اللَّهُ ۚ دَى [556] (R), meaning (by) God in both [exs.] (AKB); or [by لَعَمْر pre. to it (AKB)], as in تَعَلُّمْنَ الْعَمْرَ اللَّهَ دَقَّتُكَ تَأْقُدُّ دَرَكَ وَتَأْثِرُ، تَنْسَلُكَ (R), by Zuhair Ibn Abl Sulmā, threatening AlḤārith Ibn Warkā aṣ-Saidāwī, who had made a raid upon his people, Know thou, now a surely the life of God, this (is what I swear by), solemnly (قَسْمًا being, says Am, governed in the acc. as an inf. n. corrob. of what precedes it, because the sense thereof is أَقْسِمُ 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 لَا is prefixed to الله، there are four modes [of pronunciation]. The
most frequent of them is retention of its ۱, and elision of the conj. Hamza from ۱۰۰۱۰۰۰۱۰۰۰۱۰۰۰;
so that two quiescents meet together, the ۱ of ۱۰۰۱۰۰۰۱
after conversion of it into Hamza, as in لَيْكُونَ ذَا لَا نُفِّلَنَّ. Khl says that لَا is part of the correl. of the oath; and is enunc. of a suppressed inch., i.e., لَيْكُونَ ذَا (assuredly the matter is) this; or an ag. [of a suppressed v.], i.e., لَيْكُونَ ذَا (assuredly) this (shall be the case) or لَا (shall not be the case); while the correl. that comes after it, whether aff. or neg., as حَنَا أَلَّهُذَا لَا نُفِّلَنَّ, (by) God, (assuredly the matter is) this, or (assuredly) this (shall be the case), assuredly I will do or لَا أَنْفَلُ [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 حَنَا أَلَّهُذَا أَحْرُوكَ (assuredly I am) thy brother. But Akh says that لَا is part of the oath, either an ep. of للهِ أَلْهَيْنَاءِ النِّظَارِ (by) This, i.e., the Present, the Overlooking, God; or an inch., whose enunc. is suppressed, i.e., ذَا قَسْبِي 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 disapproval, as in the saying of AlHajjaj about HB أَلَّهُنَّ لَيْقُرْمَ عَنْدَهُ مَنْ عَيْدَهُ. نَقْرَلَنَّ كَذَا وَكُلَّدَا What! (By) God, shall one of my slaves indeed rise up, and say so and so?; or interrogation, as in the saying of the
Prophet to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd, when the latter said "This is the head of Abū Jahl", "Is it, (by) God, than Whom there is no other-god? When the interrog. Hamza is prefixed to ʿAllāh, the Hamza of ʿAllāh is either changed into a pure l, which is the more frequent mode [ of pronunciation]; or softened, as is the rule in ʾal-ğul. Is the man? and the like [661, 663, 669]: and is not elided, because of the ambiguity; nor preserved, because of the heaviness (R). There is a reading [transmitted from AshSha'bi (K, B)] َلا نَكْنُ شهادة ʿAllāh إِنَّا إِذَا لَيْنَ أَلْقَيْبَينَ. V. 105. [655] Nor will we hide testimony. What! (By) God, verily then are we sinners (IY), i.e., if we hide (B), with pause upon َشَهْادَةَ, and prolongation [of the Hamza] in ʿAllāh (K, B). And, as for disjunction of the Hamza of ʿAllāh, that is in a particular place, vid. when it follows a ف preceded by the interrog. Hamza: you say to a person "Hast thou sold thy house?", and he says َعَبْدُ ʿاللَّهِ لَقَدْ كَانَ كَذَا What! then, (by) God, assuredly such a thing has taken place; and the ف may be prefixed without [a Hamza of] interrogation, as َفَعَلْلَهُ لَقَدْ كَانَ كَذَا Then, (by) God, assuredly, etc. (R). As you prolong the ِ in ʿاللَّدُكَرْيْبَينَ VI. 144, 145. The two males [hath He made unlawful, or the two females]? [663] to distinguish between the two matters, announcement and inquiry, so, by the disjunction of the Hamza here,
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 لَّهُ by the *con.* ف. But, according to Akh, the ف in *اَنَّا لَلَّهُ* is *red.* [540]. The proof that these three [things, the *هَا*, the *interrog.* Hamza, and the disjunction of the *conj.* Hamza in *اَلَّلَهُ*] are *subs.* is (1) their interchangeability with the jurative *p.* (R): (a) the *و* [or ب] and the *هَا* may not be combined; so that one does not say إِيَّا هَا لَلَّهُ, nor إِيَّا هَا بَلََلْلَّهُ: 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* in such as وَالسَّمَكِي وَأَلْلَهِي XCI. 1, 2. *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 *و* here must be so (DM). When the *و* is repeated
after the jurative, as in َبَلۡيۡلۡيۡلۡ إِذَا یَغۡفُرَ إِذَا یَتۡجَلَّى
وَمَا حَلَقَ الۡدَّارُ وَالَّذِیۡنَ ۤۡیَسِیُّمُ لَشَنّۡى
XClII. 1–4. By the night, when it covereth [the sun, or the day, or all
that it hides by its darkness (K, B)], and the day, when
it becometh clear, and that [Almighty (K, B) God (K)]
Which hath created the male and the female, verily
your strivings are diverse, the opinion of S and Khl
is that the repeated is the copulative [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 ب [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
أَقَسِمْ بِآَلۡلِیۡلِ أَقَسِمْ بِیَلۡهَارِ أَقَسِمْ بِیَأَحَرَ 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.s.
would be required: while, if we say that two correl.s.
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 أَقَسِمْ بِآَلۡلِیۡلِ وَیَلۡهَارِ وَمَا حَلَقَ إِنَّ آَحَیرِ
swear by the night, and the day, and That Which hath created, verily etc., were said: and (2) because you say, displaying the coupling, بَلْلَهُ تَأَلَّمْ لَانْتَقَلْنَ By God, then God, assuredly I will do and بَلْلَهُ تَأَلَّمْ لَانْتَقَلْنَ By Thy life, again Thy life, assuredly etc. 

[184, 540]; but do not say لَقُلْنَ لَمْ يَقُولَ لَقُلْنَ لَمْ يَقُولَ لَقُلْنَ لَمْ يَقُولَ لَقُلْنَ L sworn 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 للهِ is then coupled to اللِّبْلِ, and إِذَا يُقَضّي إِذَا تَجْلِلَ while the con. is one [538] (R), by means of which [131] you govern the acc. and the gen., as in مَرْتَ آمِسَ ۡبَيْنَاهُ وَآلِيمَ عَصَرَ 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 للهِإِذَا تَجْلِلَ is, as it were, coupled to [two regs. of] a single op., vid. the ، [in وَاللِّبْلِإِذَا يُقَضّي]. But, according to this, says I.H., 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 being a subst. for ب, 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 إن فِي ظُلَّ اللَّيْلِ الَّذِيَا بَلَاءٌ. Verily in the house etc. [1, 538]. According to our suggestion [below], however, that the full phrase is وَعَظْمَةٌ لِّلَّيْلِ إِذَا يَغْشَى. By (the greatness of) the night when it covereth, the op. of اللَّيْلِ, and likewise of إِذَا يَغْشَى, is really the supplied [inf. n.] [331], for which the, acts as a subst.; and this is a single op., the phrase being constructively by (the greatness of) the night at the time of its retiring [or rather at the time of its covering], so that the op. of the gen. and acc. is one (R). It is said that the إن [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 إن here is not followed by anything, expressed
or supplied, suitable for being a *correl.*; nor precede by anything indicative of a *correl.* of a condition, except the oath: so that, if *إِذا* were *cond.*, the phrase would be constructively *إِذا يَفْشَى أَقْسِم* 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 *إِذا* is a bare *adv.*, what governs it in the *acc.?", I reply that *إِذا* may be said, not improbably, to be an *adv.* to the sense of *عَظْمَة* greatness and *جلال* majesty indicated by the oath, because one does not swear by any thing except because of its *great state* [650]; so that *إِذا* 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 *عَظْمَةَ أَلْلَهِ إِذَا أَلْلَه* [above], like *I marvel at Zaid, when he rides*, i. e., *من عَظْمَةَ إِذَا رَكَب* *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 (IY, 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 (IY)] heavy (IY, R) upon the tongue (R), since its utterance is like retching (IY); and therefore, [because of that heaviness (IY, Jrb),] alleviation of it is permitted (IY, R, Jrb) by some people (R), for a sort of improvement (Jrb). Alleviation is the dial. of most of the inhabitants of AlHijáz [641, 642], and [especially (R)] of Kuraish (IY, R, Jrb). The Commander of the Believers, ‘Alf (God honor his face!), is reported to have said: “The Qur'an 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 (IY, Jrb), who pronounce it [fully], like the rest of the letters (Jrb). Sounding true is the s.f., 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 ى or ء, 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 ب, 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 ى when it is pronounced with Fath, between Hamza and ج when it is pronounced with Damm, and between Hamza and ء 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 IY] (R), i.e., between Hamza and the consonant of its vowel, as you say سَل ْبَل 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 سُوُل was asked, between Hamza and , (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 سَل ْبَل and مَسْتَهْبِيْبَر [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 ظ, as in عرْقُتُ, ٌعُرْقُتْ, and 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 "head" [and "I read" (IV)], well, and "believer"; (b) at the end, as in "did not read," "was not bad," and "did not teach reading": (2) not [in the same word], as in "to the end of the world," VI. 70. To guidance, [saying to him (K, B),] "Come thou unto us," II. 283. [Then let] him that hath been entrusted [repay], and "I yield up the things to thee," 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 ٠ if precedes by Fatha, into ی if preceded by Kasra, and into ٌ if preceded by Damma (Jrb, MASH),] as ٌras, "I was evil;" [and "I yield up," and "I yielded to VI. 283., and ٌ浦东, and ٌ浦东 VI. 70. [below], ٌ浦东, and ٌ浦东 IX. 49. (SH): whether the quiescent Hamza and the preceding mobile be in one word, as in ٌras, "I was evil," 1st pers. pret. of ٌسأر, aor. ٌسأر, or in two words, as in VI. 70., II. 283., and IX. 49. (Jrb): [and] whether the Hamza be in the middle, as in ٌras, and ٌسأر; or at the end, as in ٌسأر, and ٌسأر: their predicament being one (MASH): because the unsemed 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 l of \(\text{قُلُوْدًا}^{663}\) is elided [663]; so that the expression becomes \(\text{إِلَى} \text{مُدَّنَا}^{669}\) with a quiescent Hamza after the د; and then the Hamza is converted into ل: [similarly,] in II. 283., the conj. Hamza is elided [669], and then the ى of \(\text{أَلَّدَيْنَى}^{663}\); so that the expression becomes \(\text{أَلَّدَيْنَى}^{669}\), with a quiescent Hamza after the د; and then the Hamza is converted into ى: and, in IX. 49., the conj. Hamza is elided [669], so that the expression becomes. \(\text{يُقُولُوْدَنُ}^{669}\); and then the Hamza is converted into . 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, or ء, or an ء; and, if a, or ء, 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., or ء, is converted into a, or ء, respectively; and, [when so converted (Jrb),] has the preceding ء incorporated into it, as خَطِيطَة١, [orig. fault (Jrb)]; خَطِيطَة١, [orig. مَقْرُوهَة١ read (Jrb)]; and خَطِيطَة١ (SH), orig. أَفْسِس١ (Jrb), dim. of أَفْسُس١, pl. of كَفَّن١ 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 خَطِيطَة١
prophet and \textit{creation} \footnote{278} is incorrect, \footnote{because \textit{creation} with Hamza is read by Nāfi' in the whole of the \textit{Kur}, and \textit{prophet} 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 \textit{نَبِي} and \textit{نبيَة}; 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 \textit{inf. n.}, like \textit{prophesy}, \textit{prophetic office}: but IH, seeing that \textit{نَبِي} and \textit{نبيَة} with Hamza are authorized among the Seven, decides that alleviation of them is not obligatory; and similarly \textit{نَبِي} 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 \footnote{by its canonicity} would be authenticated as part of the noble, ancient \textit{Kur'ān}, far above corruptness! (R): (2) when the quiescent is an \textit{\textbar}, is alleviated by the well-known betwixt-and-between
(SH) : so that you put it between Hamza and ٌ, if the Hamza be pronounced with Fath, as in سَأَلَْتُ reading; between Hamza and ٌ, if it be pronounced with Damm, as in تَسْأَلُ asking one of another and تَلَلَوَّم reconciliation; and between Hamza and َّي, if it be pronounced with Kasr, as in َّقَايِلُ sayer [below] and بَابِع seller: (a) elision by transfer of the vowel to the ٌ is disallowed, because ٌ does not receive a vowel; and conversion with incorporation is disallowed, because ٌ 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 مَسْأَلَة question and حَبَّ [641, 642] (Jrb), or an unsound letter other than that [ٌ or non-coordinative aug. ِّي, or ُّي, vid. a rad. ِّي, or ِّي, as in سُوء evil and شَيْتَن thing, or a coordinative aug. ِّي, or ِّي, as in جَوَابَة Jau'aba, name of a water, and جِيْبَأْل the she-hyena, where the ِّي, and ِّي are for coordination with جَعْفَر (352) (Jrb)], has its vowel transferred
thereafter, and is elided, as حَبَّ [663] and سَرُّ [below], جَبَلَةَ [below], and جَبَلَ [390] (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 theل alone, as in قَالَ [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, and ا [for theirl's (S)]; (b) the KK and some of the BB, like A.Z, allow conversion of the Hamza into an unsound letter, without transfer of its vowel, in various ways, without rule or system, saying رَفَعْ رَفَعُ for رَفَعَ inf. n. of رَفَعُ I damed, as they say, in the case of the quiescent Hamza preceded by a mobile, رَفَعْ رَفَعُ and for رَفَعَ and I grew up, and رَفَعْ رَفَعُ I hid and رَفَعَ 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 ل, after transfer of its vowel to the preceding
quiescent, as *woman* and *truffles* (S)]; and S transmits that, but says that it is rare: (d) transfer of the vowel is not allowable in the conjug. of اَنَّاعْيَر was bent, or curved, because they require the of ن of إِنْعَلَ [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 أَبْوَيْوَبَ [for the father of Job (Jrb)], دُوْرُ مُهْمٍ [for the author of their matter (Jrb)], أَبْتَغَيْيَ مَرْهَ [for I seek for his matter (Jrb)], and قَاصِرُ بِيِبَكَ (SH) for the judges of thy father; and similarly *Who is thy father?* من أَبَّكَ for من أَبُوكَ *Who is thy mother?*، كِمْ يَلُدُ كِمْ يَلُدَ for كِمْ يَلُدَ *How many are thy camels?* (Jrb): (f) the cat. of سُوءَ and شَيْ [above] also occurs incorporated (SH), as شَيِّ and سُوءَ (MASH), the non-aug, and being assimilated to the aug., as in خَطْيَة and مَكْرَة [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 يَرِى
sees, [orig. يراى, like يذرى grazes (Jrb).] and of ارئى يذرى shows, from frequency (SH) of usage (Jrb), since يراى, according to the o. f., is hardly ever used as aor. of رأى saw, or يذرى as pret. and aor. in the conjg. of إنفعل (MASH); contrary to يتنى goes far away, [aor. of نلأى (Jrb).] and to ينئتى sent far away and ينلتى sends far away (SH), which are treated like other words as regards allowability of alleviation, because they are not so frequent as يذرى, etc. (Jrb): (α) every word composed of رأى, whether from رؤى sight, رأى knowledge, opinion, or رؤيا 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 ]] from frequency of usage, except مرأى aspect, مرتى outward appearance, and مرتى mirror; but in poetry such as

[by Surāka Ibn Mirdās alAzdi alBāriki, I make mine eyes see what they have not seen: each of us is knowing in falsehoods (SM).] sometimes occurs: (β) the Hamza [of رأى, when conjoined] with the interrog. Hamza, is often elided, notwithstanding the mobility of what precedes it, in such as رأيت [below], as [will be]
mentioned (R): (b) frequent in the cat. of سَأَلَ ask, [orig. سَأَلَ (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 جَرَّ bellow for إِجاَرَ (Jrb): (β) إِسْأَلَ being used more frequently than such as إِجاَرَ, 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 إِجاَرَ; but, if the alleviation were frequent, [as IH suggests,] because of the two Hamzas only, إِجاَرَ 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 إِسْأَلَ is the combination of two Hamzas; while the [second] Hamza [of إِسْأَلَ] is [constructively] remaining [in إِسْأَلَ], 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 إِسْأَلَ, like إِلْخَسَرَ [660]; but states that what he transmits is vitiated by [the fact] that no one says إِتَّلَوْا They fought together
Reject thou [664]: and he distinguishes between مَّرُون and أَوَّل الْخَمْر by [saying] that the سَ in the latter is orig. mobile, as in سَأل asked; whereas the determinative ج [in the former] is orig. quiescent: while ّس says that the distinction between them is that the Hamza of the determinative ج resembles the disj. Hamza of أَحْمَر in being pronounced with Fatha when inceptive [668]; and in being retained in interrogation, as لَّٰلله [669], and in [the voc.] يَا لَّٰلله [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 \( \text{ا} \), is either transfer and elision, as in \( \text{حَبُّ} \) [above]; or conversion and incorporation, as in \( \text{بَرِى} \) \( \text{مَقُروُرُ} \) [above]: so that \( \text{حَبُّ} \) remains, with the mobile, like \( \text{دَم} \) blood; and is then paused upon with mere quiescence, or with Raum, Ishmām, or reduplication \( [641, 642] \); and \( \text{بَرِى} \) \( \text{مَقُروُرُ} \) remain, [with the \( \text{i} \) or \( \text{v} \)] doubled; and are then paused upon with quiescence, Raum, or Ishmām: while the alleviation of \( \text{sُورِى} \) \( \text{شِى} \) [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 \( [640] \). This is [the rule of pause after alleviation] when the Hamza is not preceded by an \( \text{ا} \): but, if the final Hamza be preceded by an \( \text{ا} \), 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 ʾ; so that nothing remains but conversion of the quiescent Hamza into ʾ, because the preceding ʾ is like Fatha; and thus it becomes like [the ʾ in ]۱[above]: but, in addition to quiescence, neither Raum nor Ishmām is allowable, because the vowel was upon the letter for which this ʾ is a subāt., not upon the ʾ [itself], so that the latter should be pronounceable with Raum or Ishmām, as we said of pause upon the ʾ of feminization [640]; and also because Raum is [achieved] by retaining part of the vowel, whereas the pure ʾ does not admit of that. This [second] mode, I mean pause with quiescence, and [with] conversion of the Hamza into ʾ, 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) elide 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 Tauwin, the Hamza is not final; so that these varieties are not found in it; but the Tauwin is converted into |, as | | | | | | prayer and | | 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 Fath, Kasr, or Damm, and, in each case, preceded by [any of] the three [vowels], as (1) سَأَل asked, (2) مَائَة hundred, (3) مَرْجَل limited [661], (4) مُسْتَهْرَقَتْин was disgusted [661], (5) مُسْتَهْرَقَتْين scoffers, (6) سَتَل was asked, (7) رَفْع pitiful, (8) رِؤوس 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) قَالَ أَحْبَيْنَ Ahmad said, (2) بُعْلَمْ أَبِيَكَ by the manservant of thy father, (3) إِنْ هَذَا غُلَامُ أَبِيَكَ Verily this is the manservant of thy father, (4) قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيم said,
by the manservant of Ibrāhim, (6) This is the property of Ibrāhim, (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 Damm, as in مَجِّل; or Kasr, as in مَائَة: because, in the well-known betwixt-and-between, the Hamza would approximate to an ! preceded by Damma 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 مَائَة, it is converted into a pure ى, 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 ِ also to occur after it: (2) if pronounced with Fath, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, as in ُمَلْجَ، it is converted into a pure ِ، for a reason like what we have mentioned in the case of مَث [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 ِ [above], because the remaining modes of alleviation are [then] impracticable, as we have mentioned; and because the ِ [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 Al'A'shâ

(949)

(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 Ḍamm, 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 Ḍamm, as in [661]: the first, says he, being converted into a pure [as ]; and the second into a pure , [as ]: since, if they were softened, the first would be like the quiescent , which does not occur after Kasra; and the second like the quiescent , which does not occur after Ḍamma; as the does not occur after Ḍamma or Kasra. And some, in the case of such as
and have recourse to the strange betwixt-and-between, [saying سُول and مَستَهْهِرُونَ, 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, after Kasra, and of the similitude of a quiescent ى after Damma,] as before mentioned; and from the charge incurred by Akh, vid. the occurrence of the pure ى mobilized by Kasr after Damma in سُول, and of the pure ى mobilized by Damm after Kasra in مَستَهْهِرُونَ: such [an occurrence] being eschewed in their language. But, as to [the Hamzas 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 ِ, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Fath, as سَأل asked; into a quiescent ُ, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Damm, as رُوس heads; and into a quiescent ى, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Kasr, as مَستَهْهِرُونَ 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 ِ the ِ is substituted.
like 689; whereas you do not say 659, orig. staff (S). In metric exigency, however, says he, that is regular, as

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

Saalatu an Raani # Quall Malii Qadd Jathmarii Bin Kar

[by Zaid Ibn 'Amr Ibn Nufail alKurashi alAdawr, 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)],

Saalat Hadil Rasool Allah Najaaste

Saalat Hadil Bama Saalat Wem Tuhib (R), by Hassaan, Hudhail asked of the Apostle of God a lewd boon. Hudhail erred in what it asked, and did not right (N). For Saal I asked, [aor. Asal], like jagf I feared, [aor. Aghaf (Mb),] does not belong to the dial. of these [poets]: nor does [Saal He asked, aor.] yasal [below] (S); or Huma yiysawllani They two ask, one of
another (Mb). It has reached me that Thou askedst, aor. تَسَالُ, is a dial. var. (S); and Am says that it is a recognized dial. var., [being the dial. of Kuraish (K, B), who say سَلُبُ, aor. هِسْبَ, and يَسِاْیَلِ. They two ask, one of another (K),] in accordance with which is the reading [of Näfi and Ibn 'Amir (B)] سَلُبُ سَآَئِلُ آَعِدُ LXX. 1. [503] (A.K.B); and [the author of the KF says that] سَلُبُ, aor. يُسَالُ [above], like حَافْ He feared, aor. يِخَافُ, is said, and هَمَّا يَتَسَأَلُ[above] (KF). S cites, among [the exs. of] what is not allowable out of poetry, except by hearsay, the saying of the poet ['Abd ArRahmān Ibn Ḥassān (S, N)]

(952)

And thou wouldst be viler than a tent-peg in a plain, whose head a hammerer batters with the stone, meaning رَجَّى (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 رَجَّى 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 [above], the rule of which is to be alleviated by being made into ى, in, or out of, poetry. When, indeed,
such as occurrences in continuity, as ثم يَدْفَتِي ِمَلَؤُواٰجِي
I passed by the hammerer, O youth, the Hamza being
made a quiescent ی, [as in مَسْتَهْرِئَنَّ 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 ـ when the letter
preceding it is pronounced with Fath, into ی when the
letter preceding it is pronounced with Kasr, and into ـ،
when the letter preceding it is pronounced with َـَ~
the Hamza, according to those who alleviate, is put
betwixt and between, is converted into ـ when the letter
preceding it is pronounced with Fath, into ی when the
letter preceding it is pronounced with Kasr, and into ـ،
when the letter preceding it is pronounced with َـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~
but the truth is that one should restrict this, as IY does,
by saying “The Hamza is [sometimes] converted into ـ 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 ـ، when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with َـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~
above expressed. IY, however, does not restrict the،
and یـ, that the Hamza is converted into, by quiescence;
but it is more proper to say “ a quiescent ـ” and “ a
quiescent یـ ”, as we have done above. According to
this, then, [the Hamza in] such as گَمِّــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ~
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 

Qālū sakkālī Ishākh said and Usāma 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 

Qālū sakkālī Ishākh says or Usāma 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 and Qālū sakkālī: 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 

Mā āhṣān How good is! and Mā āmrūk What is thine affair?, the ! is dropped, [as Mūsmān] ; but, if it be followed by a mobile, as in Mā āshū How hard is!, the ! remains, as Mā shī, whence

Mā shī ānfasūmār wāʿilmūmīma yikhābî al-dīmar bi al-krim al-nasīlim (R) How hardy are their souls! and how knowing are they in what the noble, the Muslim, defends his dependents with! (MAR). The Hamza is sometimes elided, (1) without reason or canon, as for ākās nās [52]: (2) in rāʾīt, (a) [often] with the interrog. Hamza,
as [above] for اَرَآیت; and this is the reading of Ks in the whole of the formations of اَرَآیت, conjoined with the ؤ, and having the interrog. Hamza at their beginning (R): Abu-lAswad [adDu’ali (KA)] says

آَرَیتَ أَمَّأ صُنِّعَ لَمْ أُهْلُ. * أَقَانَى فَقالَ أَنْحِدَّنِي خَلِیکَا

(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

آَرَیتَ نَعْمَتْ تَکَلَمَ لَبیِّن. * أَنْنَعْیَ عَلَی لَبیِّنَ الْبَکَأَا

Hast thou considered, mar. nin. Tell thou me [560], if thou prevent me from speaking to Lailá, shalt thou prevent me from weeping for Lailá? (Jh): (a) the reason why that [elision] is frequent in اَرَآیت and its congener is only frequency of usage, as elision is necessary in اَرَری [above], اَرَرى, and اَرَری; but unnecessary in such as يَا اَرَری [above] as يَا asks and يَنْنَأ [above] for, when you prefix the interrog. Hamza to اَرَآیت, then, [by reason of the frequency of such prefixion] it is assimilated to the Hamza of vs. [433, 488]; so that the Hamza of اَرَآیت is allowably elided: (b) seldom with هَلْ, as صَالِح هَلْ رَآیت أَمْ سَیِّغَتَ بِرَاءٍ. * رَهِ فِى الْضَّرَعِ مَا قَرَّى فِى الْحُكَلَبِ (R), by Ismā’IL Ibn Yasār (KA, Jh) anNisā’I (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, في العلاب 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 يسألون for يسألون They ask, because its alleviation is then by conversion, not by elision: the poet says

When people arise, asking of their king a gift, then Dahmā is that gift which I shall be asking; and like it is يبَيَس for يبِيس despairs (R).

§ 659. In the imp. of the v. whose لی is a Hamza quiescent in the aor., as in أنني came, aor. يأتت, and أنني sinned, aor. ياكرم, [and أنسأ dressed the wound, aor. ياكرم,] the Hamza is changed into a pure ی if the conj. Hamza be pronounced with Kasr [428], as أنت come and انتن sin, orig. أنتن [661] and انتن Dress the wound, orig. انتن: 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 \textit{vs.}, however, deviate from this [rule], \textit{vid.\: take, \textsc{kull} eat, and \textsc{ma}r\: command}, which are heard, but are not to be copied, because of their exclusion from [the predicament of] their counterparts (IY). They elide the [\textit{rad}. (Jrb)] Hamza (M, Jrb), which is a \textit{b} (IY), in \textit{\textsc{kull}}, \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}, and \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}, irregularly (M), from frequency of usage (Jrb), for alleviation, because of the combination of two Hamzas in what is frequently used (IY); and [then (IY)] they dispense with the \textit{conj.\: Hamza} (IY, Jrb), because of the disappearance of the quiescent [Hamza], and the mobility of what is made the initial, \textit{vid.\: the \textsc{t} in \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}, the \textsc{l} in \textsc{kull}, and the \textsc{m} in \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}\: \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} [428]. Thus the measure of the \textit{v.} is \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}, with the \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} elided (IY). Then they make this elision obligatory in \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} and \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}; but not in \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} (M, R), where elision, though chaster than conversion, is not obligatory (R). Therefore they do not say \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} or \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}; but [you say \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} and \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}]; and (IY) the Kur has XX. 132. [428] (M). The regular form is \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} (IY, Jrb), and \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} (IY), in the \textit{imp.\: from \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\: taking, \textsc{kull} eating, [and \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} \textit{commanding},] like \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\: [in the \textit{imp.\: from \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\: exulted, i. q.\: bat\textsc{r} (Jrb). But they keep to \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\: \textsc{kull}, irregularly, from frequency (SH) of usage (MASH). As for the \textit{imp.\: from \textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\: commanding, it does not reach the same extent of frequency as the [other] two;
so that they assign to it an intermediate predicament, allowing مأر and أُمُر in it (Jrb). This is when it is inceptive. When, however, it occurs in the interior [of the sentence], as in فَأَمَرْ مأر Then command, and فَأَمَرْ أُمَرْ 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 فَأَمَرْ and فَأَمَرْ, 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] الْوَاجِي [658], سَال, and مَسَأَلة 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 (IY)] Hamza [preceded by a quiescent, which is not a letter of prolongation or softness (IY),] has its vowel transferred to the preceding quiescent (IY, Jrb), and is elided, as مَسَأَلة for مَسَأَلة (IY); 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 (IX). If the vowel be not taken into account, as is the method of most, 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 of [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 of which belongs to the same word as the [elided], ; (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 [in the o. f.] of to the preceding [quiescent] (R). But, if the vowel be taken into account, 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:
and, since it becomes like part [of the *], the vowel transferred to it [in لَاّحَمْرِ] resembles the vowel [transferred to the س] in سَل [below], orig. إِسْلَال [658] (Jrb). When [therefore] the * of الَّٰحَمْرِ is alleviated, the Hamza of the ج more often remains (SH); while some elide it (MASH): so that لَاّحَمْرِ is said (SH), the second Hamza [only] being elided, according to the more frequent [method] (MASH); or لَاّحَمْرِ (SH), the conj. Hamza also being elided, according to the rarer [method] (MASH). And apparently the * of الَّٰحَمْرِ ability and asking pardon is like that, as respects the allowability of الَّٰحَمْرِ and الَّٰسِتِفْناَرِ, or الَّٰسِتِفْناَرِ and لِتَٰنْدِادِرُ (Jrb). And, [when or في is conjoined with the * of الَّٰحَمْرِ, then (Jrb)] one says, (1) according to the more frequent [method, مِنْ لَٰخْمِرِ pronounced] مِنْ لَٰخْمِرِ 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 مِنْ لَٰخْمِرِ [pronounced لَٰخْمِرِ] 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], مِنْ لَٰخْمِرِ, with quiescence of the ن; and مِنْ لَٰخْمِرِ, with expression of the ي (Jrb). As for مِنْ لَٰنِ from now, henceforward
[206], it is [treated] according to both methods:—(1) if you say وَلَّخَصَرُ، taking the vowel [of the ج] into account, you say مَنِ َالْقَلِيد، with quiescence of the َن in ِما، because what follows it is mobile; and, according to that, َقَالَوْا لَنَّ. II. 66. [149, 206] is read, with expression of the ج، because the ج is mobile, so that two quiescents do not come together: (2) if you say أَلْخَصَرُ، with expression of the conj. Hamza, not taking the vowel of the ج into account, but treating the ج as quiescent, you say مَنِ َالْقَلِيد، with Fath of the َن، because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and, according to that, you say ِمَلَكَانِ، on the principle of the poet's saying

Convey thou to Abū Dukhtarūs a message, not that which is sometimes said, consisting of falsehood, the ج [of مَنِ (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 [662] (IY). But Ks and Fr relate that some of the Arabs convert the Hamza into ج in such [formations] as this, [i.e., where an initial Hamza is preceded by a determinative ج], saying أَلْخَصَرُ for الْخَصَرُ and أَلْغَرُ for الْغَرُ for the red, and أَلْرَضُ for الْرَضُ for the earth (IY, R); and, in order to preserve the quiescence of the determinative ج، do not transfer the vowel [of the Hamza] (R).
It is as though the speakers of this dial. avoided mobilization of this ل; and therefore converted the Hamza [into a ل] homogeneous with the ل, as they say لُو [191, 200, 275, 306, 321], when they treat it as a م., adding a م homogeneous with the ل. And مَّنْ أَلْلُغْسِ from the earth and مَّنْ لَغْسِ are read, [the former] by throwing the vowel of the Hamza upon the [preceding] quiescent, which is the ل; [and the latter by converting the Hamza into ل].

He that says َلْحَمْرَ, expressing the [conj.] Hamza, ought to say ِسَأَلْ ُسَلْ [658] for ِسَأَلْ, when alleviated; and he that says ُلْخَمْرَ ought to say سُلْ [above]: except that the conj. ل is more often retained with the determinative ل, and elided with any other [letter]; because this ل 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 ُلْذَلْل ِسَلْ or ُسَلْ ل، 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 سُلْ, 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 َلْلَّحَمْرَ [above], because سُلْ is like ُقُلْ in respect of all the [three] reasons [above]
assigned for the constructive quiescence of the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) in \( \dddot{\text{J}} \), except the third, since transfer of the vowel [of the Hamza] in it is not so constant as transfer of the vowel of the \( \dot{\text{J}} \) in \( \dot{\text{J}} \) [below]; but, though not so constant [as that], it is more frequent than transfer of the vowel of the Hamza in \( \dddot{\text{J}} \): so that in retention of the [conj.] Hamza is more frequent; but in elision of the [conj.] Hamza is necessary: while in a dispute occurs, IH holding elision [of the conj. Hamza] to be necessary, as you see [from his words “they do not say \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) above], which is the opinion of S; whereas Akh allows \( \ddot{\text{J}} \), as before mentioned [658].

All of this about \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) [above] is based on the theory that its o.f. is derived from \( \dot{\text{J}} \), before transfer of the vowel of the \( \dot{\text{J}} \) to the \( \dot{\text{J}} \); but, if we say that \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) is derived from \( \dot{\text{J}} \) pronounced with Damm of the \( \dot{\text{J}} \), then there is no conj. Hamza here [428], to be elided because of the vowel of the \( \dot{\text{J}} \), or retained because of the vowel’s being accidental (R).

§. 661. Having finished the single Hamza [658, 660] in the word, [\( \dddot{\text{J}} \) 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 ﺔ, as ساٍل and رأٍس [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 Hamzas 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 Hamzas, together with the difficulty of pronouncing the quiescent second (Tsr)]: so that it is changed into (1) an | after Fatha, as ﺔ ﺔ I believed, [orig. ﺔ ﺔ (Tsr)]: (a) hence the saying of 'Aisha ﺔ ﺔ And he, [meaning the Prophet (Tsr),] was wont to enjoin upon me, [when I menstruated (Tsr),] that I should wear a waist-wrapper, with a Hamza [pronounced with Fatha (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 ت: 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 ﺔ, derived
waist-wrapp er; so that its is a quiescent Hamza, after the aoristic Hamza pronounced with Fath [404] (Aud): (c) [so says IHsh:] but [Kh remarks that] the Bdd allow ṣawār from ṣawār, and trusted from ṣawār. "trusted from trust, and took a wife from wife, family, by conversion of the second Hamza into t, and incorporation of it into the t [of 'entadː] ; and Z transmits ṣawār with incorporation; while IM says that it is confined to hearsay, like ṣawār [689]: and, since it is allowable in the pret., it is allowable in the aor.; and in another tradition is 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 ṣawār; though it occurs in some traditions, being perhaps a mispronunciation of the reporters" (KF): (2) a ی after Kasra, as یبسان belief, [orig. ḳeen (Tsr)]: (a) the reading of Al A'mash, reported by Abū Bakr, the disciple of ʿAsim (Tsr). [659] to begin with two Hamzases [below], this being transmitted from him by IAmb, who says that it is hideous, because the Arabs do not combine two Hamzases, whose second is quiescent (Tsr): (3) a ی,
after Ḍamma, as was trusted, [in the pass., orig. Αρτήτων (Tsr)] : (a) Ks allows 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 ذَٰلِكَ بَيْنَ الْآيَاتِ X. 16. Bring thou a Kur'ān to begin with two Hamzas [above], not in connection with أَوْطَنَ (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 Ế or ٌ (Tsr),] then, (1) if they be in the position of the Ế, the first is incorporated into the second, [because of the combination of two likes, and is sounded true (Tsr),] as سَأَلَ [671, 738] (Aud), with the Hamza doubled, [on the measure of] the intensive [paradigm] نَفَعَ [343], denoting the frequent asker (Tsr); and لَّا أُسَرُّ وَرَأَسُ [Aud], with their second [rad.] doubled, on the measure of the rel. n. نَفَعَ [312], denoting the seller of pearls and of heads (Tsr): (2) if they be in the position of the ٌ, the second is changed into ی, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether it be a final, or not a final (Tsr)]: so that, from قَرَأ read, you say, (a) in the paradigm of قَبْضَرَ [245, 392],
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 ٣١٣٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤ from تر٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤, as they incorporate in سأل [above]: and he replied [firstly] that the two ُّs are only homogeneous [369], contrary to the two ج s, as is proved by ٣١٣٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤ [392] and ٣١٣٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤ [253, 375, 731], meaning that the two ُّs are therefore more fit for incorporation than the two ج 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 ُّs in سلّ٤٤٤٤٤٤٤ ن٤٤٤٤٤٤ ن, which is disallowed in the pl. of سلّ٤٤٤٤٤٤٤ ن [683] (Sn): (b) in the paradigm of سلّ٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٣٤٤٣] [245, 254, 401], سّ٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٣, with two Hamzas, having between them ُّ substituted for a Hamza (Aud), which is not a final, or سلّ٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٤٣, with three Hamzas, the second of which is changed into ُّ, 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 ُّ, unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether the first be pronounced with Fath, Damm, or Kasr (Tsr)]: (2) if the second [Hamza (Tsr)] be not ٣٠١, ٣٠٢ (Aud), or سال.
final, but be pronounced with َدَامَمَ, it is changed into , unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether the first be pronounced with َدَامَمَ, فَاتِحُ, or كَسْرُ (Tsr)] : (3) if the second [be not final, but] be pronounced with فَاتِحُ, it is changed (a) into , if the first be pronounced with فَاتِحُ or َدَامَمَ ; (b) into ِّشَيْبَ if the first be pronounced with كَسْرُ (Aud). In short, the two mobile حمزة are either at the end [of the word], or not. In the first case, they are of three sorts, because the first حمزة is pronounced with فَاتِحُ, كَسْرُ, or َدَامَمَ : and, in the second case, they are of nine sorts, arising from the multiplication of the three states of the first [حَمْزَة] into the three states of the second. The final [حَمْزَة] is changed into ِّشَيْبَ in all of its [three] sorts : and the non-final is changed into ِّشَيْبَ in four of its [nine] sorts, vid. the [one] pronounced with فَاتِحُ after كَسْرُ, and the [three] pronounced with كَسْرُ after فَاثْحا, كَسْرُ, or َدَامَمَا ; and into , in five, vid. the [two] pronounced with فَاثْحاَ after فَاثْحا or َدَامَمَا and the [three] pronounced with َدَامَمَا after فَاثْحا, كَسْرُ, or َدَامَمَا (Tsr). The exs. of the final حمزة [after one pronounced with فَاثْحا, كَسْرُ, or َدَامَمَا (Tsr) are that you should form, from َقَرْأَ, a word like َقَرْأَ ِّشَيْبَرَ (392), ُّهَدْرُشَ, or ُّهَدْرُشَ (Aud), in which case you say َقَرْأَ, َقَرْأَ, َقَرْأَ, or َقَرْأَ, َقَرْأَ, َقَرْأَ, with two حمزة ; and then change the second حمزة into ِّشَيْبَ, because the , does not occur as a final in what exceeds three letters [685, 727] ; so that the word
becomes كتابي, or كتبى : and then, (1) if the ی be preceded by Fatha, as in the first ex., it is converted into [684, 719], and the word becomes abbreviated (Tsr), الكتاب (R, A), upon the measure of Salma (A), [pl.] كتابون, [fem.] كتابة [du.]

(2) if the ی be preceded by Kasra, as in the second ex., its vowel is elided because of the heaviness, and the word is subjected to the same alteration as كتاب [16], becoming defective (Tsr), كتاب.

upon the measure of ہند [18] (A), [but with Kasr of the Hamza, because it is defective, as also is the third [below] (Sn) : (3) if the ی be preceded by Damma as in the third ex., the Damma is converted into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved from conversion into 

, and the word is subjected to the same alteration as كتاب [16] (Tsr), [or rather] as أَيْدِ [243, 290] (A), orig.

, like أَنْفُسُ [237] (Sn), it also becoming defective (Tsr), كتب, upon the measure of ْجَبْلُ [18] (A); [and, with the art.] أنْفُسَ (MKh), like أنْفُسُ (IA) : (a) this [third ex.] and that which precedes it are defective, each of them upon this measure [ْجَبْلُ or ٌ ْجَبْلُ (Sn)], in the nom. and gen.; while in the acc. the ی returns, as كتابي فَرْطِيَا وَفْرَطِيَا (A); (b) the Hamza of is
pronounced with Kasr, like the Hamza of \( \text{ذ} \); not, as is fancied, with Damm: this is proved by A's confining himself to the return of the \( \text{ذ} \); and by [the Kasr of the D of \( \text{ذ} \) of \( \text{ذ} \) in XLI]. 20. And restrained from you the hands of the men (Sn), of Khaibar and their confederates, [the Banù (B)] Asad and Ghaṭafân (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. \( \text{ضَمَع} \) directed his course towards (Tsr)], a word like \( \text{ضَمَع} [372, 672] \) with Fath, Kasr, or Damm of the Hamza, and Kasr of the \( \text{ب} \) in [all three of] them, in which case you say, in the first [ex.], \( \text{أَمَّمُ} \) with two Hamzas, [the first] pronounced with Fath, and [the second] quiescent; and then transfer the vowel of the first \( \text{م} \), [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 \( \text{م} \); and afterwards you change the [second (Tsr)] Hamza, [to which the Kasra of the \( \text{م} \) has been transferred (Tsr).] into \( \text{ى} \) (Aud), because of the preceding [rule] that the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr after one pronounced with Fath, [Kasr, or Damm] is converted into \( \text{ى} \) (Tsr): and thus you do in the [two] remaining [exs.] also (Aud), saying \( \text{أَمَّمُ} \) and \( \text{أَمْمًا} \); 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 ی ايم, ی اويم, or ی ايم (A). That [action (Tsr)] is necessary [below] (Aud). The regular pl. of م leader is ی وما (Tsr), orig. ی ما, like ی ما pl. of ح.م ass [246] (Jrb), by conversion of the [second] Hamza into ی. If you say that analogy requires conversion of the second [Hamza] into ل, because it is quiescent, and what precedes it is pronounced with Fath, [the o. f. being ی سورة (Jh),] like ی سورة pl. of سلة vessel, and ی لة pl. of ی لة 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 ی م; and then they convert the second Hamza into a pure ی (Tsr). And [accordingly] ی یة یة یة IX. 12. Then fight against the leaders of unbelief is read (Jh). But, as for the reading of Ibn ی Amir and the KK, [like ی sim, م Zam, Ks, KhA, and Al A'mash (Tsr), and of Rauh on the authority of Ya'куب (B),] ی تنیة 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 a ى 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 یی س be pronounced?', I say 'With a Hamza followed by a Hamza betwixt and between, i.e., between the outlets of Hamza and ى [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 ى pure, it is not a reading, nor may it be; and he that makes the ى pure is committing a solecism, and mispronouncing'" (K): [while B also declares that] to make the ى pure is a solecism (B). IH too says that both softening and sounding true are correct in such as یی س (SH), in reading [the Kur] (R), an objection to the saying of the GG that the second Hamza must be converted into ى [below], 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 یی س; and also to sound the two Hamzas true (Jrb): and, in reading [the Kur], conversion of the second Hamza into a pure ى, 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] 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 (R). The exs. of the [Hamza] pronounced with Damm [after one pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm (Tsr)] are (1) pl. of ُبُرُبُُّ [255]: (2, 3) that there should be formed from ُبُُُّ a word like ضَّبُغُّ with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm of the ب, or like ُبُُُّ [372], in which you say ُبُُُّ [below], with a Hamza pronounced with Kasr or Damm, and a pronounced with Damm. The o.f. of the first is ُبُُُّ, upon the measure of ُبُُُُ [237]; and the o.fs. of the second and third are ظُبُغُّ and ُبُُُُ: 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 , [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 ُبُُُُ [247, 278, 686], pl. of ُبُُُُ (Aud), orig.
\( \text{(974)} \)

(Tsr); (2) after one pronounced with Damm, is 
\( \text{[278, 686], dim. of } \text{آنم (Aud), orig. } \text{آنیم} \) : (a) the second Hamza is converted into \( \text{،} \), when pronounced with Fath, and not final, whether what precedes it be pronounced with Fath, as in the broken pl. of \( \text{نن} \); or with Damm, as in its dim.: (b) the exemplification by the pl. and dim. of \( \text{نن} \) [above] is based upon [the supposition] that \( \text{نن} \) 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 \( \text{نن} \), like \( \text{زآر Azar,} \) [the name of Abraham's father (Jk, K on VI. 74)]; and in the M [661, 684] that it is Arabic, [orig. \( \text{ذام} \) with two Hamzas (IY),] upon the measure of \( \text{نفخل} \) (Tsr), meaning tawny (Jh, KF). The ex. of the [Hamza] pronounced with Fath after one pronounced with Kasr is that you should form from \( \text{ذام} \) [an ex (Tsr)] upon the measure of \( \text{فضع} \) [372], with Kasr of the Hamza, and Fath of the \( \text{ب (Aud), in which case you say خلم} \), with a Hamza pronounced with Kasr, and a \( \text{ذ} \) pronounced with Fath, orig. \( \text{تمه} \); the vowel of the first \( \text{ذ} \), 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 \( \text{ذ} \) (Tsr). Akh differs about two of these nine sorts, vid.
the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr after Damm, which he changes into ؛ [instead of ی]; and the one pronounced with Damm after Kasr, which he changes into ی [instead of ی]: but the correct [mode] is what has been mentioned above (A). If you formed a word like َّنَّمَنّ moaning, you would say َّنَّمَنّ; but, according to Akh, َّنَّمَنّ, the dispute being like what we mentioned on such as َّنَّمَنّ [658]. A [Hamza] pronounced with Damm after one pronounced with Kasr is not found in their language, but, if such [a n.] as َّنَّمَمّ, with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm of the ی, occurred from َّنَّمَمّ, you would say َّنَّمَمّ [above], according to S; and َّنَّمَمّ, according to Akh, as we mentioned on َّنَّمَمّ II. 13. [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 َّمَنّ I directed my course towards and َّمَنّ I moaned, the second may be [changed, as َّمَنّ and َّمَنّ; or (A)] sounded true, as َّمَنّ and َّمَنّ: [firstly] because of the assimilation of the Hamza of the 1st pers. sing. to the interrog. Hamza [below], as in َّمَنّ 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 ت, and the ی [404] (A), after which the two modes are allowable in the Hamza, as in [یومین] يَوِيَمُّن makes safe from تَأَمِيم and [یومین] يَوِيَمُّن believes from تَأَمِيم, and [یومین] يَوِيَمُّن makes safe from تَأَمِيم [below] (Sn). IA [like IJsh and A] is silent as to the case where the second Hamza is pronounced with Fath [after the aoristic Hamza], as in ۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱
second must be converted into ی [above], if either it, or the one before it, be pronounced with Kasr, as ٌ[above] and چاء [below]; and into ٌ[below] in other cases, as ۱۰ا‌ود١۰ and ۱۰دید١۰ [above] (SH). The o. f. of ۱۰جاء [708], according to the opinion of others than Khl, is ۱۰جآتٌ, with two mobile Hamzas, the first being converted, as in ۱۰بًّع [683], from the ٌ of the word, which is a ی; and the second being the ۱ of the v.; and then the second is converted into ی, because the one before it is pronounced with Kasr; so that the word becomes ۱۰جآتٌ, which is afterwards subjected to the same alteration as ٌقاضٌ [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 Hamzas. But, according to the opinion of Khl, that the o. f. is ۱ٌجآتٌ by transposition, ۱جاء does not belong to this cat., [because it contains only one Hamza] (Jrb). And hence ۱ خطابا, [which is an instance of the combination of two Hamzas 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 یعِیِئةٌ is converted into Hamza in the ultimate pl. [246], as in ۱کبّیرٌ crime, pl. ۱کبّنٌ: so that it becomes ٌخطئٌتٌ
according to S; and then the second [Hamza] is converted into ی, as the rule for two [mobile] Hamzahs in one word is conversion of the second into ی, when it is final [above]; so that the word becomes حُطَّاتٰثٗی [below].

The object of IH here is only [to indicate] the combination of two Hamzas in the o. f. of حُطَّاَپَا [283], according to S, and the conversion of the second into ی: but, as for the conversion of the first into a ی pronounced with Fath [below], it will shortly be mentioned. Khl [above] also says that its o. f. is حُطَّاَپَا [above], with a ی after a Hamza; but [in order to arrive at this] he transposes, putting the ی into the position of the Hamza, and the Hamza into the position of the ی (R). 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, Алله‌ی‌آ‌غفر‌آ‌لم [below], for which, if ی were transposed, as Khl mentions, there would be no reason (Jrb). Two other modes [of pronunciation] occur, in the case of two mobile Hamzahs in one word, (1) what is mentioned by AZ about some of the Arabs, that they sound the two Hamzahs true together; he says “I have heard those who say Алله‌ی‌آ‌غفر‌لی‌ حُطَّاَپَا O God, forgive me my sins [above], like حُطَّاَپَا”; and similar is دَرَاَپَاً pl. of دِرَیِّثَیَّ tilting-ring; and many, vid. the KK and [among the
Syrians ([IY]) Ibn 'Amir [alYahšabi ([IY]), read اَمْيِر I
IX. 12. [above], with two Hamzas: (2) alleviation of the
second Hamza, just like the alleviation of the mobile
Hamza preceded by a mobile, when not a Hamza: so
that, for سَمِعْ [above], you say سَمَعَ, putting it between
Hamza and ی, as in سَمْعُ [658]; and similar are such as
I direct my course towards thee, et cetera.
And in these two modes, i.e., sounding the two [Hamzas]
true, and softening the second, some add an ٌ [below]
between the first and second, when the first is initial,
from dislike to combining two Hamzas, or the similitude
of two Hamzas, 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 أُوْلَىٰسِلَ [357,
683] and أُوْلَيْسِلَ [683]. And, when two Hamzas are
combined in one word, but are separated by an [original]
ٌ, 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 ٌ [above] of separation, saying
ٌ [below], in order that there may be no combina-
tion? How then should the existing ٌ not be taken
into account as a separative? (R). With separation
[therefore], the combination of two Hamzas, as in ٌ
[with a Hamza pronounced with Fath, then a quiescent
and then a Hamza, the name of a sort of tree, as in
the Dm (Sn),] or [its n. un. (Sn)] ۸۶۱۱, has no effect
(A). And, as for the fact that the [first] Hamza of
[246, 278], [orig. ۸۶۱۱۸۰ (Jh).] must be converted
into ۸۶۱۱۰۰, it is because ۸۶۱۱۰۰ is one of the ultimate pls.;
and because its sing., i. e., ۸۶۱۱۰۰ [lock of hair (MAR)],
has its Hamza, in most cases, converted into ۸۶۱۱۰۰, as is the
rule of alleviation [658] in the like thereof, [such as
۸۶۱۱۰۰] (R). Elision of the second [Hamza (Jrb)] is
obligatory in the cat. of ۸۶۱۱۰۰ I honor [428] (SH), i. e.,
the 1st pers. sing. [of the aor.] from ۸۶۱۱۰۰ [332]
(MASH), another objection to what they say, vid. that
conversion of the second Hamza into ۸۶۱۱۰۰ [above] is
necessary, if neither it, nor the one before it, be
pronounced with Kasr. The o. f. of ۸۶۱۱۰۰ is ۸۶۱۱۰۰, with
two Hamz as, 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 ۸۶۱۱۰۰, the aor.
[in the 1st pers. sing.] must be ۸۶۱۱۰۰ (Jrb). By rule,
the second [Hamza] in it should be converted into ۸۶۱۱۰۰
as in ۸۶۱۱۰۰ [above]: but the word is lightened by elision
of the second [Hamza], from frequency of usage, as it is
lightened in ۸۶۱۱۰۰ and ۸۶۱۱۰۰ [659] by elision; though, by
rule, the Hamza [in them] should be converted into ۸۶۱۱۰۰,
(R). And [then (R)] its congener, [تَوْكَرُمُ and تَوْكَرُمُ (R),] are made to accord with it (SH), as and [then (R),] are made to accord with it (SH), as and تَوْكَرُمُ and تَوْكَرُمُ (Jrb), although two Hamzas are not combined in them (R). They make conversion of the Hamza, when single, into a ي pronounced with Fath [above], obligatory in the cat. of مَطَابَيا [283, 726]. And hence لَوْمَيا [above], according to the two sayings (SH) of Khl and others (MASH). This predicament is common to (1) what contains two Hamzas, like لَوْمَيا, according to the opinion of S: and (2) what contains a single Hamza, like (a) مَطَابَيا, by common consent; and (b) لَوْمَيا, 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 قِتَرَجَةٌ citron, you would say قِتَرَجَةٌ, [with a Hamza pronounced with Damm, then a quiescent , then a Hamza pronounced with Damm, then a quiescent , then a Hamza pronounced with Fath, and then a ء of feminization (Sn),] orig. قِتَرَجَةٌ (A), with five Hamzas, the second and fourth quiescent, the first and third pronounced with Damm, and the fifth pronounced with Fath (Sn). If the two Hamzas
be combined in two words, then, if the first [Hamza] be inceptive, like the *interrog.* Hamza, their predicament is [the same as] that of two Hamzas in one word, when the first is initial, as in ﴿أمّٰ رُْمين﴾ [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 anٌ, whether both be sounded true, or the second of them be softened, as in ﴿أيّنٰ﴾ [above or ﴿أمّٰ﴾], 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 ﴿فِيَا طَبِيبَةٌ﴾ [29]; and another says ﴿حُرْقُ إِذَا مَا السَّتَوْمُ أَبْدَوا فَكَاهَةٌ ﴿تَفَكَّرُ إِيَّاهُ يُفْعَونَ أَمْ قَرَدا﴾ (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 ﴿آَنْذَرْتُ هُمْ﴾ II. 5. [497, 28], and similarly ﴿آَشْتَكِلْ لَأَنْتَ يُوسُف﴾ XII. 90. [581]. Then,
after the entry of the \( \text{f} \) of separation, some, vid. the Banù Tamîm, sound the two Hamzas true: while others, vid. the people of AlHîjâz, alleviate the second; and this is preferred by IAI (IY). When the first is an *interrog.* Hamza, and the second a *conj.* Hamza, then the latter, if pronounced with Kasr or \\
\( \text{damm} \) [668], is elided, as \\
\( \text{أَصْطَفَى} XXXVII. 153. [669] \text{Was he chosen?} \); and, if not, is converted into \( \text{f} \), or softened [656, 663, 669] But, if the first be not inceptive, vid. in the case of the *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 AlHîjâz, alleviate one of them, deeming it heavy to sound both of them true, as the people of AlHîjâz 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 IAI (IY, R), who adduces, as proof of that, \\
\( \text{فَقَدْ جَآءَ أَشْرَاطُهَا} XLVII. 20. \text{For already its signs have come} [\text{below}] \) and \\
\( \text{يَا ذَّكَرِيَّةٍ إِنَّا نَبْشِرُنَّ} XIX. 7. \text{O Zachariah, verily we bring thee glad tidings} (IY): (2) some of them alleviate
the second (IY, 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 Khl [below] (R): S says (IY), We have heard that from the Arabs, vid. in XLVII. 20. and XIX. 7. [above] (S, IY), where he alleviates the second Hamza, putting it betwixt and between (IY) ; and the poet says

For every fair woman, when she comes forth, the evil eye is dreaded, and envy (S, IY), 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 سُمَّمُ] (IY), [and] which we have heard so recited by trustworthy Arabs: (a) Khl [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 آدمُ and جنه [above]; and I have seen IAl take the Hamzas in يَا وَلَكُتْي أَلَدَوَّانَا عَبَّرَزَ 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 (IY, R) together (R) is allowable (IY); [and] is preferred by many, vid. the Readers of AlKūfa 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 AlHijaz 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 (1) I1. 136. [He guideth whom] He willeth unto [a right way] three modes occur in the second [Hamza, as in the Hamza of سَوْلِ, 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 IAI, as أَوْلِيَا أُولِئْكَ XLVI. 31. [Nor have] protec-
tors [against Him]: those [are in manifest error], جَأْ أُشْرَاطِةٌ XLVII. 20. [above], and XXXII. 4. From the heaven to [the earth]: (2) conversion of the second into a pure letter of prolonga-
tion, i.e., into an َّا if the first be pronounced with Fath, a, if it be pronounced with Damm, and a ٰ 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 in إِقْرَأَ آيَةَ السَّلَامَ Make thy father read the salutation, [i. e., Deliver to thy father the (written) salutation (KF),] and لَمْ يَرَّدُ 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 ٌ, if the preceding letter be pronounced with Fath; into ، if it be pronounced with Damm; and into ی 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 ٌ, ٍ, or ی: and soften the second betwixt and between, when it follows the ِ, because transfer [of its vowel] to the ِ 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 إِنْ قَرَأْتَ آيَةَ ٱلْكِبْرَىُ بِٱلۡمُؤۡرِضُ, with the ی pronounced with the ی of the first, and softening in the second; and یتَرَدُّوْ بُرَةَنَ, with the ی pronounced with Fath, i. e., with the Fatha of the elided Hamza; and یتَرَدُّوْ بُرَةَنَ, with the ی pronounced with Fath: and, on the analogy of this, you form لَمْ يَرْدُوْ مَكَّ, Thy mother was not bad, and لَمْ يَرْدُوْ بَلۡكَ, Thy camels were not bad, et cetera. Similarly, if the second alone be quiescent, as in مَنْ يَشَا أُتُمَّنَ 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 أُتُمَّنَ Whoever wills shall be entrusted, the first must be mobilized [663]; 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 (M), the n., as زيد الطريف the smart Zaid; the v., as خذى العفو VII. 198. [428]; and the p., as سى الْجِلْ نى آل الدار. 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 impleled, 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 بِكْر Bakr [below], بِشْر Bishr, and بُسْر 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 شْكَاب ہستان and سْتَان place, the initial of which is quiescent, as is proved by یشتَاب Make haste and نُسْتَان 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 conj. 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 إذْرِبْ آضرِب below and لم يُكْيَ الّذين 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 ١ [646, 658], because of the prolongation contained in the ١, since it is a [letter of] prolongation only; and, for that reason, such [formations] as مَا contended in pulling and stopping up are more frequent than such as ١ [below]. Next after that [in degree of lightness] is when the first of the two [quiescents] is a ٌ or ى preceded by a vowel homogeneous with it, as in نُمُودُ ٍ: ٍثُوب [below]: but no similar ex. with the ى, as سَّاَرَةٌ سُوْرٌ [for was privily spoken to, pass. of سَوِّرَ spoke privily to him], occurs in their language; [though ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١(unittest), as in ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١(unittest) will be found below]. And the last degree [of lightness] is when the first of the two quiescents is a ٌ or ى preceded by Ṭatha, because of the smallness of the prolongation contained therein: but such [a combination] occurs only in the dim., as خَوْيَصَةٌ [below]; so that, in يَلْلُ from shortness of the upper teeth (MAR) and ٌ, affection, you do not say ٌٌََُّ ٌٌََُّ and ٌٌََُّ [below]; but transfer the vowel of the first ٌ [and ٌ], as in ٌٌََُّ [below]; but transfer the vowel of the first of the two similar letters, when incorporation is intended, to the ٌ and ى, as ٌٌََُّ having short upper teeth and ٌٌََُّ more
affectionate, as you do in such as اِشْتَفَأَ harder and اِشْتَفَأَ bitterer: the ی of the dim. being exclusively character-
ized 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 quies-
cence [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 predica-
ment of the mobile, because of the closeness of its
adhesion thereto, since the tongue removes the incorpo-
rated [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 خَافِئًا اَللَّهَ Fear ye
two God, خَافِئًا اَللَّهَ Fear ye God, and خَافَوْا اَللَّهَ 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., الْأَلِفُ *Alif*, pausing a little, just enough to separate it from the others; and then says بَآَُِّٔ بَآَُِّٔ *Ba*, 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 دَالٌ جِيمٌ ذُوْنُ *Dāl-Jim-Nūn*: (b) similarly in the *ejās.*, as قَوْسُ *Qūs* [used in *chiding a dog* (MAR)] and طَيِّبَ *Tayyib* [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 *ejās.* [640], as نَبِيْمَتْ and ثُمُمُتْ [below],
food and the dead; (b) similarly in ns. enumerated [159], as زيد نُورِ سُعیدُ عِبَادُ : for they are constituted to be spoken in syntactical construction; and then the user pauses upon them, either in construction with their op., as جَا نَى الْمُؤمَّنُون The believers came to me; or not in construction therewith, as زُورُ زَيد Thamād-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 الْمُؤمَّنُون the male believers, الْمُؤمَّنات the female believers [above] (R); or not (R, Jrb), as in بَكْرُ [above] and عَمَرو [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 عَمَرو [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 «مَرُوْتَُ» 
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 impos
sible 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 حُوْيَّةٌ dear particular friend, [dim. of حَوْيَّةٌ partic
cular friend (R, Jrb)], and حَوْيَّةٌ آَلَّتَحَبٌ The garment, or cloth, was pulled out, or
stretched [above] (SH), pass. of جَمَّدْنَا آَلَّتَحَبٌ We pulled the garment, or cloth, one against
the other (R, Jrb), i. e., each of us pulled it from the other (R),
and أَنْتَ أَنْحَاجْ جَوْنَي VI. 80. [170] (M), read with a single أَنْتَ أَنْحَاجْ جَوْنَي [405] by Nāfi' and Ibn 'Āmir, 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 وَإِذْ قَالُوا اللَّهُمَّ VIII. 32.
And when they said “O God”, VIII. 65.

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 ū is always a letter of prolongation: while the ی and , are sometimes letters of softness, as in تول saying and بيع selling; and sometimes letters of prolongation, as in يقول says and يبيع 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 ورع promised and يسر was genile: (c) thus it is 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 [أصِيمُ]
and [مْدِيقٍ] (K on III. 1.), when these two matters are
combined, i.e., in pause upon a word like [256,
646] and rather deaf [274, 281], dim. of أصِيمُ
deaf (Jrb), and [مْدِيقٍ] [274], dim. of مْدِيقٍ [367] (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 [عِينٍ , كَافٍ , مِيمٍ]
... etc. [821], 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
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 ḫ 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 requirer 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 كَافٌ, مَيْمٌ, 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 كَافٌ لَامْ Kuf-Lam; or something else, as in مَرْصَادٌ كُبْوُذَ ambush-Thamūd-chief: and whether the first [quiescent] letter be a letter of softness, as in what we have mentioned; or not, as in أمَـرُ بَكْرٍ 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 uninflectional, which is not allowable, because the uninflectedness of that [n.] in which the cause of inflection does not exist is stronger than the uninflectedness of that [n.] in which a preventive of inflection accidentally arises; and the stronger of the two kinds of uninflectedness ought to be accompanied by the o. f. of uninflectedness, vid. quiescence [159], because the o. f. of inflection is mobility, and the o. f. of uninflectedness is quiescence: (g) we say of these words, whether names of letters of the alphabet [321, 635], or nums., like زاي, زائد عامر, إمتنان كُلْنَا [159, 321, 647], or anything else, like زائد عامر, حالِي [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 إِنَّ الَّذِينَ أَرْبَعَةَ وَاحِدَةٌ إِنَّالَاقَةً كلَّتْهَا أَرْبَعَةَ One-two-three-four, by common consent; whereas the conj. is elided [669] in the interior [of the sentence], and the is not converted into  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 كَم [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] يَسْمَى اللَّهُ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمٌ In the Name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful has no [syntactical] concern with the beginning of the chapter after it, like فإنَّ النورُ أَحَدُ CXII. 1, [160], so that you pause upon الرَّحِيمٌ; 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
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 $اًربعة is converted into $ [646]; but, since you join them to what follows them, and do not pause upon them, the vowel of the Hamza in $اًربعة is transferred to the $ [of $كلمة], according to what is transmitted by $ [321, 647, 648], as it is transferred in $مسنة [658] and $قثّة فلّغ. XXIII. 1. [16], and similarly in the saying of the poet [Abu-nNajm al'Ijli (AKB)]

[先进的 from the presence of Ziyūd (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 ألف is transferred to the of لألف : (i) Mb transmits from Mz that transfer of the vowel of the Hamza in $كلمة أربعة to the [preceding] $ 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 زَيْد وأَحْدَ إِثْنَانَ تَلَّتَةٍ [159], saying that, in what is orig. infl., the nom. may be pronounced with Ishmām [640], as زَاَحِدٌ إِثْنَانَ with Ishmām of the Damm [on the د of زاَحِدٌ], the nom. being pronounced with Ishmām because it is the strongest and earliest inflection [24]; whereas in أَلْفُ كَأَمْ 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 زَيْدُ the manservant of Zaid, when not constructed with its op. (R): (m) one ought to pause upon the م in آَلْمُ أَلْلَهُ III. 1. [321], as one pauses upon كَأَمْ and أَلْفُ; and to begin with what follows it, as you say زَاَحِدٌ إِثْنَانَ [above]: and this is the reading of ‘Āsim: (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 آَلْمُ أَلْلَهُ III. 1. [321, 664]:—those who assert that, in continuity also, the concurrence of two.
quiescents [in such as ميم ] 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 واجيب أثنان 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 ميم ] 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 들과 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 ك 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 \( \text{الله} \),
which is read by ‘Amr Ibn ‘Ubaid, on the ground that
the vowel is because of the two quiescents, not because
of transfer (R): (4) in such [phrases] as \( \text{الله} \text{ عنَّدك} \)
Is Al Hasan with thee? and \( \text{آيَنَّ الله} \text{ يَبِينك} \) 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 \( \text{أَيْنُ} \text{ الله} \)
[599, 667], and secondly with \( \text{أَيْنُ} \text{ الله} \text{ or} \text{ آيَنَّ} \text{ الله} \) [650, 667], since the conj. Hamza is not pronounced with
Fath except in them [668]: (b) they permit the concur-
rence of two quiescents here, because, if they elided the
conj. Hamza, saying \( \text{آيَنَّ} \text{ الله} \text{ يَبِينك} \) and \( \text{الْحَسَن} \text{ عَنَّدك} \),
one would not know whether it was an enunciation or
an interrogation; so that they change the [conj.]
Hamza into \( \text{I} \) (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 Hamza, in what we have mentioned, between [658] : the poet [AlMuthakkkib al-Abdi (AKB)] says

[669] (Jrb) 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 the verse] 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 X. 91. What! [dost thou believe (K, B)] now? [497, 669] and 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 Ķur is read in both ways: (f) when the second [Hamza] is converted into \( \text{لاَ تَحْسَسُنُ } \) [above], the second [quiescent] is neither incorporated, nor paused upon, as we prescribed [above]; while, in your saying \( \text{لاَ حَيَّ } \) [above], 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 \( \text{سُ } \) of the art., while the incorporated into is part of what the art. is prefixed to (M.A.R)]: (g) the \( \text{لاَ } \) 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 \( \text{لاَ } \), notwithstanding the irregularity in the concurrence of the two quiescents,] is facilitated by the \( \text{لاَ } \) 's being more powerful in prolongation than its two fellows (R): (5) in such as \( \text{لاَ هَا } \) [552, 656] (SH), where the concurrence of two quiescents appears, from their being in two words, not to be allowable; but is allowed (M.A.S.H), because \( \text{لاَ } \) is equivalent to part of the word [\( \text{لاَ } \)], by reason of its being a compensation
for the jurative p., 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 اَلَّهُ [52, 262] should occur pronounced with Kasr of its Hamza, so that its meaning should not be recognized: (a) elision of the ٠ of ٠ in [such as (Jrb)] [552], and elision or Fath of the ٠ in اَلَّهُ [558] are allowable (Jrb, MASH), in which case two quiescents do not concur (MASH); so that in اَلَّهُ and اَلَّهُ 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 and اَلِّهُ; and [is] likewise [affirmable] in these two, either upon the ground of the well-known method, [vid. conversion of the conj. Hamza into ٠, ] 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)] إِلَّهَتُ [حَلَقْتَا أَلِّهَتَي] with expression of the ٠ (Jrb) is anomalous [228, 610] (SH), analogy requiring elision, as in ُحُلْقَتَا اَلِّهَتَي the two menservants of the governor and ُحُلْقَتَا اَلِّهَتَي the two garments of thy son, where you
do not pronounce the 1: Aus [Ibn Hajar (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 du. true in pronunciation (Jrb). [since] التقت ألف 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 حلقتا آلبطان is anomalous” ought to come after “and يرمى الغرض” [below], because the ought to be elided, as in يخشى القرآن [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 Two Muslims and Muslims, where the ن [16, 228, 234] is
orig. quiescent; and, if the [ and , 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 يُسِلّمَانَ They two become Muslims, يُسِلّمُونَ They become Muslims, and

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 حُفِّ fear thou, قُلّ say thou, and پُعْ Sell thou [671, 703]:

(b) like part of that word, as being (a) an attached nom. pron., as in كَفَرُونَ Thou [fem.] dreadest, يَا Ye [masc.] raid, and تَرُمِينَ Thou [fem.] shootest: (a) their "o.f. is كُفَرَ, كَفَّرَ, كَفَّرْتَ; and but, when the quiescent [nom.] prons., [i.e., the of the pl. masc. and the of the sing. fem.,] are attached to them, the s are elided because of the two quiescents: (b) the first of the two corrob. ن s, one of which is incorporated into the other, as Do ye surely raid and إِرِمًا Do thou [fem.] surely shoot [below], where the two prons. [ and ] are elided, because the quiescent ن is attached to them [610]: or (c) the initial of a separate word, as in يُخْشَى
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 إِضْرَبُ آذَهَ، strike, strike, [like إِذْهَبُ آذَهَ below,] except with a preventive, as in لَمْ يَلْدَ، [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 أ, 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 ١, there is no question about it, because mobilization of it is impossible, since, in that case, it would not remain an ١ [683]. And the reason why the ʻ and the ی is elided from ١، ʻ, and the ١ from ١, ʻ [above], though the corrob. ١ is like part of the preceding word, so that, if the ʻ or ی were left intact, it would be like [the ١ in] ١. 7. [above] and [the of ١ in] ١, ʻ [above], is that this ١ 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 ١؟” De ye two surely strike [below], so that the ١ is not elided?”, I say “The object is to distinguish between the sing. and the du.: for the ʻ, 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 ١؟ [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 ʻ, ʻ Ye did not raid, ʻ, ʻ Ye did not ra
Ye two did not shoot. 

Shoot ye and Ye did not shoot, 

Shoot thou [fem.] and Thou didst not shoot.

Be ye two pleased and Ye two were not pleased, Be ye one pleased and Ye were not pleased, Be thou [fem.] pleased and Thou [fem.] was not pleased, are affixed to the v. after the elision of the l for formation of the apoc. [404] or imp. [428], as they are affixed in Strike ye two and Say ye [below],

Ye two did not strike and Ye did not say [below], after the apocopation [404] or quiescence [431]; then the l's are restored on account of their affixion, because with them the apocopation and quiescence are not upon the l; and then the l's are elided with the 7 or 7, on account of the concurrence of two quiescents, after elision of the vowel of the l; but are not elided with the a, as [below], and [above],

Ye two did not raid, and [above], because of the absence of two quiescents. And the l is not converted into l in [above] and

Dread ye two, because they are made to accord with Ye two are pleased and Ye two dread, as will be explained [719] (R). And, [should one say
that the ū of ُمُ ،، vid. the I converted from the ،، and the ل of ُمُ ،، vid. the I converted from the ى، are elided only because of the concurrence of two quiescents, while this cause is absent (Jrb) in such as ُمُ ،، ُمُ ،، ُمُ ، Dreads the ُمُ للهَ ، ُمُ ،، ُمُ للهَ Dreads thou [fem.] God [below], ُمُ ،، ُمُ للهَ Do ye surely dread and ُمُ ،، ُمُ للهَ Do thou [fem.] surely dread, [so that the elided must be restored, IH replies that in them (Jrb) the vowel [of the ]،، and of the ،، and ى (R)] 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. للهَ ،، [which is obvious (Jrb)]; and [similarly (R)] the [corrob. (Jrb)] ن ،، 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 كَفْيَةٍ: so that the I elided on account of the quiescence of the ،، and of the ،، [and ى ]، does not return (R), contrary to [the I of] such as ُمُ ،، ُمُ للهَ، ُمُ ،، ُمُ للهَ Fear ye two and ُمُ ،، ُمُ للهَ Do thou [masc.] surely fear (SH), where the vowel [of the ]،، is quasi-original, because what follows it is attached to the word in the same way as a part [thereof], which in ُمُ ،، ُمُ للهَ is obvious; and in ُمُ ،، ُمُ للهَ is [equally true,] because, with the pron. latent, the ن is quasi-attached [to the v.] (Jrb). If, then, it be said "Grant that the ن [of
is like a word separate from the $v.$, because of the intervention of the [prominent] $\text{pron.}$ between them, is it not quasi-attached to the $\text{pron.}$, in the same way as to the $\text{l}$ in $\text{حَافِن}$? and therefore, since the vowel of the $\text{l}$ in $\text{حَافِن}$ is quasi-original, because of what is attached to it, i.e., the $\text{n}$, and for this reason the $\text{l}$ elided in $\text{حَافِن}$ returns [in $\text{حَافِن}$], so ought the vowel of the $\text{y}$ and $\text{y}$ in $\text{إِخْشَيْن}$ and $\text{إِخْشَيْن}$ to be [quasi-original], so that the $\text{l}$ elided in them, on account of the quiescence of the $\text{y}$ and $\text{i}$ attached to them, ought to return”, we say (1) that, between the attachment of the $\text{n}$ to the $\text{l}$ of the word, and its attachment to the [prominent] $\text{pron.}$, there is a difference, because the $\text{n}$, when attached to the $\text{pron.}$ in letter, is not attached thereto in sense, since it denotes corroboration [610] of the $\text{v.}$, not corroboration of the $\text{pron.}$: and (2) that the $\text{l}$ of the word is radically mobile, so that [even] its accidental vowel is taken into account; contrary to the $\text{y}$ and $\text{i}$ of the $\text{pron.}$, which are radically quiescent. If you say “Is not the $\text{n}$ in such as $\text{إِضْرُبَان}$ [above] after the [prominent] $\text{pron.}$? Then why is not the $\text{l}$ elided, as in $\text{إِضْرُبَا أَلْرُجَل}$ Strike ye two the man?”, I say “From fear of confounding the $\text{du.}$ with the $\text{sing.}$, as above explained”. As for the vowel of the $\text{l}$ in $\text{حَافِن}$ [above], $\text{حَافِن}$, $\text{حَافِن}$, and in $\text{حَافِن}$, $\text{حَافِن}$, 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 لَيَبَحَفَا Let them two fear and لَيَبَحَفُوا 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 لَمْ يَقُمَ اللَّيْلَ لَمْ يَقُمَ اللَّيْلَ لَمْ يَقُمَ اللَّيْلَ لَمْ يَقُمَ اللَّيْلَ LXXIII. 2. Rise thou [to pray (B)] at night [below] and لَمْ يَقُمَ اللَّيْلَ 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 كُمْ تَقُولَا Say ye two and كُمْ تَقُولُوا Ye two did not say, كُمْ تَقُولُوا Say ye and كُمْ تَقُولُوا Ye did not say [above], كُمْ تَقُولْيِ Say thou [fem.] and كُمْ تَقُولْيِ Thou [fem.] didst not say, without a corrob. ن, the [indication of the mood, which in كُلُّ Say thou and كُلُّ 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 \( \text{J} \) remain constructively quiescent. Inevitably, therefore, the \( \text{E} \) s return. And, on account of the cessation of the apocopation or quiescence, the \( \text{J} \) s are retained in Do thou surely raid, Let him surely raid, and Raid ye two [above]. The reason why the first of the two quiescents, i.e., the \( \text{J} \) in \( \text{A} \) and \( \text{R} \) and \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) and \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), is not elided upon attachment of the \( \text{J} \) of the \( \text{du} \). in \( \text{A} \) and \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), but is converted into or as you see, and mobilized, is fear of confounding the \( \text{du} \). with the sing., i.e., \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \). \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), the pregnant female of \( \text{A} \). [684]. But the \( \text{J} \) elided in the like of \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), although the \( \text{J} \) is mobilized, in \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), They two [fem.], \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), Shot [fem.], \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \) \( \text{G} \) \( \text{A} \) \( \text{H} \), Stand ye two, [which is radically mobile,] as above mentioned: and also because the \( \text{T} \), which ought to come after the \( \text{ag} \), because it is the sign of feminization of
the *ag.*, not of the *v.*, debars the *l* from complete attachment, as we said of [the prominent *nom. pron.* in] إِخْشَىْنَ, [which debars the *n* from complete attachment to the *v.*]. Some, however, allow restoration of the *l* in the like thereof, citing as evidence the saying [of Imra al-Kais, describing his mère (*Jsh*)]

لَهَا مَئَتِنَاتٍ خَطَاتَا كَمَا أَكْبَ عَلَى سَاعِدَيْدِيَةِ النِّبُر

(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 حَقَّانَا (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 أَذْهَبَ أَذْهَبُ لَمْ أُبْكِيْلَةَ. Go, go [above], لَمْ أُبْكِيْلَةَ [below], and III. 1. [above]; and [as] إِخْشَىْلَلَّهَ and إِخْشَىْلَلَّهَ [above] (SH): except when its mobilization would lead to destruction of the object, as in لَمْ يَلْدَهَ 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 لُدُنْ [205], which is elided, though anomalously, because, being liable to elision, without a concurrence of two quiescents, as in the saying [of the رَاجِزِيْقَةَانِ (S)]

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 ج, [270]: (a) the ن of لَمْ يَكُن [450], although it shares with the ن of لُدُنْ in what we have said about resemblance to the ج, and allowability of elision without [a concurrence of] two quiescents, is not treated analogously to it, because elision of the ن of لُدُنْ 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 ابن 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 [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 أَبْلِهَ I did not care [above] is لَمْ أَبْلَأْ : the ال is elided because of the prefixion of the apocopative [لَمْ ] ; then, لَمْ أَبْلَأْ being frequently used, abbreviation is required ; and therefore a second apocopation of the word by the apocopative is allowed, through assimilation of أَبْلَأْ, on account of the mobility of its final, to what has nothing elided from it, like يُقُولُ يَخْضَفُ says and يَخَضُّ fears ; so that the vowel of the أَلْ is elided ; and then the ال, on account of the two quiescents: and then the أَلْ of silence is affixed, as in لَمْ يَرَهُ He did not see and لَمْ يَخْضَهَ He did not dread [615], because the أَلْ 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 إِخْضَوْنَ [above] are said, because, [says IH,] the [corrob. (Jrb)] نَ [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 أَلْ in لَمْ أَبْلِهَ [above] ; or separate, like
and 

in 

[above]; or quasi-separate, like [the ]

and 

: then what sense has his saying "because the is quasi-separate", when the predicament of the attached also is the same?
The mobilization of the 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

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 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

In the Name etc. [141], praise etc. [141] is transmitted with Fath of the , when you conjoin it with the initial of ; and similarly

LXXIII. 2. [above] is anomalously read with Fath of the (R), by alleviation [658] (B). And,
according to this, the Kasra of the ل in الانتقالات [above] may be transferred from the conj. Hamza. And similarly the Damm in such as وَلَمّ ْيُسْلِمْ آبَادٍ VI. 10. [540] and XII. 31. [664]. But [the authority for] this [transfer] is weak: and, if it were allowable, لَمْ ْيُبْدِ ْآبَادٍ XCVIII. 1. [above] and مَنْ آبَادٍ 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 ْنُطْلُقُ [with quiescence of the ل, and Fath of the ق (MASH)], and ْلَمْ ْيَلْدُهُ [with quiescence of the ل, and Fath of the د (MASH)]; and as 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 ْنُطْلُقِ Depart thou, orig. طَلِقْ , an imp. from ْنُطْلِقُ departure, where, ْنُطْلِقِ
being assimilated to كِتْف in the dial. of Tamīm [368], the جـ 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 يَلْدُهُ (R), and [according to Z] وَيُبْتَغُهُ XXIV. 51. [below] (M): the poet says بُدِّى وَلَبِّي لَمْ يَلْدُهُ الْحَرْث which [also (IY)] is assimilated to كِتْف; so that the جـ is made quiescent; and, [two quiescents then concurring (Jrb),] the جـ is mobilized with Fath [below]: and hence, [as some assert (Jrb),] the reading of Ḥaṣṣân زَيْخُشَ اللَّهُ وَيُبْتَغُهُ 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 جـ 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 مُدْنَ [203, 664]; or because the quiescent [to be mobilized] is the جـ of the pl., as in إِخْسَوْنَ [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 AlHijāz do not incorporate in the
reduplicated [v.] whose ج is quiescent on account of the apoc. or imp., as لَمْ يَرْذَّنَّ Restore thou and لَمْ يَرْذَّنَّ 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 أَردُنَّ 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 (Jręb)]: and this [mobilization of the second] occurs in the Kur, as لا يُصَارَ كَاتِبٌ أَوْ شَهِيدٌ 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 لا يُصَارَ is read with Kasr [by 'Umar (K)], and Fath (K, B) by Ibn 'Abbās (K): (f) all agree upon omitting incorporation in أَفْعَلُ when a [v. of] wonder [477], as أَجْبِبْ يَا 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 ʿādār], if the first were mobilized, one measure would be confounded with another, as in ʿādār [206] and ʿāmīs [above], where the ʿādār would be mistaken for the ʿāmīs mobile therein: (a) [the mobilization of the second quiescent in] ʿāmīs [206, 321, 666], ʿādār [207, 321, 666], and ʿādār [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 Ḥāṣāy ṣ ʿāmīs X.XIV. 51. And seareth Him [above] does not belong to this [cat. (Jrb)], according to the soundest (SH) saying, because the ʿā 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 ʿāmīs [above] (MASH). This is a refutation of Z, who says that ʿāmīs is orig. ʿāmīs , with the ʿā of silence [615] affixed thereto; so that [the termination of] it becomes ʿāmīs like ʿāmīs [above]; and then the vowel of [the medial, i. e.,] the ʿā is elided, as is [the practice in] the dial. of Tamīm (R), like [the vowel of the ʿā 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 s 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 s of silence, [and expression of it in continuity (Jrb), each of] which is strange [615, 616]: and [J, whose opinion is adopted by (Jrb)] IH, says, which is the truth, that the s here is [an objective pron. (Jrb)] relating to اللّهُ يَتَخَشَى أَنْ تَكُفِّ نَسْيَةً [above]; and that كَفْ , being like كَفْ , is lightened by elision of the Kasr of the ق; and then the conj., i.e., the اَلْلَّهُ , which follows the s of the pron., is elided, because it is elided when the s follows a quiescent, as in عَنْهُ [161], عَلَيْهِ , and وُلْدَيْهِ (R): so that there is no concur- rence 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 بَعَّدَ أُلَّامَةً The handmaid committed fornication and قَامَتِ أَلْجَارِيَةُ 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. Hauza [668, 669], is said to be that quiescence is substituted in the v., i. e., the apoc., for Kasr in the n., i. e., the gen. [404]; so that, when a vowel replacing, and annuling, 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 ذَامَم or فَث is sometimes an inflection without Tanwin, or any subst. therefor, as يَضُرُّ [408] and يَضُرِّ [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 لَهُمَّ الْمُنْصُورُونَ 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 a, after it (Jrb, MASH), as عُلِّيّتُنَّ (MASH): (a) IH's saying "in the م of the pl." [above] is not unrestrictedly true, because, when the م of the pl. is after a ا pronounced with Kasr [161], the best known [pronunciation] is Kasr of the م, as in the reading of IAl يِهِمُ الْأَسْبَابِ II. 161. The ties between them, for alliteration to [the Kasr of] the ا, 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 يِهِمُ الْأَسْبَابِ II. 161. and عَلِّيُّهُمُ الْغِنَاطِلْ 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 ا, as in هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ VIII. 4. They are the believers and in the reading of خمزة [161] IV. 79. [above],
or upon any other [letter], as in أَنْتُمُ آٰهَلُ الْفَقْرُ آٓ. XXXV.

16. Ye are the needy, نَكُمُ أَلْيَمَ آٓ. VIII. 50. For you to-day, and يَتُوبُ بِقَمَ آٓ. II. 143. God will bring you, the well-known [pronunciation] is Damm 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 [concurrence of] two quiescents, as in the rest of its congeners, consisting of one quiescent before another (R): (b) similarly (Jrb) مُدَّ (SH), as مُدَّ أَلْيَمَ آٓ [203, 510] (MASH), because, its o. f. being مُدَّ, they mobilize [the م], in case of need, with the original vowel (Jrb): (a) Damm of the م of مُدَّ, on account of two quiescents, is not necessary, as IH mentions: but is more frequent than Kasr, either because its o. f. is Damm, since مُدَّ is said to be orig. مُدَّ; or for alliteration [in the vowel] of the م to [that of] the م; or because it is like the finals [201]: (c) نَخْصُ (SH) [161], in order that the Damm may indicate plurality, as in مُنْهُ (R): (2) the preference for Fath in such as آلْيَمَ آٓ. 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 آلْيَمَ آٓ. III. 1.” is relevant only on the
assumption that the vowel of the 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  is not on account of pause; and, on that assumption, the reasons for adopting Fath, in preference to Kasr, as the vowel of the , 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  is on account of pause, says that] the Fatha of the  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  

Do thou surely strike and  

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 ] be infl., [as in  Let him strike,] or uninfl., [as in  strike thou,] because, by affixion of the , the v. is estranged from resemblance to ns. [404]; and therefore reverts to its o. f., vid. uninflectedness [402], the
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 Damim when the second of the two quiescents is followed by an original Damma in the same word [with the second quiescent (R, Jrb)], as َقَالُ تَخْرَجَ XII. 31.

And she said "Come forth" [663] (SH), XXXVIII. 40, 41. [609], XV. 45, 46.

And springs. Enter ye them (M), and َقَلْ أَنْظُرُوا X. 101. Say thou, Consider ye [666] (IY), in [all of (IY)] which Dam is [allowable (Jrb)] for alliteration (IY, Jrb), the Damma of the ب in َقَالَ being an alliteration to the Damma of the ر in َخْرَجَ, since there is no barrier between them, except a quiescent letter; and similarly [the Damma of] the Tanwin [in َعَدَابٍ] being an alliteration to the vowel of the ل [in أَرْكُضُ], since there is nothing between them, except the quiescent ر: and similarly [as] أَرْكُضُ LXXIII. 3. Or deduct [666, 668], except that the Damma here is for two reasons, one being the same as in XXXVIII. 40, 41.
and the other being assimilation to the \( \mathbf{r} \) of the pron., on the principle of assimilation. IX. 42. [below], where Damm is allowable, although the \( \mathbf{s} \) after the \( \mathbf{w} \) is pronounced with Fath (IY): and [similarly (Jrb)]

She said “Raid thou [fem.]” (SH), because the original vowel of the \( \mathbf{z} \) is Damma, since the \( \mathbf{i} \) is affixed to \( \mathbf{g} \) with Damm of the \( \mathbf{z} \) (R): contrary to such as \( \mathbf{g} ^{\prime} \) [16, 591] (SH), because the Damm of the \( \mathbf{z} \) (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 \( \mathbf{g} ^{\prime} \) (SH), because the original vowel of the \( \mathbf{m} \) is Kasr, since the \( \mathbf{m} \) is affixed to \( \mathbf{r} \) with Kasr of the \( \mathbf{m} \) (R); and \( \mathbf{m} ^{\prime} \) (SH), because the Damm of the \( \mathbf{h} \), 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 \( \mathbf{m} ^{\prime} \) (IY), \( \mathbf{h} ^{\prime} \), and \( \mathbf{m} ^{\prime} \) (IY) : (c) Mb does not approve of Damm (IY, R) of the first
quiescent (R) here (IY), 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 (IY, R) in their language, and is not found in their speech; whereas X. 101. and LXXIII. 3. [above] are not like that (IY) : (d) L. 24, 25. Suspicous [of God and His religion (K, B)], who is read with Fath of the ﺱ، for an escape from the succession of Kasras (M), upon the principle [666] of ﻣِنَّ ﺣُرُمِينَ IV. 97. [89]; but the reading of the majority is مُرَبِّبٌ ﺳَلَٰٰٓ with the Tanwin [of ﻣُرَبِّبٌ ] pronounced with Kasr [609], on account of the concurrence of two quiescents (IY) : (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 ﻓُنَّ ﺳَلَٰٰٓ. Say thou "Strike"; and ﺜُأَلِلَٰٓ LXXIII. 2. [663] is anomalously read (R), with Damm of the ﻣ (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 ﻣ ], the object is realized" (K) : (f) by analogy to this, the [first quiescent] preceded by a Fatha is pronounced with Fatha by some, as ﺛَٰٰٓ ﺗَٰٰٓ 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) Dread ye the people (SH), II. 238. [547, 668], and دَعَوْا اللَّهُ مُخْلِصِينَ XXXI. 31. They call on God, being sincere (Jrb), contrary to IX. 42. [below] (SH): (α) [the of the pron. in] إِحْسَنُوا الْقُوَّمُ [above] is pronounced with Damm to distinguish it from the in such [words] as لَوْ and ۡأُنْثَى [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 Khl: (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 ى or ۡى (Jrb),] pronounced with Damm has been elided [here] before the, [of the pron.] (IY, Jrb), the o. f. being إِحْسَنُوا, and دَعُوْا [and دَعَوْا] (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) إَخْضَرَنَّ [610, 663], in order that the vowel of the letter preceding the ن may be similar in all conjugs., as إَخْضَرَنَّ, إِرْمَنَّ, أَفْرَنَّ, إِضاَّ بِنَّ [610], in order that the vowel of the letter preceding the ل may be similar in all conjugs., as إَخْضَرَنَّ, إِرْمَنَّ, أَفْرَنَّ, إِضاَّ بِنَّ (α) it may be said that they intend to distinguish the ن of the pl. from any other ن, as in IX. 42. [below]; while the ن of the pl. is more worthy of ذامم, in order that the letter preceding the corrob. ن may be made to keep one vowel in all conjugs., as just mentioned (R): (b) similarly in the ن of the pl., [when preceded by a letter pronounced with فاث], in the ن. [161] (R); [for] they treat the ن of the pl., [when so preceded,] like the ن of the pron., because each of them indicates the pl. masc., and has a letter pronounced with ذامم, vid. the ل of the word, elided before it (Jrb), as مَصْطَفَرُ اللهِ the elect of God (R, Jrb), [which is so pronounced] in order that it may correspond with such as مَصْرِبُوُ الْقُومُ the strikers of the people (R): (α) in other cases, the ن [preceded by a فاث] is pronounced with كسر (Jrb); [so that] كسر is preferred in the ن of and [R], as لَوْ أَسْتَطَعْتُ (R), as لَوْ أَطْلَعْتُ XIX. 42. If we had been able (R, Jrb), لَوْ أَطْلَعْتُ XVIII. 17. If thou hadst come suddenly, [and أَنْفُص ل XXIII. 3. above] (Jrb), according to the o. f.; because there is no such inducement to ذامم as there is in
the, of the pl. : (b) the, of the pl., is sometimes assimilated to the, of such as لُوّ and وُأَرُ, and is therefore pronounced with Kasr; and similarly the, of such as لُوّ [and وُأَرُ] is sometimes assimilated to the, of the pl., and is therefore pronounced with Damm (R): [thus]

II. 238. [above] is read with Kasr of the;
[of the pl.] (K): while IX. 42. [above] is read with Damm of the, [of لُوّ], by assimilating it to the, (K, B) of the pron. (B) of the pl. [masc.] in فُنْصُوا آثْرُوتَ

II. 88. Then wish for death (K), [and] in II. 15. [403] (B); and [similarly]
[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. ٣٢, as إِخْشَى ٣٢ رَجُلَ. 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 ى homogeneous with the ى, which is treated here as the, is treated there; while, if you treat it like [the ى in]

II. 238.
[above], you [still] pronounce with Kasr: so that in every case it is pronounced with Kasr: (d) the ى in مُضَطَفِيْنَ is [treated] like that in إِخْشَى, as...
from the elect of God (S): (c) in

[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 ُّرِهِّ Restore thou and ُّرِهِّ 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 ُّرِهِّ [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 [ُّرِهِّ], and then a [second] concurrence thereof in two words [ُّرِهِّ] supervenes, the cause of Kasr is strong; and the allowable becomes necessary, on account of the strength of its cause (IY): (a) some, [vid. the Banu Asad (M),] pronounce [it (IY, Jrb)] with Fath [with the art. (IY)], as ُّرِهِّ müsāraً آلْحَمْر [171] (M, Jrb), also related ُّرِهِّ with Kasr (Jrb); and as ُّرِهِّ [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 ﺇ (Jrb, MASH): but, if it be
pronounced with Fath or Kasr, then 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 ا (MASH): (c) when the Banû Tamîm, 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 مُدَّدَةٌ and نِّمُيْلَةٌ [663], from regard to its being a v., in which it is more proper to avoid a permanent Kasra; whereas in أَرْضٌ أَلْقَىٰ [above] the matter of the Kasra is softened by its being accidental: so that they say مُدُّ draw, عَصَّ bite, and عُرِرُ be mighty; and, according to them, the Fath of عَصَّ is not for alliteration, otherwise they would say مُدُّ with Damm, and عُرِرُ with Kasr: (b) some flee from Kasr to alliteration, as in مُدُّ [203, 663]; so that they say عُرِرُ, مُدُّ, and عَصَّ; and, according to them, the Kasr in عُرِرُ is not because the [second] quiescent is [properly] mobilized with Kasr, otherwise عَصَّ and مُدُّ also would be pronounced with Kasr: (c) some, vid. Ka'b and Ghani, 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 عُرِرُ is not for alliteration, otherwise alliteration would take place in مُدُّ and عَصَّ also: (d) the
Arabs, Hijazis and others, unite in adopting incorporation, together with Fath, in مَعَمَّلٍ [189], because, مُّلْمُمُ being compounded with مَا, they lighten it by the necessity for incorporation, and the necessity for Fath: (e) if this apor. or imp. be contiguous to a quiescent after it, as Restore thy son and لَمْ تَزَوِّدَ الْقُوَّمَ 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 إِضْرَبَ الْقُوَّمَ 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 Jarir (IY, Jsh) Ibn 'Atiya atTamimi, addressing 'Ubaid Ibn Husain an Numairi, the poet cognominated Ar Rai', Then lower the eye: verily thou art of Numair; so that neither Ka'b hast thou reached, nor Kilub (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 فَضَّحَ الْطَّرَفُ إِنَّكَ مِنْ نُبِيّ فَلاَ كَعْبَا بَلَغْتَ وَلاَ كَلَابَا [above] 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 زَرْعٌ. 

Restore thou her (SH), for affinity to the ! (Jrb): (a) the Arabs are all agreed upon the necessity for Fath when a  is followed by an ! is attached to this imp. or apoc., as زَرْعٌ [above], عَضَّهَا

Bite her, and إِسْتَعِدَهَا Make her ready (R), because the  is faint (R, Jrb); so that the !, as it were, follows immediately after the [letter] incorporated into; while the ! is not preceded by any [vowel] but Fatha (R): (b) Damm in such as زَرْعٌ Restore thou him, [for affinity to the , (Jrb),] according to the chastest [usage]; while Kasr [in زَرْعٌ (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 زَرْعٌ [below] (MASH): (a) when the  denoting the sing. masc. is pronounced with Damm, all of them pronounce [the letter incorporated into] with Damm, as زَرْعٌ [above], عَضَّهَا Bite him, and إِسْتَعِدَهَا Make him ready, because the, [161], as it were, follows immediately after the [letter] incorporated into. since the  is faint, as though you said زَرْعٌ, عَضَّهَا, زَرْعٌ, إِسْتَعِدَهَا; and the Damm in زَرْعٌ is not for alliteration to that [vowel] which precedes it, otherwise عَضَّهَا and إِسْتَعِدَهَا would not be pronounced with Damm (R): (b) IH says "according to the chastest
[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

كُلَامٍ [161], so that the , is converted into ی; 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 Fašḥ, without [the authority of] any hearsay, allows Fath of the [letter] incorporated into, notwithstanding the occurrence of the s of the 3rd pers. [sing. masc.] after it, as یُؤَلُعَة [above], عَضْمَة , and إِسْتَعْلَة :

but many pronounce this to be an error; though analogy does not forbid it, because the occurrence of the quiescent , after Fatha is not uncommon, as in طُوْل saying and superiority (R): (c) Fath in the ین of جزی ین with the ی of determination (Jrb)], as یَمِينَ الرُّجُلَی, یَمِینَ یَأْبَیک from the man, Kasr being weak; contrary to یَمِینَ یَأْبَیک from thy son [666, 669] (SH), where Fath 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 دابّة beast and شابّة lass (IY). Mobilization of the first quiescent occurs in two pardonable 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 مَحْرَتُ يَعْمَرُو 'Amr came to me and جَآءْنِي عُمْرُو I passed by 'Amr, in which case the first is mobilized with the vowel of the second, [as يَعْمَرُو and يَعْمَرُو], because it must have a light vowel, as we mentioned at the beginning of the chapter; and therefore to mobilize it with a vowel that was 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 ٢ of the masc. [648], as in ضَرْبَتْهُ strike him, مَنْهَةٌ, and ضَرْبَتْهُ, the vowel of the ٢ may be transferred to the preceding quiescent, as ضَرْبَتْهُ [641], مَنْهَةٌ, and ضَرْبَتْهُ; but some of the Banū Tamīm, vid. the Banū 'Adr, elide the vowel of the ٢, and mobilize the first [quiescent] with Kasr, as عُنْصُدَتْهَا [641] and عُنْصُدَتْهَا She took him, as you say ضَرْبَتْ آئِلَةَ The woman struck [607]: (2) when the second quiescent is incorporated, and the first is an ١ [below], as in I. 7. [663], in which case the ١ is converted into a Hamza [683] pronounced with Fath, as in the
anomalous reading \( \text{أَلْتَأْفَّلِيمُنَ} \) I. 7. [539, 656] transmitted from Ayyūb es Sikhtiyān; and in [641, 656] and transmitted from him by AZ, who cites

\[ 
\text{يَا عَلَيْكَمَا لَقَدْ رَأَيْتُ حُضْنًا * جَارُ قَبَاتُ يُسْوِقُ أَرْنَبًا} \]

[677] (R) O marvel! Assuredly I have seen a marvel, a woodlouse driving a hare, putting a halter upon her, attaching a nose-rein to her, in order that she might go. Then said I “Let me ride behind”, and he said “Welcome!” (MAR), i.e., \( زَامَهَا \), the \( تُذْهَبُا \) being converted [by poetic license (Jh)] into a Hamza pronounced with Fath, since the metre of the verse would not be correct with \( لِتُذْهَبُا \), by reason of the combination of the two quiescents; and in the reading of [HB and (K)] ‘Amr Ibn ‘Ubaid \( حَبْثُوُّمِثَيْدَ لَا يُسَأَلْ عَنْ ذَنِيبٍ إِنَّ ذَنِيبٍ لَّا جَانَLV. 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 \( تُذْهَبُا \) 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 \( لِتُذْهَبُا \) in such as \( زَامَهَا \) into Hamza is not for an escape from the concurrence of two quiescents, but is like what is [found] in [683]; and that, since they convert it
into a quiescent Hamza, which cannot be followed by a quiescent, as the ٍ 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 ٍ, because both are from the throat:

(d) if the ٍ have an o. f. mobile with any vowel, the Hamza is mobilized with that vowel, as in the saying

[of the Rājiz (Jh)]

يا دار مي يا أباد كاد ديك ألبزق صبأ نهد يفج بك شوق السفتيق

(R) O abode of Mayya (a woman's name) in the low-lying sands, sands mixed with stones and earth, (give me) patience, صبرا being governed in the acc. by a v. understood, i.e. أعطيني صبرًا, while Jh has the version سقيا 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 ٍ [above], one escapes from the concurrence of two quiescents by converting it into a mobile Hamza; but not when it is a س, as in تأمرتني [663] and قُنُوَّه تأمرتني

XXXIX. 64. Do ye bid me?, [with incorporation of the ن (K)]; or a ى, as in دُوَّبَّت [274] and حُوُيَّصَت [663]: because of the frequency of the [concurrence of] two
quiescents when the first of them is an \( \ddot{a} \), not when it is a, or \( \dot{a} \) (R): (f) they do not alter the \( \dot{a} \) in XXXIX. 64. [above], because, [says Jrb,] the Hamza is remote from it; and because, [if the words were said,] the Dam upon the Hamza, together with what precedes it, would be heavy (Jrb): (g) \( \ddot{a} \text{مْرْ} \text{وُّنَاتِي} \) is read in XXXIX. 64. [by Ibn 'Amir, with the two \( \ddot{a} \)s displayed (B)], according to the o. f.: and \( \ddot{a} \text{مْرْ} \text{وُّنَاتِي} \) [by Nafi (B)], with elision of the [second (B)] \( \ddot{a} \) (K, B), which is often elided [170, 405] (B).

§ 666. The \( \ddot{a} \) of مُنُّ (1) when the \( \ddot{a} \) of determination [599] is conjoined with it, is most commonly pronounced with Fath, because the \( \ddot{a} \) of determination frequently occurs after مُنُّ, and the succession of two Kasras is deemed heavy when frequent: (a) that [Fath] is not because the vowel of the [conj.] Hamza [in أَلَّى] is transferred [to the \( \ddot{a} \)], otherwise حَدَّثَ أَرْجَعُ [663] would be allowable: (b) Ks says that they pronounce [the \( \ddot{a} \)] with Fath in such as مُنُّ أَلْرِجُ [664] because مُنُّ is orig. مُنُّا, but he produces no argument in [support of] it; and this is as he says that مَمْبَعَا is orig. مَمْبَعَا [664, 669], when a quiescent other than the \( \ddot{a} \) of determination follows immediately after it, is commonly pronounced with Kasr, according to the o. f., as مُمْبَعَا [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 ﺯ (R)] with Fath (S, R) with [a quiescent] other than the J of determination (MAR), to escape from the [succession of] two Kasras (R); so that they say ﻣِنَّ ﺟُنُدَّكَ, treating it like ﻣِنَّ ﺟُنُدَّكَ from the Muslims (S). And [they assert that (S)] some of the Arabs [also (R)] say ﻣِنَّ ﺟُنُدَّكَ from God; so that they (S) pronounce it with Kasr, [which is not common, with the J 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] ﺟَيْدَنَ [206, 321, 663] and ﺢَيْدَانَ [207, 321, 663], in order to escape from the combination of two likes, i. e., the ﻋ and Kasra, [which would ensue] if they pronounced with Kasr, according to the o. f.; and because Damma after the ﻋ, if they pronounced with Damm, would be heavy. But ﺢَيْدَانَ 202, 663, 664] deviates from that [rule]: for they allow [the final in] it to be pronounced with (1) Damm, in the chastest, best-known [usage]; (2) Fath, according to the rule mentioned [for ﺟَيْدَانَ and ﺢَيْدَانَ]; (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 ْعَنْ 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 مِن [above] (R).

And ْعَنْ أَلْرَجْلِ from the man, [quoted by Akh (R)] with Ḥamm, is weak (SH); and, says he, is bad (R). He likens it to their saying فَلَ أَنْظُرْوا X. 101. [664 (IY, R) and ۚ أُرْأَيْتْمُ لَّا مَنْصَصَ LXXIII. 3. [664, 668] (IY), meaning that the ْن is mobilized with Ḥamm for alliteration to the Ḥamma of the چ, the incorporated چ not being taken into account, [so that ْعَنْ أَلْرَجْلِ is reducible to ْعَنْ أَلْجُلِ ]: but this [explanation] is weak, because Ḥamm is not allowable in VI. 57. [664], notwithstanding the Ḥamma 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] Ḥamm, as in ْعَنْ أَلْحَكْمِ from the judgment; or by a letter [interposed] between them, as in ْعَنْ أَلْعَضِلِ 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 قام زيد قائم [24], and [20], and إنَّ زيدًا قائم [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 م of عموو Amr, upon a neighbouring vowel; or, like the ب of دابه and the ص of خويصة [663], 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 *šart* camel and *štām* saddle-ornaments. Apparently, however, it is impossible; and beginning with a mobile is unavoidable: but, since that mobile in such as *šart* and *štām* 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., *ibn*, *ibn* daughter, *ēnā* [i. *ēnā* (Jrb)], *ēnā* *enā* [masc.], *enā* *enā* [masc.].
[fem.], 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)] is [in the pret. (Jrb)] are followed by four or more (M, Jrb) letters [668], as (a) إِفْتَعَلَ (M), like أَفْتَعَلَ [668] (IY); (M), like had power [483, 668, 671]; and, like , these three being of one measure and one paradigm (IY): (b) إِفْتَعَلَ [332, 482] (M), like أَفْتَعَلَ [332, 432, 493, 668] إِفْتَعَلَ [496]; like أَفْتَعَلَ [432, 496]; like أَفْتَعَلَ [482, 494]; and, like أَفْتَعَلَ [494]; these five also being of one paradigm, [to which belong three more formations, whose inf. ns. are mentioned below, vid. إِفْتَعَلَ, like أَفْتَعَلَ (482) إِفْتَعَلَ, like أَفْتَعَلَ (482, 483); and, like أَفْتَعَلَ (495, 496, 668): (c) إِفْتَعَلَ (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): (b) 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) [١٣٣٢] إِنْفَعَالٍ (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), [إِسْتَفْعَالٍ (M, Jrb, Tsr, MASH),
إِنْفَعَالٍ (Tsr, MASH), إِنْفَعَالٍ (Jrb, Tsr, MASH),] and (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), as [إِفْتَدَارٍ , إِفْنَالٍ, إِنْفَعَالٍ, إِفْنَالٍ (IY), إِفْنَالٍ (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), إِفْنَالٍ (Jrb, Tsr),]
إِفْتَدَارٍ [إِفْنَالٍ, إِفْنَالٍ (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), as (Jrb, Tsr, MASH),] (IY), إِفْتَدَارٍ (IY, Jrb, Tsr), إِفْتَدَارٍ (IY, Jrb, Tsr),
إِفْتَدَارٍ (Jrb, Tsr), إِفْتَدَارٍ (Jrb, Tsr). (γ) hence [١٧٥٧], inf. n. [١٣٣٢] إِطَّايَرٍ, inf. n. إِطَّايَرٍ; and إِذَا رَكَّبُوا They overtook one another,
inf. n. إِذَا رَكَّبُوا, where the initial is quiescent, because they incorporate the تَفْعَّلَ of into what follows it
(IY): (2) vs. (M, Jrb), (a) 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 إِطَّايَرٍ,] whether
such vs. be in the pret., as إنْفُلَتْ departed [above]; or
imp., as إنْفُلَتْ depart [٦٦٨] (Jrb): (b) the paradigms
of the imp. [of the 2nd pers. (M)] in the [unaugmented
(M)] tril. (M, Jrb), as ضَربَ إِذْهَبَ go [٤٢٨,
668] (M), when neither the ف nor the د of its aor. is unsound; for, if either of them be unsound, the conj. Hamza is not needed, as ﺛ ﺪ ﺪ promise and ﺟ ﺪ say [428, 668] (Jrb): (3) ps., the ج of determination [599], and its م [599, 687] (M, Jrb) in the dial. of Tayyi (M). The initial of the word is not quiescent, in a regular way, except in vs., and what is connected [330] with them, vid. inf. ns., because vs. 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 n., except a few irregular ns. vid. the ten [668] mentioned [above]; nor in the p., except the ج and م of determination. The Hamza in the ten ns. is a compensation for that infirmity which affects them, since they are trils., weak in constitution, their جs 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 trils. whose ج is elided, that the Hamza should be substituted for it, as you see in ﺪ ﺪ morrow [153, 275], ﺪ ﺪ [231, 260, 275, 306], and ﺪ ﺪ vulva [275, 306]. Since, then, these [ten] ns. are afflicted with transformation, which ought to be in the v., they resemble vs.; 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 إِبْنَيٌّ [306]. The finals of إِبْنَيٌّ [16, 306], إِمْرُ [16, 306], and آيَّنُ [650], are not [actually] elided, the م in إِبْنَيٌّ being a subst. [687] for the J, i.e., the و, [which is therefore like the expressed]. But, since the vowel of the ن and the ر, in إِبْنَيٌّ and إِمْرَ, 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 إِبْنَيٌّ is, [however, sometimes said to be (R)] aug., [for corroboration and intensiveness (Jrb, Tsar),] as in زَرْتُ (R, Jrb, Tsar) and ستُهَمَ [below], the J being [actually] elided.

And, as for إِمْرُ [650], since the ن is often elided, as إِمْرُ [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 إِبْنَيٌّ [275, 277] is [origin] قَعْلُ with two Fathas (Tsar), like قَلْمُ pen (A), with Fath of the ف and ع (IY, R, Fk), because its [broken (Jrb, Fk)] pl. is بَنُ [307] (IY, R, Jrb, Fk), upon the measure of أَفْعَالٌ (Fk), as نَخْصَ أَبْنَاءٌ أَللّٰهِ V. 21. We are the sons of God and
being regular in فَعَلُ (R, Jrb) with فَتْحٌ of the ع, like أَجْمَالٌ [237]; and [not] in فَعْلٍ quiescent in the ع, [except] when فَعْلٌ is hollow [237], like أَبْنَآ and أَمْيَاتٌ [242]; while أَبْنَآ may not be like فَتْحٌ أَجْمَالٌ pl. of فَعْلٍ [237], nor like فَتْحٌ أَجْمَالٌ pl. of جَلْدَةٍ trunk, because فَتْحٌ indicates فَتْحٌ of [the ف in] its sing. [307] (R), for which reason they say in the rel. n. فَتْحٌ [306], with فَتْحٌ of its ف (IY). The proof of the فَتْحٌ of the ف is its pl. فَتْحٌ and its rel. n. فَتْحٌ, with فَتْحٌ thereof (A) in the pl. and the rel. n. "But," says the author of the مسْبِب, "its o. f. is said [by some] to be فَتْحٌ, with كَسْر of the ب, like جُمْلَة load, as is proved by فَتْحٌ فُنُقْتِ 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 فَتْحٌ (Sn). And the proof of the mobilization of the ع is its pl. أَفْعَالٌ above, فَعَلٍ أَفْعَالٌ being pl. of فَعْلٍ with mobilization of the ع; while the proof of the vowel's being فَتْحٌ is that أَفْعَالٌ is more frequent in [the pl. of] the فَعْلٍ pronounced with فَتْحٌ of the ع than in [the pl. of] the فَعْلٍ pronounced with دَامَم of the ع, like أَعْضَانِ pl. of عَضْدٍ upper arm, or with كَسْر of it, like أَكْبَانِ pl. of كُبْدنَ liver [237] (A). Its ل [below] is elided (Jrb, تَسْر,
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Fk), for lightness (Fk); and its ُٰ 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)] ُٰ is [said to be (Tsr)] (1) ُٰ (IY, R, A, Tsr), which is correct (Tsr), not a ُٰ [below] (A), (a) because the ُٰ of those ns. in which the ُٰ 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 [below] (Tsr), not a ُٰ (A); (b) because they say in the fem. ُٰ [above] (IY, R, A), substituting the َلُ for its ُٰ (IY, A), and substitution of the َلُ for the ُٰ is more frequent than for the ُٰ [689] (IY, R, A); (c) because of [their saying (A)] ُٰ sonship [below] (R, A), while ُٰ youthfulness [243] from ُٰ a youth is irregular (R): (2) ُٰ (A, Tsr), as ISH reports to be held by some, who derive ُٰ from ُٰ He went in to his wife, aor. ُٰ (A), because the son is the effect of the father’s going in to the mother (Sn); [or] from ُٰ 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 ُٰ [above], because of ُٰ, which is from the ُٰ (IY, A), since they say ُٰ in the du. [229, 326], and
in the pl. [243, 246, 257] (IY). And Zj allows both the modes [of representing the J] (A). The o. f. of ُبَنَةُ [below] is ُبَنَةُ (R, Jrb, Fk, Sn), like tree (Jrb, Fk), because it is fem. of ُبَنُ (R, Jrb, Fk); and its predicament is [like] that of ُبَنُ (Jrb). As for ُبَنُ [above], it is ُبَرُ augmented by the م [668] for intensiveness (IY, A, Fk) and corroboration (IY), as in ُزَرُمُ intensely blue (IY, A) and ُزَرُمُ big in the rump [671, 676] (IY). It has been heard (Fk), as

*وَهِلْ لِيَ أَمْ غَيِّرْتُهَا إِنَّ دُكَرْتُهَا # أَمَّي أَلْلَهُ إِلَّا أَنْ أَكُونَ لَهَا أَبْنًا* (IY, A, YS), by AlMutalammis, 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 J (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk) of the word (IY, Jrb, Tsr), as [it is for the ع (Fk)] in دُمُ [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 J, [it would virtually be the J; and (IY)] the J 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 J] (Fk). The o. f. of ِنَزَيْنِ [16, 313, 314] is ِنَزَيْنِ (IY, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), with Fath
of the ف and ع (A), like جَنَبٍ [above] (R), (1) because it is from كَتَبَ [313] IV, A, Fk), an explanation of the reason for the ل's being a ى (Sn): (2) because they say in its rel. n. ²[302] (Jrb, Jr, 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 Damian or Kasr, that would appear in the rel. n.; and, if the ع were quiescent, they would say جَنَبٍ with quiescence, like جَنَبٍ [302] (Jrb): but this is open to the objection that their saying جَنَبٍ does not prevent quiescence of the ع in the o. f., because, in the rel. n. of جَنَبٍ [below], you say جَنَبٍ سَمَوَى [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 ى is elided, the ف made quiescent, and the [conj. (Tsr, Fk)] Hamza put (Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk). And the o. f. of جَنَبٍ [below] is جَنَبٍ جَنَبٍ (Jrb, Tsr, Fk, Sn), like جَنَبٍ جَنَبٍ two trees (Jrb, Tsr, Fk). The o. f. of جَنَبٍ جَنَبٍ [and جَنَبٍ (below) (Fk, Sn)] is جَنَبٍ جَنَبٍ (A, Fk) and جَنَبٍ جَنَبٍ (Fk, Sn), which are another dial. var. (Fk). جَنَبٍ جَنَبٍ is a complete n., nothing being elided from it, except that, since its Hamza [in the o. f. جَنَبٍ] may be elided by transfer of its vowel to the quiescent ى before it with the art. [below], as الْمَرْضُ 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 $658$; so that they are treated like $\text{بن م مز}$ and $\text{بن في}$ (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 $\text{بن}$ [above], $\text{تنثبي}$, $\text{هزة}$, [i.e., $\text{مز}$, $\text{نثبي}$, and $\text{نثبي}$ (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 $277, 295, 307$, 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),]
with Kasr of the ف (IV), as S says (IV, A), like قنَوُن. A bunch of dates (Jrb, A, Fk), or سَمَسَم, [as is said (A),] like قَفْتُلُ (R, A), as is proved by their also saying سَمَسَم without a conj. Hamza, whence

By Ru’ba Ibn Al‘Ajjaj (N), By the Name of Him whose Name is in every chapter of the Qur’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 س (MAR), meaning إِسْبَة (AZ): [and by other evidence also,] because its [broken (Fk)] pl. is أَسْبَاتَ (Fk, Sn), أَسْبَاتَ being a pl. for these two measures, like أَجْدَاعَ, أَجْدادَع, pl. أَجْدَاعْلَ, أَجْدَاعْلَ [above] (Jh); and its dim. is سَبَى [277] (Fk, Sn); and its v. is سَبَىْتُ I named [below]; orig. سَبَىْتُ, أَسْبَأَرُ, and سَبَىْتُ, where the canons of etymology require conversion
of the, into Hamza in the first [683], and into ی in the two last [685, 723, 727] (Sn): whereas, if its o. f. were ُوَسَم, [as the KK say (Sn),] its pl. would be أَوْسَام, and its dim. ُوُسَم, [and its v. ُوَسَتُ (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 ُوَسَم with Fath of the س, the reason being that ُوَسَم with Fath does not form the pl. أَفْعَال [237] (Sn): (b) it is derived from سَا was elevated, because it elevates, and gives notoriety to, its named, which, but for the name, would be obscure (R): (c) its measure is إِنْ (Jh, IY), the [letter] gone from it being the, (Jh): (d) its ج (A, Tsr, Fk), the ج (IY, Jrb), is elided (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), for lightness (IY, A), as in إِبْن and إِبْدَة [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 (Â) as a compensation (A, Tsr) for the [elided (Sn)] ج (Tsr, Sn), for which
reason they do not combine the two, [i.e., the ج and the 
Hamza (Sn),] but express one of them, saying in its
rel. n. اسم or اسم [306] (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 trans-
mit اسم [668] with Damm of the conj. Hamza (R): (2)
according to the KK, اسم (R, Jrb, A, Tsr, YS), with
Fath of the س (YS), meaning علامات 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 (ح): [or] it is
inverted, its ف being put last, after the ج; and its
variations occur in accordance with that (A): (b) accord-
ing 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 اسماء and اسماء [above], and
others, like اسماء namesake on the measure of
confederate, and اسميت I was named and اسميت [above], refute that; unless they say that the ص is
inverted by putting the ف into the position of the ج,
when they intend to lighten the ص by elision, since the
[usual] position of elision is the ج; and that then the ص
is elided as forgotten; but is restored in its variations,
vid the *dim.*, broken *pl.*, etc., in the position of the ل, since it was elided in that place *(R)*: (c) the preferable opinion is the first *(Jrb)*. As for *عَبْرَتْ* it is *orig.* *(IY, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk)*, upon the measure of *فعل* *(IY)*, with Fath of its first and second *(Tsr, Fk)*, like *جمل* *(Jrb, Tsr)*; and is curtailed of the ل, i.e., the ِ and *أُجْذِعْ* *[above]*, because of the rel. *n.* *(IY)* *(306)* *(R)*; (2) *[its *dim.* *(IY, Fk)*] [275, 277] *(IY, A, Fk)*; (3) their saying زَيْدُ أَسْتَهْ مِنْ عِبْرَتَيْنَ Zaid is bigger in the rump than 'Amr *(A)*. Its ل, i.e., the ِ, is elided; its initial is made quiescent; and the Hamza is put *(A, YS)*, because of what has been mentioned *[under *إِسْمُ* *(A)*]. And it has two other *dialect. vars.*, ِ *[275, 306]*, with elision of the ع, its measure being *قلُْ* ; and ِ, with elision of the ل, its measure being *(A, YS)*. The proof that the o. *f.* is ِ, with Fath of the ف, is the Fath thereof in these two *dialect. vars.*; and the proof of the mobilization, and Fath of the ع is what has been mentioned under ِ *[above]*. And, as for the ِ *[650]* peculiar to the oath, *[which is a n. so constituted, with Damm of the م and ن, for the oath *(Jh)*, itsِ is *conj.* according to the BB, but *disj.*
according to the KK, because, according to them, it is pl. of ُيِسُّينَ oath; whereas, according to S [and the other BB (Sn)], it is a sing. n. from ُيِسُنَ, i. e., ُبَرَكْتَةُ blessing (A). The BB hold that [the pre. n. in] [650] is a sing., upon the measure of أَفْنَعُ [372], upon which the sing. does sometimes occur, like أَخْرُ [256, 628] and أَنْكُ [255, 256], as in the tradition مَيۛ آسَّتَعَ إِلَى قَيِّمَةٍ صَبَّ فِي أَذْنَيْهِ أَنْكُ Whoso listeneth to a singing female slave, into his two ears shall lead be poured (Jrb). And, since its ن is elided, as أَيُّمُ أَلَّلِهِ [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

سَمِّرْ أَيْمَ وَايْسَنَ تَأْقَطَحَ وَأَكَسَرَ أَوْلَمْ فَلِدْ

أَوْ قَلْ مَ أَوْصُ بِالْتَّثِیلِیْتُ قَدْ شَكِیکَا

وَإِنَّ أَخْتِمَ بِهِ زَ أَلَلِهَ كَلَّا أَصْفُ # إِلَّیْهِ فِی قَسَمٍ تَسْتَفْوَی مَا نُقِیَلَ

The Hamza of (1, 2) (1) and (3, 4) (1) [with Damm of the م (YS, Sn) in both (Sn)] then pronounce thou with Fath and Kasr; or say (5) (1) [with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm of the م (Sn)]; or say (6-8) (2) 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 (12) [with Kasr of the Hamza, and Fath of the م (YS, Sn),] do thou finish off with: and postfix الله everywhere to it in an oath—so wilt thou exhaust what has been transmitted (A, Fk). The result is that, if the Hamza of يَمَس be pronounced with Fath, the م must be pronounced with Damm [below]; but, if the Hamza [of يَمَس] 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) مُأَم with Fath of the Hamza, and Damm of the م [651, 668]; and (14) مُأَم with Fath of the Hamza and م, instead of مُأَم 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 مُأَم 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 110a
which is "And [the pre. n. in] أَيُّنَ حَلِيلٍ (1-4) and أَيُّنَ حَلِيلٍ; the initial in both of which is also pronounced with Kasr; and (5, 6) أَيُّنَ حَلِيلٍ with Fath of the م and Hamza, [the latter of] which is also pronounced with Kasr; and (7) إِيمَّ اللّهِ with Kasr of the Hamza and م; [the 1 (in all) of which is said to be a conj. 1 (KF):] and (8) لَّهُ مَلِكُ الْأَرْضِ with Fath of the s, and Damm of the م; and (9-11) أَمْ أَلْلَهَ with triple vocalization of the م; and (12, 13) إِيمَّ اللّهِ with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm or Fath of the م; and (14) مُّ حَلِيلٍ with Damm of the م, and Kasr of the ن; and (15-17) مَّ حَلِيلٍ with triple vocalization of the م and ن; and (18-20) مَّ حَلِيلٍ with triple vocalization; and (21, 22) لَّهُ مَلِكُ الْأَرْضِ and إِيمَّ اللّهِ; is a n. constituted for [use in] the oath, the full phrase being أَيُّنَ حَلِيلٍ قَسَمَى 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.s.] is that these Hamzas are a compensation for (1) a ل [elided], (a) a و, vid. in إِنْبَمْ، إِنْبَمْ، إِنْبَمْ، [and إِنْبَمْ]; (b) a ى, vid. in إِنْتَنَانِ and إِنْتَنَانِ; (c) sound, i. e., a ى, vid. in إِنْتَنَانِ; (2) an imaginary elision, vid. in إِنْبَمْ and
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3) an elision occurring at times, vid. in **إِمَّرَةٌ** (Tsr). The Hamza in the *du.* also of such of these *ns.* as are dualized, vid. **إِمْرَّةٌ، إِمْرَاثٌ، إِمْرَاثاً، إِمْرَاثًى**، **إِسْكَانٌ، إِسْكَانٍ**; and is a *conj.* Hamza (Jrb). The Hamza of **ُّلُّ** is similar [668] (IM), i.e., a *conj.* Hamza, whether **ُّلُّ** be determinative [599], conjunct [176], or *red.* [599]. The determination is by the **ٰلٰ** 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 **أَيَّمٌ** [541] and **أَيْنَى** [571] is not elided; and because the Tanwīn [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 **ُّلُّ** 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 **ُّلُّ** [575] 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 **ُّلُّ** 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 ِّ 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. †s and conj. †s, because the Hamza and †
are approximate in outlet [732], for which reason, when they need to mobilize the ی, they convert it into Hamza [683]: Jh says “The ی is of two kinds, soft and mobile, the soft being named ی, 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 تَفْرَأْ أَخْبَدَ أَخْبَدُ. Ahmad took fright, where the Hamza of أَخْبَدٌ forms a barrier between the أ and the ح, disjoining one of them from the other. And for this reason it is named حَمْزَةُ قَطْعٍ Hamza of disjunction, [commonly rendered as if it were حَمْزَةُ تَقْطِعَةَ disj. Hamza, which also occurs]. But the conj. Hamza is dropped [below] in the interior [of the sentence], so that it conjoints what precedes with what follows it, as كَتَبْتُ أَسْمَاكَ I have written thy name, where the Hamza of اَسْمُ is dropped, so that the س is conjoined with the س. And for this reason it is named حَمْزَةُ تَصْلَلٍ Hamza of conjunction, [commonly rendered as if it were حَمْزَةُ تَصْلَلْةَ 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
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This is the correct [opinion]; but it is said that possibly its o. f. may be the l, since it is expressed as an l in such as َلاَّ ُلِّيِّ 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 l; 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 إِذا ُلِّيِّ َلاَّ ُلِّيِّ [669] (MKh). Expression of it in the interior [of the sentence] is disallowed, except for poetic licence, as in َلاَّ ُلِّيِّ إِنْيَّ أَحْسَنَ شِيْعَةَ عَلَى ُلِّيِّ َلاَّ ُلِّيِّ َلاَّ ُلِّيِّ [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 حَمْزَةُ الْحَمْزَةِ 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 سَلْمُ آلِلْسَابِ 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 prefixion [of هَسَّةٌ the word] 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, مَضْلٌ Inf. n. of the trans. مَضْلِّي conjoined, if one said “so that the speaker conjoins what precedes with what follows it”, this would agree with the name حَمْزَةُ الْحَمْزَةِ (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] (A). It is not [found] (1) in any aor., unrestrictedly (Aud, A, 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 ُنَنْنَدُكَرْ [657], because it would necessitate importation of the conj. Hamza (YS): nor (2) in any p. other than [the determinative (Mk, Sn) or red. (Sn)] ُنر (Aud, A, Fk), according to [the opinion of] S [667] (Tsr): (a) like the J of determination are (a) its in the dial. of Tayyi and Himyar [599, 667, 687]; and (b) the conjunct [176] and red. [599] ُنر (Fk): (b) as for the conjunct [ُنر], it is a n. [below], according to the preponderant [opinion]; and for this reason A says, “so that the non-inf. ns. are twelve” [below] (Sn): (c) Khl [667] says that the Hamza [of ُنر] is rad., being made conj. from frequency of usage (Fk): nor (3) in any pret., [either] tril., [like ُنر commanded and ُنر took (Aud)]; or [numerically (Tsr)] quad. [483, 488] (Aud, A, Fk), like ُنر
honored and 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 إِخْرَّجٌ (Aud) and إِنْطَلَقٌ (Tsr): or the sex., [which is of two sorts, the tril. containing three augs. (Tsr),] like إِسْتَخْرَجٌ [667] (Aud); and the quad. containing two augs., like [667] (Tsr): and (b) in their imp. (Aud), quin. and sex., like إِجْرَأَّ (Tsr): and (c) [in (Tsr)] the imp. of the tril., [the second of whose aor. is literally quiescent (Tsr),] like إِضْرَبٌ [428, 667] (Aud); contrary to such as ُعَّب grant, ُعَدَّ, and ُقُلُّ [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 إِسْتَخْرَجٌ and إِنْطَلَقٌ [332, 667] (Aud), in imitation of their vs.: (a) the formula for them is “every inf. n. the 1 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. إِنْتَنَّ, إِنْتَنَّ, إِسْمُ, إِنْتَنَّ, إِنْتَنَّ, إِنْتَنَّ, إِنْتَنَّ, إِسْمُ, إِنْتَنَّ (Tsr), and the
peculiar to the oath (Aud); while they ought to add [the conjunct ل and (Aud) [آيّم] a dial. var. of لّ in (Aud, A), so that the non-inf. ns. are twelve [above] (A), vid. the ten ns., إسم, etc. [above], the conjunct لّ included in IM's saying "The Hamza of لّ is similar" [667], and آيّم (Sn): (a) if they say [of آيّم (Tsr)] that it is لّ with the ل elided [651], we say "And أبّن is لّ with the م 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 م, alliteration of the ن to the م in the vowels [of inflection], according to the ops., accrues to أبّن [16], which therefore becomes so like an original word that the .K.K even say that it is infl. in two places; contrary to آيّم, which does not undergo this process: and moreover there is no special appropriateness in the mention of أبّن for [the purpose of] comparison, since the fems. of these ns. are their mascs. [667] with the ـ 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 م accrues to آيّم also by reason of the defective ness; so that, in both أبّن and آيّم, 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) \( \text{يَمّ} \), not \( \text{يَم} \) [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 \( \text{م} \), a dial. var. of \( \text{ل} \), according to Tayyi," who change the determinative \( \text{ل} \) into a \( \text{م} \) [above], saying \( \text{مُرَجَـِل} \) 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 \( \text{ل} \) [176] because of the dispute as to its being a \( \text{n} \) [345], and because of its resemblance to the determinative \( \text{ل} \) [599] in form (Tsr).

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 \( \text{عُسْـتَمْر} \) became hidden, when the \( \text{ب} \) of \( \text{عِمْـتَمْال} \) is intended to be incorporated into what follows it, its vowel being transferred to the \( \text{ف} \) [756]; so that \( \text{عُـسْـتَمْر} \) [with Fath of the \( \text{s} \), and doubling of the \( \text{ب} \) (Sn)] is said, [the difference between this and the hid from \( \text{تَسْـتَيْر} \) being apparent in the aor. and inf. \( \text{n} \), because you pronounce the aoristic letter from
this with Fath, and from the second with Damm; while you say, with Kasr of the س in the inf. n. of this, and ٍ 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 ٍٍ [660] is transferred to it, in which case the preferable [method] is retention of the [conj.] Hamza, as ٍٍ AlAhmar is standing; while ٍٍ is weak: the difference [between this case and that of ٍ] being that incorporative transfer [of a vowel] is more frequent than non-incorporative transfer (أ); 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 F, which is adopted by Shl; and the second the opinion of S, which is apparently correct, because every inceptive p. must be mobilized, 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 S 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 إِضْرَبٍ إِذْهَبَ [428, 667]; while, in such as إِخْرُجٍ [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 إِضْرَبٍ, and Damm in إِخْرُجٍ; while, Fath being disallowed in إِذْهَبَ 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 إِضْرَبٍ, and Damm in أَسْكُنَ dwell are for alliteration to [the vowel of] the third [letter]. The absence of Fath in إِعْلَمْ know is adduced as an objection [to the saying of the KK (Sn)]; 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 أعلم would, in pause, produce confusion with the aor. [أعلم I know], and with the pret. [أعلم 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 أ [663] (Aud, A), like أَلْجِلُ the man (Tsr), from frequency of usage (Tsr, Sn): (2) necessity for Damm, [vid. (A)] in (a) such passives as أَطْلِقَ and أَسْطَرْجَ [436]: (b) the imp. of the tril. orig. pronounced with Damm of the ع, as أَقْتُلَ kill and أَكتبَ write, [from dislike to the transition from Kasr to Damm, because the quiescent barrier is not insuperable (Tsr, Sn)]; contrary to إمشوا walk ye (Aud, A) and إفسوا judge ye (Aud), where the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr, because the ع is orig. pronounced with Kasr, the o. f. being إمشوا (Tsr, Sn) and إفسوا (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 (Tsr, Sn): (c) so in the Tsr; but Kasr is said to be a corrupt *dial. var.* (Sn): (3) preponderance of Ḍamm over Kasr, [vid. (A)] where the Ḍamm of the ẹ is accidentally made Kasr, as in ُغذي [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 ẹ 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 Ḍamm should be inclined towards Kasra [428], not what has been previously mentioned [640], vid. *compression of the lips, without any sound,* that [Ishmām of the letter before the ẹ ] being necessary (Sn) for a notification of the original Ḍamm (Tsr, Sn); and (b) the Hamza [must be pronounced] with pure Ḍamm, [without Ishmām (Tsr)]: (b) IM says in the Tashil that the *conj.* Hamza is pronounced with Ishmām before the Ḍamm 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 Ḍamm of the Hamza (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (4) preponderance of Fath over Kasr, [vid. (A)] in َيمُن
and [663] (Aud, A), because of the heaviness of the transition from Kasr of the Hamza to Damm of the ت, and afterwards of the ن (Tsr): (5) preponderance of Kasr over Damm, [vid. (A)] in the word اسم [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 إِنْفَادَ أَخْتَارَ إِنْفَادَ and when put into the pass. [436] (Aud, A), as أَنْفَدَ أَخْتَارَ and with Damm, and (Tsr) أَنْفَدَ أَخْتَارَ and 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 أَنْ أَكْتَلُوا أَنْ أَكْتَلُوا IV. 69. [below] and أَنْ أَكْتَلُوا LXXIII. 3. [664, 666] (A). In أَنْ أَكْتَلُوا أَنْفَدَ أَخْتَارَ أَنْ أَكْتَلُوا أَنْفَدَ أَخْتَارَ أَنْ أَكْتَلُوا IV. 69. Saying, Kill yourselves, or go forth from your homes, IAl and Ya‘kūb read أَنْ أَكْتَلُوا with Kasr of the ن, according to the o. f. of mobilization [664]; and أَنْ أَكْتَلُوا with Damm of the و, for alliteration, and [for] assimilation
to the, of the pl. in such as II. 238. [547, 664]: while Āṣim and Ḥamza read with Kasr of both, according to the o. f.; 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] قَالُوا XL. 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 إِذَا جَأَوَرَ أَلْحَ. [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

ٌلا يَبَدِّلُونَ بِي ٌمَا ٌأَلْصَمَّاءُ ٌوَلَدَانَا ٌأَلْقَدَرُ يُنْزِلُهَا ٌبِعْيِرٌ جَمِيعٌ
(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, [664, 666], and then from thy name.

And the saying [of Kais Ibn Al-Khatim (IY, MN)]

إذا جاءَ اللَّهُ الْإِثْنَىَانَى سيَرَ كَانَهُ # يُتْنُزَر وَإِفْشَاء الْكَبْرِياء قَيْبِينَ

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

بِنَتٌ وَتَكْشِيرُ الْوُضْهَة قَيْبِينَ

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 نَسْبُ الْيَوْمَ أَلْحَم [105], where he expresses the Hamza of إسْتَسْعَ 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, inceptively (IX). But the Hamza of the art. alone [below], when it occurs after the interrog. Hamza [581], is not elided [661], being [usually] converted into † [below]
XXVII. 60. Is God better, or what they associate [with Him]? (TY), 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 J [667]. For that reason, then, it is retained, [though in a modified form]; and is assimilated to the ِل of ُن red [658], because of its permanence: the poet says اَلْحِيَبُ ِبَلْدَيْ أَلْجِ [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. ِل is prefixed to it, is [generally] dropped, as in II. 74. [543] and ُن ِبَنَّيَ عَلَى أَلْبِينَ XXXVII. 153. What! hath He chosen daughters above sons? [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. ِل [generally] with Kasr [664, 668] (TY). [Conversion into ِل 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 ﷽ [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, Δ), which is (Sn)] the Hamza of ٌ [and its subst. ﷼ in the dial. of Himyar (Sn), and of ﷽ and ﷽ (Tsr, Sn)] is (1) changed into a [letter of] prolongation (IM), i. e., ٌ [497,668] (Aud), which is the more approved [method] (A): (a) IH.Kh says that F and many, [among whom are Z and ΔY], 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 IAI that this [ٌ is not a modification of the conj. Hamza, but] is an [extraneous] imported for separation, like the ٌ of ٌ [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 
\[\text{ba'adda yundun} \] [below], which, but for the regard paid to its original vowel, would not be allowable, contrary to 
\[\text{a'dhuna} \] [above] [Tsr]: or (2) [sometimes (Aud)] softened (IM) between Hamza and ı (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 َأَلْحَسَنَ and the Hamza of َأَلْحَسَنَ [Tsr]. You [therefore (A)] say َأَلْحَسَنَ َأَلْحَسَنَ and َأَلْحَسَنَ َأَلْحَسَنَ [663], with prolongation, [by change (Aud),] more approvably; and with softening, less approvably, [but agreeably with analogy, as before mentioned (Sn),] whence

\[\text{ba'adda yundun} \]
(Aud, A), by Ḥassān Ibn Yāsār at Taghlabī (MN), Is it the truth, if the abode of ArRābūb (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 ArRābūb)? (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 اَتْخَذَنَاهُم ِسَقْرِيَا XXXVIII. 63. What! did we make of them a mockery? [in the reading of others than IAal and the Two Brothers (Tsr), this text being read with the interrog. Hamza by the two Ḥijāzis and Ibn ‘Āmir and ‘Āsim (B)]; and [as (Tsr)] اَسْتَغْفِرَنَّ لَهُم [LXIII. 6. [581, 543] (Aud, A), in the reading of all [the Seven]: the o. f. being اَسْتَغْفِرَنَّ لَهُم, and اَسْتَغْفِرَنَّ لَهُم, with an interroga. 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 Damm is elided, as اَضْرُرْ اَلْرِجْلُ Was the man constrained? (A, Tsr), the o. f. being اَضْرُرْ with a Hamza pronounced with Damm, which is elided when the interrog. Hamza is prefixed: the course required by analogy being abandoned, in the case of the [conj.
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 \(\text{لا أُرِى أَحَد} [668] \) (Aud).

§ 670. When preceded by something spoken, no mobile initial of a word, besides the conj. \([669]\), is elided or altered, except the \(\text{س} \) of \(\text{هَوُرُ} \) and \(\text{هُوَ} \) [161], which, when preceded by \(\text{ا} \), \(\text{ف} \), or \(\text{ب} \) [of inception], is [often made] quiescent, as 

\[\text{وهَوُرُ ذَاهِبٌ} \]  

Assuredly he is better than thou, and 

\[\text{فَهُوُرُ} \]  

Then he is standing, and similarly with \(\text{هُوَ} \) [319]. But many of the Arabs leave the \(\text{s} \) with these ps. in its [original] state. And they do the like of that to the imp. \(\text{ج} \) with the \(\text{ف} \) and \(\text{و} \), as in your saying 

\[\text{ولا يَضَرِّبَ} \]  

Then let him look and let him strike; 

while those who leave the \(\text{s} \) of \(\text{هَوُرُ} \) and \(\text{هُوَ} \) in its [original] state leave the Kasra of the \(\text{ج} \) in its [original] state (S). 

As for the quiescence of the \(\text{s} \) in \(\text{هَوُرُ} \) and \(\text{هُوَ} \) [above], \(\text{فَهُوُرُ} \) and \(\text{فَهُوُرُ} \), and \(\text{فَهُوُرُ} \) and \(\text{فَهُوُرُ} \), it is accidental, [but] elegant (SH), i.e., used by elegant speakers, contrary...
to II. 282. [below], and to such as منتصبًا [below], from the frequency of its usage in the first [set of exs.] (R).

And so is [the quiescence of] the imp. ل, as لنيوفًا نذوزهم xxii. 30. And let them pay their vows [below].

And [the quiescence of] أهَوَ and Thُمَ لَيَّفَ وَا أَهَوَ xxii. 30. [603] are assimilated to the foregoing. But such as آَن يَبِل هُوَ II. 282. That he himself should dictate [above] is rare (SH). If it be said "The initials of these words are quiescent, as in the texts زَهوُ خَيْرُ َلكَّم II. 213. [464, 539]

XXII: لَهُوُ خَيْرُ أَلْهَمْ، [543] Nehii كَالْجَبَرِ [69]. Assuredly He is the Best of Providers, لَهُي أَلْحَيْرُ أَلْهَمْ لَينَفِيقَ، xxii. 7. Assuredly it is life, LXV. 7. Let him expend, II. 282. [above], and in the saying of the poet فَقَلْتُ أَهَيِّ سَرَتُ آمَع [543]; so that, according to what you have mentioned [667], the conj. Hamza must be put, whereas it does not occur here," IH answers that their quiescence is accidental, as is proved by your saying حُمُّ [161], and لَينَفِيقَ LXV. 7. [419, 603]: but that, زَهوُ and هُوُ and being treated as on a par with كَيْفُ [368], quiescence [of the medial] is allowed as elegant with the, and ف and ل [of inception], because they become like part [of the pron.], in addition to [their] frequency of usage; while what contains the [interrog.] Hamza is assimilated to [what contains] the
[three pl.] mentioned, because, though not so frequent, it is unil.; and similarly what contains ثناء, because it is copulative, like the , and ف [533]: but that such as II. 282. [above] is rare, for want of both the quality of part and the frequency of usage (Jrb). IH means that the initials of هُوَ and هَيْ are with the copulative وَ, and ف , and [with the ل of inception and] the interrog. Hamza, and similarly the imp. ل that is preceded by a وَ, or ف , 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 مُهُوَ and مَهْيَ being assimilated to عُضْدَةُ and مِهْيَ and كَفَ to كَفَ; and so is it said of [the imp. ل 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 [658, 667], since you say نَسْمَةٌ, notwithstanding that نَسْمَة occurs, and similarly نَسْتَ and سَت [667]? He ought therefore to say
that the Hamza is not imported [in \( \text{م} \), 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 \( \text{فيه} \) and \( \text{فيه} \) are less used than \( \text{فيه} \) and \( \text{فيه} \), and \( \text{فيه} \) and \( \text{فيه} \); and, for this reason, the alleviation [of the \( s \) by elision of its vowel] is rarer in their case: while \( \text{فيه} \) and \( \text{فيه} \) are like \( \text{فيه} \) and \( \text{فيه} \), alleviation of the \( s \) being allowable in them, according to what is read in the Kitab (R). As for \( \text{ليينظر آلح} \) XVIII. 18. [1] and \( \text{ليينظر آلح} \) XXII. 30. [above], this is the imp. \( \text{ليينظر آلح} \) [419, 429, 603]: it is orig. pronounced with Kasr, as is proved by the fact that, when you begin, saying \( \text{ليينظر آلح} \) [603], you pronounce it with Kasr, not otherwise; but, when you prefix the \( \text{و} \) or \( \text{ف} \) to the phrase containing it, the \( \text{ل} \) may be made quiescent (IV). But in such as \( \text{ليينظر آلح} \) And in order that he may do, with the \( \text{ل} \) of \( \text{كي} \) [411, 599], alleviation is not allowable, from the rarity of its usage (R). If \( \text{ثَمَّ} \) occur instead of the \( \text{و} \) or \( \text{ف} \), quiescence is not as good as with the \( \text{و} \) or \( \text{ف} \), because \( \text{ثَمَّ} \), 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 Nafi', Ibn 'Amir in one version, and Ks read with quiescence of the $, by assimilation of the detached to the attached [con.] (B). But Ks and others read XXII. 30. Then let them fulfil [603] their purification, with quiescence of the imp. ل, by assimilation of ل to the ف, because it is a con., like them; while the BB deem that inelegant, because ل is independent, [susceptible of being] paused upon (R). Those who say ل لتقيقْوا تنفِّشُهم XXII. 30. [above], with quiescence of the ل, assimilate the second of ل to the ف and م, treating ل لتقيقْوا تنفِّشْوًا as on a par with تنفِّشْوا تنفِّشْوا; and this is like their saying منفَّضَا I see thee puffed up, meaning منفَّضًا, the being assimilated to كف, and the therefore made quiescent; and like it is

Then it passed the right erect, and did not contract [above] (IY). And II. 282. [above] is read anomalously, with quiescence of the $, by treating [in $]
like عضد but it is inelegant, because ينيل is an independent word, and cannot be assimilated to the con., as نم is; and the saying فباث منتصبًا علم [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 هو and after the ل [of inception], and after the و and ف, as likewise mobilization of the imp. ج after the two [latter ps.], is the ϕ.ϕ.: 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 p.s., there is no augmentation in them, because it is a kind of plasticity, which is not [found] in p.s. [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 ℓ of مَضْرُوبٌ and the ℓ of مَضْرُوبَةٌ [369]; or for a kind of extension in the vocabulary, like the ℓ of ٌجَمْارٌ [374, 401], the ℓ of عُمْودٌ [246], and the ℓ of سُعْيدٌ [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 كُرْنَدٌ [a rugged place (Jrb)] is co-ordinated [375, 731] (SH) with جَعْفَرٌ.
[392], for which reason they say ١٠٩٢ [253] and ١٠٩٢ [274], as they say ١٠٩٢ [245] and ١٠٩٢ [274] (Jrb).

But such as ١٠٩٢, ١٠٩٢, and ١٠٩٢ [333, 361, 372, 676] is not co-ordinated, although ١٠٩٢ and ١٠٩٢ 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 ١٠٩٢, ١٠٩٢, and ١٠٩٢ (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 ١٠٩٢, being ١٠٩٢, ١٠٩٢, and ١٠٩٢, ١٠٩٢ (MASH). The meaning of co-ordination [678] 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 اَعَذَر, impotent is different from that of كَفَّل corn in the blade, and the meaning of مَشَل [483] is different from that of مَشَل included, and similarly كَوْتَر [below] is not i. q. كَثْر 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 مَفْعُل denotes the inf. n. [333], or the time or place [361], and in مَفْعُل 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 مفاعلة [332, 490] (A): (2) co-ordination, as in (a) [the ٌ of (A)] below (A, Tsr) and ء ٌ [369, 374, 675], the ٌ of ميَّزى [373] and ء ٌ [374], the ٌ of أرطى and رَفَقُنى [678], and the ٌ of ﺪَحْـٌفُل [below] and مَهْـٌسُى [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 ء ٌ [above], e.g., is فَعَّلٌ [392], while the measure of كُتُّبٌ [283, 675] is فَعَّلٌ [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 book [673] (Tsr); and hence the ٌ of رسالة [246], the ٌ of سَيِّيْفَة [246], and the ٌ of حُكْوَّة [267] (A): (4) compensation, as in the ٌ of (A) زِرَادٍةَةَ [265] (A, Tsr) and إِقَامَةٌ [265, 338], the ٌ of يُسْطَعِ [680], and the ٌ of أَلْلَهُمْ [52, 56] (A): (5) magnification of the sense, and (Sn) multiplication (A, Tsr) of the letter (Sn), as in the ٌ of سَهَّمْ and زَرْقَم [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. [667] (A, Tsr), because it is not possible to begin with a quiescent (A); (b) the s of silence in [such as ء 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 LXIX. 28. [648, 679] and يا رَبِّ لاَ تَأْتَنِي [48, 55, 679], which is added to make the vowel plain [in the former (Sn)], and the [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 , the , the , the , the , the , the , and the ] (IY), comprised in the (mnemonic) phrases (M, Jrb)] [1-3] (369, 401] (M, SH), which somebody has combined in a verse, vid

يا أَوُسُ هَذِئْ نِبْتَ وَلَمْ يَأْتِيَكَ سَهْرَ O Aus, hast thou slept, when negligence has not overcome us? Then said he, "To-day thou dost forget it"

(Jrb): (4) And Solomon came to him (M), 114a
which is not good, because it contains a duplication of the ی (IY) سَأَلَتْهَا (5): (a) it is said that a pupil asked his master about the letters of augmentation, and he said سَأَلَتْهَا Yell 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 ِنَسْأَةْ 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): (6) آلِسْبَانِ (M, SH): (a) it is said that Mb asked Mz about the letters of augmentation, and he recited

[1] [2][3] [4][5]

[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 آلِسْبَانِ: (b) Z [followed by IH] says آلِسْبَانِ, making آلِسْبَانِ 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) 
أُسْکَبْنِی رَقّ{\textquotesingle}ة

He left me, and lost his way: (8) 
۴َٰلْمَّ {\textquotesingle}لُّا

Death forgets him (9) : (IX) 
۴ُمْ {\textquotesingle}نَسَأَا لَوْنَ

They question one another: (10) 
۴َٰلْمَا سَأَلَتْ يَهُوُنَ

What thou hast asked is light: (11) 
۴َٰلْمَا سَأَلْتُمْ هَوَاَیَ

They [fem.] sought. or Seek ye [fem.], my love: (12) 
۴َٰلْمَا سَأَلْتُمُ فَتَوَانِی

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

سَأَلَتْ أَلْخُرُوفُ أَلْرُآوِدَبٱ عَی آسِیِّهَا

قَالُوا لَمْ تَبْقِسْلَ آمَانْ رَقْسِهِلْ

(R) I asked the augmentative letters about their name; and they then said, nor begrudged saying, "Those letters are collected in آمَانْ رَقْسِهِلْ [below]" (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 كُرْکُدُ [above]; or non-co-ordinative, as in كُبرُ interpreted [489]; where the ال and ب are not letters of augmentation. The reduplicative
letter, notwithstanding its augmentativeness, is [taken] from all the letters of the alphabet, [except the I, as shown below,) whether letters of augmentation, as in قلّع [438, 482] and جمع amased; or others, as in قرْدُنْ set free: and is co-ordinative, as in جلبب [731]; and non-co-ordinative, as in علم [above]. But that [aug. letter] which is co-ordinative, yet not reduplicative, is [taken] only from the letters of "آَلِیَّمّ" sometimes [above], as in جدول [369, 374, 675], and عْبَدَل [681] (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 سالشونيه [above] or not, except the I [above], which is not susceptible of reduplication (Tsr). And its condition is that it should resemble (1) the J, as in جلبب [above] and جلبب [385]: (2) the ع, (a) with union, as in قتل slaughtered [489]; (b) with separation by an aug. [between them (Tsr)], as in ١۹۶۵: (3) the ف and ع, as in ِمَرْپَي ی [370]: (4) the ع and ج, as in صصصص [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 [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 مَرْمَرِّیس [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, and of the second م, their elision in the dim., as مَرْمَرِّیس and مَرْمَرِّیس [283]. But it is transmitted from the KK that the measure of ح is نَعْلٌ, its o. f. being مَرْمَرِّیس , where they change the middle ح into م (Tsr). As for that [duplicate] which resembles the ف alone, as in [wine (Tsr)] and سْنْدَس [thin silk brocade (Tsr)], or the ع separated [from its duplicate] by a ر...., as in حَدْرَد [a man's name (Jh, Tsr), whence Abū Ḥadrad al-Aslamī, a Companion (KF)], while no other نَعْلٌ, with repetition of the ع, occurs (Jh, KF, Tsr), and الْخَدْرَدَّز [meaning the short——so in the CT (KF)], it is رَد. And, when the quad. is formed of two letters, then, (1) if its third be not omissible, the whole are رَد., as in سَمْس [311, 674, 677] (Aud), the measure of which is فَعْلَلٌ [392], because the radicalness of the two letters is certain, and there must be a third to complete the [number of] رَد.; 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 قَتِّعُت, it فُرُجُت being repeated; but this is improbable (Tsr): (2) if its third be omissible, as in i. q. لَمْ نُكِلْنَيْهَا reunited it, that third is, (a) as the KK say, an aug. substituted for a letter resembling the second (Aud), the o. f. of كَتَب, according to their saying, being كَتَب, 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 قَتِّعُت for its inf. n. [332]; whereas, if كَتَب were orig. [a tril.] reduplicated [in the medial], its inf. n. would occur on [the measure of] تَفَعِّلُ [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 كَتَب a repeated [formation] agreeing in sense with the reduplicated tril., as the BB say of its similars, like قَتَعَضْفُت I crushed, كَبِكَبُت I restrained, and كَفَكَفُت 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

Congratulations and
salutation (are a matter that), (2) has followed the day of his friendliness, (3) an utmost craving (of desire), and (4) 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 s 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 (Jrb)] 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 ! [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 in outlet [732], and is convertible into a soft letter upon alleviation [658]: (2) the s also is adjacent to the in outlet [732] (Jrb, Tsr), while A kh asserts that their outlet is one; and it is faint; and is sometimes substituted for the in ٍهَناء [690], and for the in ٍهَناء [171, 174, 275, 648, 690] (Jrb); (3) the is [uttered]
from the outlet of the \(\text{ٰ} [732]\), vid. the lip; and contains a nasality [akin to the softness of the soft letters (Jrb)]: (4) the \(\text{n} [\text{also (Jrb)}]\) contains nasality [270]; and is prolonged in the upper part of the nose, like the \(\text{l}\) in the throat: (5) the \(\text{w}\) is a surd [734] letter; and is substituted for the \(\text{m}\) in \(\text{نَجَاء} [689] (\text{Jrb})\): (6) the \(\text{s}\) 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 \(\text{w} [732] (\text{Jrb, Tsr})\), for which reason they substitute it for the latter, saying \(\text{سَت} \quad \text{ضَت} \quad \text{ضَت} [759]\), the converse of which is \(\text{سَت} \quad \text{ضَت} \quad \text{ضَت} [759] (\text{Jrb, Tsr})\): and (7) the \(\text{l}\), though a vocal [734] letter, resembles the \(\text{n}\); and is near to it in outlet [732] (Jrb, Tsr), for which reason the \(\text{n}\) is incorporated into it [749, 751], as ﺑِ婚纱*\(\text{l} [307, 316, 689, 758] (\text{Jrb})\): and the \(\text{n}\) of protection is sometimes elided with it in \(\text{l} [170]\), as with its like in \(\text{نَى} [170] \quad \text{نَى} [170] (\text{Jrb})\). 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) \(\text{رَدُسٌ}, (4) \text{أَعْسٌ}, (5) priority, (6) posteriority, (7) elision, and (8) absence of elision. And the measure is the crude form of ﺗَمَيَّز.
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 فعل [below], because it is the most general of the vs. in sense, and may be employed for every act, as فعل النصر He did striking and فعل الصر He did helping, whence وَآللذين هم للمركوة فاعلون XXIII. 4. And who are doers of almsgiving, i. e., مُرزُونٌ الْمرکُوة almsgivers (Jrb), where the المرکوة is meant to be an abstract n. [3], vid. the deed of the almsgiver, i. e., التَرْكُیة almsgiving (K). What is intended is the crude-form of فعل [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 غ, and [then (Aud)] the ل [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 فعل, the first by (A)] the ف, [the second by (A)] the غ, and [the third by (A)] the ل (R, A), i. e.,
you put, in the measure, these three letters in place of the radiq letters (R), making the measure and the measured equal in vowel and quiescence [253] (A), as you say "ضَرَبَ struck is on the measure of فَعَلٌ" [below] (R). You, therefore, say (1) قَالَ [with quiescence of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] [368] (Aud, A), among ns. (Tsr): (2) قَالَ (Aud, A), with Fath of the [ ف and (A)] ع (A, Tsr), for [the measure of (Tsr)] ضَرَبَ [above] (Aud, A), among vs. (Tsr); and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] قَامَ [403, 482] (Aud, A), in the hollow (Tsr), and شَدّ [482] (Aud, A), in the reduplicated (Tsr), because their o. f. [before conversion or incorporation (Tsr, Sn)] is قَوْم [403, 684, 703] and شَدّة [731]: (3) قَالَ [with Kasr of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] عَلِيم [432, 440, 482]; and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] شَابِ [in the hollow (Tsr)] and مَلِ [Aud, A] in the reduplicated (Tsr), because their o. f. is قَوْم [403, 684, 703] and مَلِ [loathed, was weary of] [731] (Tar, Sn), with Kasr of their second (Sn): (4) قَالَ [with Damm of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] طَرِف [331, 432, 482]; and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] طَالِ [432] and حَبَّ [476] (Aud, A), because their o. f. is قَوْم [403, 684, 703] and حَبَّ [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 J in [the measure of (Tsr)] the quad., saying جَعْفَر for [the measure of (Tsr)] جَعْفَر [392]: (2) a second and third [J (Tsr)] in [the measure of (Tsr)] the quin., saying جَعْفَر for [the measure of (Tsr)] جَعْفَرُ [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 KK, 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] َفَعَلُ ْبِعُقِّرُ [392], as the BB say, or َفَعَلُ ْبِعُقِّرُ َفَعَلُ with the aug., or َفَعَلُ ْبِعُقِّرُ َفَعَلُ with the 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 (1-3) َفَعَلُ , َفَعَلُ ْبِعُقِّرُ [332, 482, 674], and َفَعَلُ ْبِعُقِّرُ [482, 675] (Aud), with the aug. Hamza, ى , and ى , 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 [693, 756], because the o. f. is َضَمَّبَرُ and َنَذَرُ for [the measure of (Tsr)] َغَلَّبَرُ َغَلَّبَرُ َغَلَّبَرُ َغَلَّبَرُ [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 ٌفَعَلَلَ , فَعَلَلٌ , فَعَلُّلُ [385] [beginning of rain and wind (Tsr, Sn)]—so says SBd (Sn), and ٌغَدُوَدَنَ [482, 483, 675] (Aud), respectively. the [second] ت in ٌسَحَوْنَ and in ٌجَلَتَ بَتَ [253, 396, 674, 677] and cartilage [396], respectively; while the [second] د in ٌغَدُوَدَنَ 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 ٌفَعَلَلَ , فَعَلَلٌ , فَعَلُّلُ for the measure of ٌجَلَتَ بَتَ [above], ٌسَحَوْنَ, and ٌغَدُوَدَنَ respectively (Tsr). The aug., (1) when it is not one of the letters of ٌأَمَانُ وَتُسَهِّيلُ [above], is a duplicate of a rad., like the ب in ٌجَلَتَ بَتَ [above]; (2) if it be one of them, is (a) a duplicate, as in جَأَلُ [661, 738]: (b) not a duplicate; but having the semblance of a duplicate, though some evidence, [like the extraordinariness of ٌفَعَلَلَ without repetition of the ف and غ (Sn),] indicates that reduplication is not intended by it, in which case it is represented in the measure by its own letter, as in سَمَنَّ, a [place wherein is (Sn)] water belonging to the Banû Rabî'a, the measure of which is ٌفَعَلَلْنَ , not ٌفَعَلَلَ , because ٌفَعَلَلْنَ is an extraordinary measure,
no instance of which occurs without repetition [of the "
and \( \text{ع} \) (Sn)], as in \[273, 332, 396\], except \( \text{حَرْطَال} \) [396] and \( \text{كَفَّار} \) denoting [hard (Jh, KF)] stone, [to which the KF adds \( \text{كَسْكَال} \) dust and \( \text{حَرْطَال} \) oats (Sn).]
while \( \text{بَهْرَام} \) and \( \text{شَهْرَام} \) Bahram and Shahram are foreign (A) proper names: (c) not a duplicate, nor in the semblance of one, like the Hamza in \( \text{أَكْرَم} \) [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 \( \text{نَعْل} \) and \( \text{مُفَعْل} \) for the measure of \( \text{رَزَز} \) [331] and \( \text{مَرْدَن} \) repelling, respectively, because their o.f. is \( \text{رَزَز} \) and \( \text{مَرْدَن} \) (A); and similarly, as before mentioned, \( \text{قَام} \) and \( \text{شَدَد} \), because their o.f. is \( \text{قَوم} \) and \( \text{شُد} \); and so \( \text{هَاب} \) and \( \text{مُل} \), and \( \text{طَال} \) and \( \text{حَب} \) [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) \( \text{نَلَع} \) for [the measure of (Tsr)] \( \text{نَا} \) [pret. of \( \text{يَتَنَع} \) (Tsr), a dial. var. of \( \text{i. q. بَعَدَ} \) was far away (Jh)], because it is from \( \text{تَأَي} \) (Aud), the o.f. being \( \text{تَأَي} \); but the \( \text{ل} \), vid. the \( \text{ى} \), being transferred to the position of the \( \text{ع} \), vid. the Hamza, so that it becomes \( \text{نَيَا} \); and the \( \text{ى} \) then converted into \( \text{i} \) [684, 703], because mobile, and preceded by a
letter pronounced with Fath; so that it becomes ٌ with prolongation (Tsr): (2) عَالِفٌ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ۱ٌحَدَةٌ Алчади, because it is from unity (Aud), the o. f. being ف, but the ف, vid. the ج, being transferred to the position of the ج, vid. the د; and the ح then made to precede the ل, with which it is impossible to begin, so that it becomes ْعَالِذٌ; and the ح then converted into ی [685, 721], because occurring as a final after Kasra; so that it becomes عَالِذٌ (Tsr): (3) فَيِّلُ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ۱ٌحَدَةٌ یَهَبٌ [482, 699] (Aud), the ف of which is elided, the o. f. being یَوْهِبٌ, because it is orig. یَفْعَلُ with Kasr [of the و], and is afterwards pronounced with Fath because of the guttural letter; so that the elision is from یَفْعَلُ with Kasr: so says سد on ۱ٌحَدَةٌ [482] and its congener (Tsr): (4) ۱ٌلٌ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ۱ٌبَٔجٌ [703] (Aud), imp. of ۱ٌبَٔجٌ, the o. f. being ۱ٌبَٔجٌ, but its و being elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents [663] (Tsr): (5) ۱ٌلٌ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ۱ٌسَاضٌ [16] (Aud), the ل of which is elided, the o. f. being ۱ٌسَاضٌ, but its ل being elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents [663]. The measurement of some words is impracticable, like
because we consider the original vowel and quiescence; and, the \( \text{ت} \) in those [words] being orig. quiescent, while the \( \text{s} \) and \( \text{س} \) [also] are quiescent, a concurrence of two quiescents would ensue in the measure; so that the right course is to say \( \text{ت} \) for their measure, because they are orig. and \( \text{تر} \), the \( \text{s} \) and \( \text{س} \) 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 \( \text{اتن} \) [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 \( \text{اتن} \), which is aug., because it is elided in some of the variations (Tsr), since you say \( \text{قد} \) \( \text{قد} \) (A, Tsr), i.e., as in the KF (Sn), did as he did (KF, Sn); so that, by the elision of the \( \text{ت} \) [in \( \text{قد} \) \( \text{قد} \) and \( \text{قد} \)], you know that it is aug. in \( \text{اتن} \) was imitated, or was put on or worn (A). \( \text{اتن} \) is imitation; or putting on, or wearing, sandals (Tsr). One says \( \text{اتن} \) imitated him (A), [and] \( \text{اتن} \) imitated his example (Jh, KF), i.e. \( \text{اتن} \) (Jh, KF, A); and
The foot-sore barefooted man puts on any sandal, \( جدآ \) 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 \([253, 373]\) and the of \([392, 395]\) 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 \( قرَّنَفْل \), the of \( عقّال \), and the of \( عقّد \) are rads., notwithstanding that they are elided in \([482, 699]\), \( كَمْ يَعْفَرُ \) \([404, 719]\) (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 \( عقّد \) is excluded [from it], while such as the of \( قرَّنَفْل \) 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
rad., when elided for unsoundness, [like the $\text{ذ}$ of $\text{ذد}$ (A),] is constructively present, [contrary to the $\text{ا}$ (Tsr)]; while the $\text{ا}$, when inseparable, [like the $\text{ن}$ of $\text{تنقل}$ and the $\text{ك}$ (A),] is constructively elided. And therefore the $\text{ا}$ 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 o.f., like the elision of the $\text{ل}$ of $\text{لرب}$ [343, 369, 373] in its o.f., i.e., the inf. n. [331]; (b) a deriv. form, like the elision of the $\text{ل}$ of $\text{كتب}$ [above] in its pl. $\text{كتب}$ [246, 256]; (c) a counterpart, like the elision of the $\text{ي}$ of $\text{أ يطلب}$ [674] in $\text{طلب}$ [368], [which is like $\text{أ يطلب}$ in sense and crude-form (Sn)]: (a) the condition requisite, in order that elision of the letter from an o.f., a 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 $\text{م}$ in $\text{م أ يطلب}$ [above], or in $\text{م أ عدة}$ [401, 482, 699], it is not a indication of augmentativeness: (4, 5) the letter's occupying, in the non-deriv. [word containing it (Sn)], a position wherein it is $\text{ا}$ in the 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 $\text{ن يطلب}$ [675, 677], which is an evil, [a calamity, and
a great matter (KF),] which is thick in the hands and feet; and 'Asansar, which is a mountain, the ن in 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 n. [3], as is proved by what follows, derivation [here] being in the sense of mere taking (Sn), as جَكْنَفَلَ [393, 395] from جَحْشَلَة [677], which in the solid-hoofed [animal] is like هُفَة lip in man, جَكْنَفَلَ 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 أَنُكْلَ [18, 249] and أَرْنُبَ [249, 372] is judged to be aug., because made to accord with [the Hamza of] a word whose derivation is recognizable, as أَخَّرُ [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)] كَنْتَأَو (A), with which كَنْتَأَو [380] is synonymous (Sn); and of such as كَنْتَأَو، سَدَأَو، and كَنْتَأَو، حِنْطَأَو، 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 ُتَتْنَفُّلُ [372, 678] with Fath of the first ١, and Damm of the ف, meaning the young of the fox; for its [first] ١ is aug., because, if it were held to be rad., the measure of ُتَتْنَفُّلُ would be ُتَرْتُنَّلُ [392], which is not found: (b) the counterpart of the word to which that letter belongs, as in ُتَتْنَفُّلُ [372], according to the dial. of those who pronounce the [first] ١ and the ف with Damm; for its [first] ١ 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 ١ were held to be rad., the measure of ُتَتْنَفُّلُ would be ُتَرْتُنَّلُ, which is found, as ُبِرْتُنَّلُ [392], still unprecedentedness does ensue in its counterpart, i. e., the dial. var. with Fath; so that the ١, 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 aoristio letter [369, 404] and the ١ 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 ُتَتْنَفُّلُ [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 ُتَرْتُنَّلُ.
[with Damm of the second J (Sn)], like سَفَرُّ جُلُ, with Damm of the َج, which is not found [401]; and, on the assumption of its augmentativeness, is فَنْفُلْ [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 (IY),] as in ًأَرْنَبُ (M) and ًأَذْهَبُ, ًأَصْفَرُ [249], ًأُحْلَسُ [671] and ًأُنْكَلْ [671], I go and ًأَجْلَسُ I sit (IY), and ًأَكْرَمُ [671] (M): (a) that is because the Hamza, when initial, is prevalently
and frequently _aug._ in those words whose derivation is recognizable, as in _أَخْلَصُ_ [above], _صَفِرُ_ and _أَخْرَبُ_ [249], _إِلَيْفُ_ and _أَخْلُصُ_ [above], _إِلْخَرْبُطُ_ and _إِفْجِيلُ_ [379], from _حُمْرَةُ_ redness, _صَفْرَةُ_ yellowness, and _غَرْنَةُ_ greenness, _جَعُلَ_ went and _جُلْسَ_ sat., taking fright and fleeing, and _حْرَطُ_ defoliation; and is therefore decided to be _aug._ in those words of that class which are uncertain [in derivation], as _أَيْدّعُ_ and _أَرْتَبُ_ [above], _أَفْكُلُ_ and _أَرّْكَبُ_ [below], _أَبْلَّهُ_ (IV), _نِ. _ع. _وَلَمُ_ [372] (Jh), and _إِضْعَعُ_ [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 _أَفْكُلُ_ is said by them to be like _جَعُفْرُ_ [392]: but S refutes them by the argument that _أَفْكُلُ_ [18], if used as a name, would necessarily be diptote; whereas, if it were _تُعَلَّلُ_ [392], it would be triptote: and also that, if it were _تُعَلَّلُ_, a formation whose initial is Hamza would be allowable in the _conjug._ of _تُعَلَّلُ_, _أُورُ_ _يُعَلِّلِ_, _نِ. _يُعَلِّلُ_ (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 _مَمْعَةُ_ [374] and _مَمْمَرُ_ weak-minded (M), because there is no _نِ. _ع. _مَعْلُ_ ; while, if we judged
the Hamza in them to be *aug., the word would be of the cat. of *دَنَّ andُ كَوْكَبُ، which is rare, not to be acted upon (IY): (b) that both matters should be allowable, as in أَوَلِقِ [below] (M): (α) the Hamza, if accompanied by a letter that may be *aug., as in أَيْدَعُ [249, 674] andُ أَيْضَرُ a short tent-rop, 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 أَيْدَعُ the Hamza is *aug., because of what we have mentioned; and because they say َيْدَعَتْ I dyed it with أَيْدَعُ، inf. n. ُكَيْدَعٌ، [with elision of the Hamza,] this being a proof that the Hamza is *aug.: while in أَيِّضَرُ, 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. ُإِصَارُ، as ُرَيِّقَمْ دَأ بَيْنَهُ أَلَيْضَرَا And this unites between them the short tent-ropes; so that the elision of the َي is an indication that it is *aug. (IY): (α) 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 aug. [above], except by reason of some indication: but this is contrary to what 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 rad. or aug., the Hamza is judged to be aug., and that ambiguous [letter] to be rad., unless some indication exists to the contrary, for which reason the Hamza of أَنْفَعَى [673] and أَيْدَعَ [above] is judged to be aug.; but that, if some indication shows the Hamza to be rad., and that ambiguous [letter] to be aug., one judges accordingly, as the Hamza of أَلْقَى and أَرْطَى [below] is judged to be rad., according to those who say أَرْطَى مَأْرَوِطَ [673] and أَلْقَى, pass. part. مَأْلُوقُ [below]: (γ) such as أَرْطَى [673] is excluded [from the presumption that the Hamza in such a position is aug.], since أَرْطَى مَأْرَوِطَ and مَأْلُوقُ have been heard for dyed with [the leaves of (Jh on رُطَى) رُطَى: he that says رُطَى makes the Hamza rad., and the 1 aug.; while he that says مَأْرَوِطَ makes the Hamza aug., and the 1 a subst. for a rad. ى: and, according to the first, the measure of أَرْطَى is فَعَلَى أَرْطَى, its 1 being aug. for co-ordination; so that, if used as a name, أَرْطَى [18] would be diptote, because of the quality of proper name and [the 1 of (Sn)] quasi-femininization, [which is the 1 of co-ordination (Sn)]: while, according to the second, its
measure is َأَنْعَلِل 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 َأَرْطُطُ are more numerous [than those of َأَرْطُطُ], since they say َأَرْطُطُ َأَرْطُطُ I dyed the hide with [the leaves of] َأَرْطُطُ, and َأَرْطُطُ َأَرْطُطُ The camels ate َأَرْطُطُ, [act. part.] َأَرْطُطُ, as our Master has written after it (Sn), and َأَرْطُطُ َأَرْطُطُ The land produced َأَرْطُطُ; while َأَرْطُطُ َأَرْطُطُ The land produced َأَرْطُطُ, [inf. n. َأَرْطُطُ, as in the KF (Sn),] is also said: (8) similarly َأَرْطُطُ [above] (A): as for َأَرْطُطُ [674], which is a kind of madness (IY), it is said that (A) the Hamza [in it (IY)] is rad., [and the, aug. (A),] because they say َأَرْطُطُ َأَرْطُطُ The man was demented, [a pass. formation (Sn), i. q. َأَرْطُطُ (A),] pass. part. َأَرْطُطُ demented (IY, A), upon the measure of َأَرْطُطُ (Jh), which is a proof that the Hamza is rad., and the, aug. (IY); and its measure then is َأَرْطُطُ (IY, Sn), like َأَرْطُطُ [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 َأَرْطُطُ [above]; while in َأَرْطُطُ the Hamza may be orig. َأَرْطُطُ, which is converted into Hamza because pronounced with Damm, as in َأَرْطُطُ
for ٍُّ [683] (IY): and [it is said that (A)] may be ٍُّ (IY) from ٍُّ [an act. formation (Sn)], i. q. hastened (IY, A), whence hastened.

XXIV. 14. When ye were speaking it hastily with your tongues, [so read by 'A'isha (Jh),] and the saying of the poet [Al Kulakh Ibn Hazn (TA, MAJh)]

جاء مبتسم من أَلْشَامٍ تَلَقَّع

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 أَنْعَلُ (A); so that, if used as a name for a man, it would be diptote [18]: moreover they say لَقَعَ أَلْقَى for a swift charge, which shows that its ف is sometimes Hamza, and sometimes، as in ۛأَرْضَتْ أَلْبَابَ I shut the door and أَمْضَى (IY); but the first is preferable: (ε) similarly 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 أَمْضَى أَجْفَلَى [381]; and أَمْضَى، like حَوْزَلَى [380] (A): (2) rad., (a) when it [occurs as an initial, but] is followed by two rad. letters, as in ۗأَنْبَث [α shirt without sleeves (IY)] and ۜإِزَارُ a waist-wraper, [the paradigms of which one أَجْفَلَى فَعَلُ and، like حَبَلُ and جَبَّارُ، respectively (IY)]; or by four, as in إِضْطَبَلْ stable
[373]; (c)爬上[above], upon the measure of قماءل [246];
(d)爬上, with Fath of the ش; (e)爬上, with Fath of the م; (f)爬上, with quiescence of the م; (g)爬上, upon the measure of ضيفُل [253]; (h)爬上, upon the measure of طويل [246]; (i)爬上, upon the measure of طويل [246]; (j)爬上, 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) جوهرُ爬上, like شومُل [369] (Sn): (α) IU and others adduce, as evidence that the Hamza of爬上 is aug., their saying شملت آلل يخ爬上[above], meaning blew northerly; but it is objected that爬上 admits of being orig.爬上, [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爬上 [681. A], as爬上 His belly was swollen [482]. But from that [rule] is excepted the final Hamza after an ل 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 ل, and that this ل be preceded by more than two rads. [below], [whether the initial of its word be pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm (Tsr),] as in
\(1123\)

correct to [the Hamza of (Tsr)] such as \(\text{ذ م} \) and \(\text{ذ ش} \) [326, 688] (Aud), where the I is preceded by one rad. (Tsr); and ٣ a building [683] and ٣ [667] (Aud), where the I is preceded by two rads., not by more: and contrary to such as ٣ tidings, where the Hamza is not preceded by an I (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 I 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 I separated from the ٣ by a double letter, as in ٣ [prickles of the palm-tree (Sn)] and ٣ [below], or by two letters, one of which is a soft letter, as in ٣ ز ت و ٣ [273], admits of two alternatives, that the Hamza should be rad., and one of the two similars [in such as ٣ سلا and ٣ حROW \(\text{Sn})\] or the soft letter [in such as ٣ ز ر and ٣ ت و \(\text{Sn})\], should be aug.; or the converse. If, then, the Hamza be made rad., ٣ is ٣ فعال [from ٣ سلا I pulled off the prickles of the palm-trees (Jh)], and ٣ شوا خة snake-charmer is ٣ فعال from ٣ شوا خة collecting; while, if it be made aug., ٣ is ٣ فعال [from ٣ سلا pulled out (KF)], and ٣ ختا greenish black or
blackish red, [and Eve (MAZ, Nw, KF), Adam's wife (KF), the mother of mankind (MAZ, Nw),] is from đen (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 tên is judged to be aug. when đen is diptote (A), because the diptote declension indicates that it is the Hamza of feminization [263, 688], which is aug. (Sn); and rad. when đen is triptote, like đen denoting one that charms snakes: while the preferable [alternative] in đen is that its Hamza should be rad., because, in plants, đen is more numerous than đen [278]. If, then, IM had said "more than two rads", [as IHsh says in the Aus above,] it would have been better. The Hamza is made aug., in the n., when (1) first, as in a’zhar [372, 671]; (2) second, as in sambal [373]; (3) third, as in sambal [above]; (4) fourth, as in hutsamik [384], i. e., short; (5) fifth, as in huyr [385]; (6) sixth, as in yurriya [273, 399], which is a country; and (7) seventh, as in yurriya [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), [below] (248, 250], and (Aud) with Damm of the 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 كَـل [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 [below] [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 كَتَاب [247, 373], خَاتِم [below], فَتْنَى [below], سَرَدَاح [396], and [below] (M). If it accompany two rads. only, it is not aug.: but is either rad., as in لَي (below); or (IA)] a subst. for a rad. [i.e., (A)], as in كَـل [703] (IA, A) [and] بَـٰب [684], and دَّمَ [684], and رَحْي [16, 719] (A). But what is mentioned by [Z and] IM is [true] only in vs., and in [Arabic (Sn,
MKh) decl., [i.e., infl. (Sn),] ns., [whether prim. or deriv. (MKh)]: while in uninfl. [ns.], and in ps., the 1 is not judged to be aug. (A, MKh), with more than two rads., as in [501, 540] and مَهَمَّة [181]; or to be a subst. for another [letter], with less than two rads., as in لَوْي [500] and مَتَي [206]: but it is rad., unconverted (MKh): and similarly in foreign [676] names, like إِسْكْنَان (MKh) and Isaac (A): because that [augmentativeness or substitution] is recognizable only by derivation, which is lacking (A, MKh) in what is [here] mentioned (MKh). The 1 is made aug., (1) [in the n. (A),] when (a) second, as in ضَارِب [671]; (b) third (IY, A, Tsr), as in كَتَاب [below] (IY, A); (c) fourth (IY, A, Tsr), as in حُبَلَى [below] and سَرْدَاح [above] (A); (d) fifth (IY, A, Tsr), as in جِلْبَلْاب (IY, A), a plant (Jh, IY), which the vulgar name convolvulus (Jh); (e) sixth, as in ُقُبُعْرُى [below] (IY, A, Tsr) and ُكُبْرَارُى [671] (IY); (f) seventh (A, Tsr), as in بُرَكَرَأْيَا [272] (Tsr): (2) in the v., when (a) second, as in نَاتِل [490]; (b) third, as in ُعَقَانِل [482, 483, 487, 678]; (c) fourth, as in سُلْقَي [482]; (d) fifth, as in إِجَلْلَي [The horse (Sn)] was of dark chesnut color; (e) sixth, as in إِعْرَنَدُي overcome [432, 496] (A). But [the 1, when it accompanies more than two
rads. in (Tsr) the reduplicated quad. (674), [whose first J is homogeneous with its ف, and whose second J is homogeneous with its ع (Sn),] such as ضَرْوَضَى [674] (A, Tsr) shouted in battle (Sn), and عَعَعَى [674] (A) chid sheep, saying عَا or عَا or عَا (Sn), is excepted [from IM's language (A)]: for the I here [i.e., the I of ضَرْوَضَى, as also each of the two Is, the first and the second, of عَعَعَى (Sn),] is a subst. for a rad., [their measure being فً (Sn)]; and is not aug. (A, Tsr). When the I 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 I is aug.; and, if it be assumed to be aug., the I is non-aug.: but, if the ambiguous be an initial Hamza [672] or م [676], as in اَنْعَى viper [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 كَفَّقَى, [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 I to be converted from a rad., so long as no indication shows these letters to be rad., and the I to be aug., as in اَرْطَى [below], according to those who say اَرْطَى مَارِطُ, meaning a hide dyed with مَعْرَى [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 *rad.*, and the l to be *aug.* (A). The l does not occur as a co-ordinative, except when final, as in دَرَأَ [below] (M), سَلَقَ [482], and جَقَبَى [below] 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 كَتَابُ [671] is not said to be co-ordinat-ed with دِمَقَسَ *silk* (IY), like عَدَأَرْ [392] (KF); nor عَدَأَرْ [395, 677] to be co-ordinated with فَلَدَعْلُ [401]: because the unsound letter, when it occurs as a medial, and is pre-ceded by a vowel homogeneous with it, like the 

and the 

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 l is made an *aug.* of three kinds, (1) co-ordinative, as in أَرْطَى [248, 272, 326, 375, 671, 672] and مَعُزَى [272, 375, 671, 676], which are co-ordinated by the l with جَقَبَى and دِمَقَسَ [392], respectively:

(a) what indicates that the l is *aug.* in أَرْطَى is their saying أَرْطَى [above], the elision of the l in مُأْرَطَ [above] being an indication that it is *aug.*; while their saying مَعُزَى [above] and مَعُزَى [255, 257] is an indication that the l is *aug.* in مَعُزَى: (b) their saying أَرْطَى and مَعُزَى with Tanwim 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 شهر [below]: (a) moreover ٍ [258], has been heard from them, with affixion of the ی 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 مُـعْرَى is not for feminization is their making it masc., as مَعْرَى هَدِبَ الدَّمْحُ [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 شهر [18, 248, 272, 375], and جمادى Jumādā [328]: (a) what indicates that the ٍ here is aug. is the derivation, since شهر is from حُبَّلَى pregnancy, شهر from سَكَرَى drunkenness, and جمادى from جَمَادَى 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 قبَعِترَى [272, 326, 401, 497, 671], and سُمَّانَى [311], and كَتَّرَى, بَاَلِلَى, حَاَنَى, كَتَّرَى, [401, 671], and quail, a kind of bird: (a) the 1 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 بَافِلَةٍ a bean and سُمَّانَى 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 كَتَّرَى قبَعِترَى [IY]), it is like the 1 of كِتَابٍ [401], because it exceeds the limit (M). Z means that the 1 in كَتَّرَى and قبَعِترَى 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 كِتَابٍ and حَمَارٍ [671] (IY).
§. 674. The ی [below] and و [675] are similar (IM) to the ل [673], in that each of them, when it accompanies more than two rads., is judged to be aug. (A), as in قَنْتَيْل [269, 347] and مقترح [347] (Sn), if they do not occur [repeated (A),] as they are in بَيْرَجُ (IM), the name of a bird [of prey (Jh),] having talons, that resembles the بَاَشْق sparrow-hawk (A), and وَعَعَ (IM), i.e., made a noise, in which sort [of formation] all the letters are judged to be rad., like the letters of ذْسَسم [671] (A); and if they be not initial, the , unrestrictedly, according to the majority [675]; and the ی before four rads., in any [formation] other than the aor. [below], as A will mention (Sn). The division previously made in the ل [673] applies here also, so that we say:— the ی and و have three states: for, (1) if either of them accompany two rads. only, it is rad., as in سُوَلَتِ and بَيْت [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 م [676], the initial is judged to be aug., and the ی or و to be rad., as in لَدْنَع [672] and وَمَوَ (372), the bag for the traveller's provisions (Sn),] unless some indication shows (a) the
initial to be rad., and the ی or ی to be aug., as in ~

[672] according to those who say یـ and یـئ٢; and as in یـئ٢ [671], because of their saying یـئ٢: or (b) the whole to be rad., as in یـهیم Mary [the mother of Jesus (Nw)], and یـی٢ Midian [a well-known district in Syria (Bk)], their measure being یـئ٢; not یـئ٢, because it is not [found] in the language; nor یـئ٢ [below], otherwise transformation [of the unsound letter] would be necessary (A), since یـئ٢ and یـئ٢ [712] would be said, by transferring the vowel of the ی to the preceding quiescent, and then converting the ی into ی because orig. mobile, and now preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath: (α) this requires یـهیم to be an Arabic name, otherwise no judgment as to radicalness or augmentativeness could be passed upon [the letters in] it, because of what A has previously mentioned [673] (Sn): (β) IAl says that (Jh) the measure of (K, B) on II. 81. یـهیم is یـئ٢ [above] (Jh, K, B), according to the GG (K), from یـئ٢ یـئ٢ (Jh), because یـئ٢ [with Fath of the ی (K)] is not found (K, B) among the formations, as یـئ٢ and یـئ٢ [874] are found (K): (γ) [some say that] یـهیم is a foreign name (ID, Jk), there being no یـئ٢, with Fath of the ی and ی, 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 ه or و to be aug., so long as no indication shows the
contrary of that, as in (α) يَهْيَر [with the doubled
(Jh, Sn)], which is hard stone; and says IS, one of the
names of أَبَاطِلُ the vain, unreal, naught; and is said to
be the mirage, as أَكْدَبْ مِنْ أَلْيَهْيَرٍ Falser than the mirage
(A): (α) IS says that they sometimes add an I to it,
saying يَهْيَر [272] (Jh, Md, A): (β) the letter which,
but for the indication of augmentativeness, would be
ambiguous, is the first ه (Sn): (γ) the first ه is decided
to be aug. (A), [so that] يَعْفُل (Jh, Md), because
نَعْفَل is not found in the language (Jh, Md, A), while
there is no obscurity about the augmentativeness of the
ه in such as يَحَتْر is red (A): (δ) the هs are not
both rad., because ه is not rad. with trils. in the non-
reduplicated: nor are they both aug., because a ه is not
formed of two letters: nor is the second ه the aug.,
because نَعْفَل, with Fath of the ه, is not found in the
language; while نَعْفَل, which is found, has Kasr of the
ه; so that, if the second ه were aug., يَهْيَر, with Kasr of
the initial, would be said, like هَيْيَر [374] and هَيْيَر skil-
ful: and therefore the first must be the aug. (ΙY):
(b) عَزْوِرُ [675], which is the name of a place;
and is said to be also [an ep., meaning] short: (α) the,
is decided to be rad., and the ی [below] and َ is aug. because its measure cannot be َ, since this is not found in the language; nor َ, because the َ is not rad. in quads. [675]; nor َ, because the word becomes without َ: so that its measure must be َ.

like َ [646] (A): (B) A’s mention of the ی [in ] as aug. is unnecessary, since it is not imagined [by any one] to be rad. (Sn). When three rads. other than the ی are found, the ی is aug., whether it be at the beginning, as in رَلَع [below] and يَضْرُب َ strikes [404]; or in the middle, as in رَأَلَع [349] and ِقَلِبَق [calamity (MAR)]; or at the end, as in أَلْبَالَيِ جَ [255]. And similarly with four or more rads., when the ی is non-initial, as in سَلْسَسِبَل, َسَلْسَسِبَل [398], َسَلْسَسِبَل [368, 401], and َسَلْسَسِبَل [399]: whereas, if it be initial, with four rads. after it, then, if the word be a v., like يُدْخُرِج َ rolls down [404], in this case also the ی is aug.; but, if not, it is rad., as in يُتَسْتَغْفُر [below] (R). The ی is made aug., (1) in the n., when (a) first, as in يُجِلَع [mirage (Sn)]; (b) second, as in َصِيَفِم [373]; (c) third, as in َصِيَفِم [385]; (d) fourth, as in َصِيَفِم [385]; (e) fifth, as in َصِيَفِم [above]; (f) sixth, as in َمَقْباَطْيِس magnet, lode-stone, [which is arabicized (Jh, KF)]; (g) seventh,
as in حُنْزُرَاتِي (with a single ى, meaning pride (Sn)) : (2) in the v., when (a) first, as in یَضَرِّبُ [above]; (b) second, as in یَبْطُر [671]; (c) third, according to those who authorized یَفَعَّلُ لَفْمَيْنَ [482] among the formations of vs., as [بَلْسَيَّا رَأْيَة] His judgment was unsound and (A on the Augmented Triliteral Verb)] یَفَعَّلْ (A), i.e., عُلِّطَ 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.] یَفَعَّلْ, 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 یَفَعَّلْ كْلَسَيْنَ I put on him a cap [675], where یَفَعَّلْ كْلَسَيْنَ [482] also is said (Sn); (e) fifth, as in یَفَعَّلْ كْلَسَيْنَ I wore a cap; (f) sixth, as in یَفَعَّلْ كْلَسَيْنَ [482, 483] (A), i.e., I slept on my back (Sn). The following are [additional] exs. of the aug. یَدْرَمُ یَنَفِّدُ یَفْعِدُ یَفْعُدُ [372]; and, in the v., یَفْعُدُ sits [482]: (2) when second, یَصِرُّفُ [373]: (3) when third, یَسَعُیدُ [671]: (4) when fourth, دِهْيِلُ یَنْقَبُ [385], یَسُتِبَعُ vestibule, [which is Persian (Jh, Jk), arabicized (Jh),] and یَنَدِیلَ [396]: (5) when fifth, یَبْسَى کْبَتُ [283]: (6) when sixth, یَبْسَى کْبَتُ.
[283] and عَدَّةٌ كَيْبَتٌ dim. and broken pl. of ُعَتْكَّبُرٌ [678], according to what As transmits. We know the ی to be aug. in all of that, because it is not rad. in words of three or more [rad.] letters. As for صِصَبَةٌ spur [of the cock (Jh, KF)], the two ی s in it are rad., even though three rad. letters are with you, because the word is compounded of صٍ twice [uttered]; so that the first ی is rad., lest the word remain with [only] one letter, vid. the ص; and, since the first ی is rad., the second ی also is rad., because it is the first repeated.

And hence حَاجَتْ I called [goats (Jh, KF)] [673], where the ی is rad., because it is the first repeated; while their measure is ُعَلْدَتْ, the o. f. being ُحَيْجَتْ and ُعَيْقُتْ, but the first ی being converted into ی because of the Fatha before it, as they say ُبَيْنَج یاَجْلُ [684]. And similarly ُخَمْصَتْ I clucked and ُخَمْصَتْ [673], where the second ی is rad., because it is the first [و ] repeated, their o. f. being ُخَمْصَتْ and ُخَمْصَتْ and ُخَمْصَتْ, the second [و ] of which is converted into ی, because it occurs fourth, as in ُخَمْصَتْ and ُخَمْصَتْ and ُخَمْصَتْ [629]. If it be said "Then why is it not aug., as in ُثَلْقَتْ and ُثَلْقَتْ [673]?", the reply is that, if this were so, ُخَمْصَتْ and ُخَمْصَتْ and ُخَمْصَتْ would become of the cat. of ُخَمْصَتْ was agitated, sturred and ُئَلْسَ سَلْقٍ was loose, slack, which is small, while the cat. of ُخَمْصَتْ and ُخَمْصَتْ [332] is
more numerous, and only the more numerous is acted upon. And, if it be said "Then make the \( \textit{aug.} \), as in \( \textit{I collected} \) \[675\] and \[482\]," the reply is that, if this were done, they would become of the \textit{cat.} of \( \textit{كَوْكُب} \) and \( \textit{ف} \) \[357, 671\], whose \( \textit{ع} \) and \( \textit{س} \) and \( \textit{تَيَّقِيق} \) \{above\} \{IV\}. When the \( \textit{i} \) is initial, then, if followed by three \textit{rads.}, it is \textit{aug.}, as in \( \textit{يَلَعْ} \) \{above\}; but, if followed by four \textit{rads.}, in any \{formation\} other than the \textit{aor.} \{above\}, it is \textit{rad.}, like the \( \textit{ي} \) in \[401, 678\] \{A\}, upon the measure of \( \textit{فَعْلُول} \) \[401\] \{Su\}, because the derivation does not indicate augmentativeness in such cases, except in the \textit{aor.} \[404, 497\] \{A\}, like \( \textit{يَسَتَفْعُر} \) \{above\} \{Su\}. \( \textit{يَسَتَفْعُر} \) \{in the poem of \textit{Urwa} \{Jh\} Ibn AlWard al\'Absi, who says

\begin{quote}
I obeyed those who bade (me) to part from Salmā: then they fled away into the regions of AlYasta'ār \{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 \textit{tree}, \{the wood of\} which is used for tooth-picks \{Jrb, A\}, its tooth-picks being extremely good \{KF\}; and a \textit{cloth} put upon the crupper of the camel; and one of the
names of calamities (Jrb); and [i. q. الْبَاطِلَةَ the vain, unreal, naught, because (R)] ْذَهَبَ فِى الْيَسْتَغْفِرُ He, or It, went into, i. e., came to, naught is said (R, Jrb), i. o., الْبَاطِلٌ (Jrb). As for ْيَأْتِجْجُ ْيَأْتِجْجُ ْيَأْتِجْجُ Ya’tjaj, which is the name of a place [eight miles from Makka (MI)], the ْيَأْتِجْجُ at its beginning is rad., that being indicated by the display of the reduplication; whereas, if the ْيَأْتِجْجُ were ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر would be from ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر aor. ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر; and it would be necessary to incorporate, and say ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر [482], like ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر is choked and ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر lowers: so that, since they do not incorporate, this indicates that the last ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر is aug., for co-ordination with the paradigm of ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ 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)] ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر with Kasr, saying ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر: and, if what they transmit be correct, the ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر is aug., because there is no ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر, with Kasr of the ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر, in the language; and the display of the reduplication is anomalous, of the same class as [in] مَهْبَبُ Mahbob [4] (IY).

§ 675. The ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر, like the ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر [673], is not made aug. when initial: and their saying ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر [671, 677] is like ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر [671] (M), the ْأَرْجَجَجَجْ جَعْفَر in it being part of the word
itself; while the ن [677] is aug., co-ordinating [it] with سَفْرُ جَدْل [393, 401], its measure being فَعْلَٰكَ [395] (IY). The opinion of the majority [674] is that the ج 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 دامم, it would be regularly convertible into هامزا [683]; and similarly when pronounced with كسر, although conversion of the ج pronounce with كسر into هامزا is less frequent; and, when pronounced with فتح, it would be liable to conversion into هامزا, because the initials of the الن and ج are pronounced with دامم in the ديم. [274] and pass. [436, 482], respectively: so that, since making it aug. at the beginning would lead to its conversion into هامزا, they avoid doing so, because conversion of the ج into هامزا would sometimes occasion confusion (A) with the word whose [initial] هامزا is original, unconverted, as in ج کُل left, which, in the pass. [ج کُل was left], is liable to conversion of the ج into هامزا, in which case it would be confounded with ج اکُل was eaten, the هامزا of which is راد. (Sn). Some, however, assert that the ج of ج زَرَّنُتْ [above] is aug., extraordinarily, because the ج is not راد. in قدس. : but this is weak, because it leads to the formation زَرَّنُتْ, which is not found; while the correct [opinion] is that the ج is راد., and that the ن is aug., as in ج نَصْبٌ 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. 681 (Sn), and in i. q. a worn-out garment (Sn), since there are precedents for
the augmentativeness of the ج when final, contrary to the augmentativeness of the و when initial (A). When not initial, [but medial, with three or more rad. letters (iy),] it is only aug., as in عَوْسَجْ
[373] and دُهْرَرَ قَسْوَرَ جُلَّٰION [253] and [threw into a pit (iy),] 283, 385, 389, and 254; 390, 674, except when that [indication of radicalness] intervenes which is [found] in عَوْسَجْ
[674] (M). In that [position as medial, with three or more rads.,] it occurs (1) second, as in جَوْهْر [369] and صَوْمَع [674]; (2) third, as in جَذَرْل [671] and رَجَلْعَلْرَآجْلَ. The man swaggered in his walk; (3) fourth, as in عَنْفُوْعَ جَرَّوْتَ عَنْفُوْعَ جَرَّوْتَ [above], 368, 401 and 398, 676 (iy). The و is made aug.: (1) in the n., when (a) second, as in كُوَّر [671]; (b) third, as in عَنْفُوْعَ 369, 673; (c) fourth, as in عَنْفُوْعَ 248, 301; (d) fifth, as in عَنْفُوْعَ [above]; (e) sixth, as in أُبْعَأَرَى 272 (A), with دَمَم of the Hamza and ب, as in the KF; but with فَث of the Hamza on the authority of Syt and Dm (Sn): (2)
in the v., when (a) second, as in حَرْقَل [above]: (b) third, as in جَهْرَ [482, 671] (A), i.e., raised his voice: (a) as for ُ جَهْرَ جَهَّر [392], it is the name of a place (Sn): (c) fourth, as in إِفْتُرُونَ [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. [258] (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 Ḥadrad, the Companion (KF),] إِمْتَازُوا إِمْتَازُوا إِمْتَازُوا Imitate the sons of Ma‘add is cited as evidence that the م of مَعَدَ [375] is rad.; while such as
[332, 482, 483], and are not taken into account (M), being rare, like the [v.] derived from the n. by means of an augment, as He said سَبَّحَ اللَّهُ I. 1. [141, 504]. On the whole, however, the م when initial is aug. more often than the Hamza when initial (IY). It is universally made aug. 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 مَمْبِيج مَمْبِيج [below] the name of a city, is aug., and n rad., since you may not make them both rad., because there is no مَعْفِر with Kasr of the ف among o. fs.; nor both aug., because the inf. word would remain with [only] two letters, the ب and ج : so that one of them must be rad., and the other aug.; and we judge the م to be aug., because the ن [677] is rarely aug. when second (Jrb). مَمْبِيج مَمْبِيج [below] is made to accord with مُقْتَل [671] and مَضْرَب [333, 361] the unknown being made to accord with the known. And, as for مَعْد [above] and مَعْد [875, 678], their predicament, and their variance from this rule, have been already mentioned (R). The derivation of مَعْد is from [one of] two things, مَعْد being either مَعْد from عَدَد number, as though it were مَعْد.
and then the were incorporated; or [transferred] from [4], 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 مَعْنَٰٰى صَلَابَةٗ hardness (ID). As for معْزَى [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 Arabs make the part of the word itself (Jk)]: so that its م is rad., because of their saying مَعْزَى and معْزَى [673], which are معْزَى and معْزَى; whereas, if the معْزَى were aug., and those paradigms were formed from it, معْزَى and معْزَى would be said (IY). The م 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 معْزَى [361] and معْزَى [above], [which, says Jh, is the name of a place (Tsr),] contrary to such as (a) مَهْدُ [lion, because the م is not initial (Tsr)]; (b) مَهْدُ [cradle, because the م is not followed by three rads. (Tsr)]; (c) مْرَزْجِبَشَ [below] (Aud), i. q. مْرَزْجِبَشَ marjoram, [the arabicized form of مْرَزْجِبَشَ dead ear, the م of which they pronounce with Fath (KF),] a sweet-smelling plant, because the م is not followed by three rads. only, but by more (Tsr);
and (d) َثِيْرَةٍ َعَزَّ (soft wool (Tsr)), because they say َثِيْرَةٍ َعَزَّ a garment made of soft wool, retaining the َعَزَّ [inseparably (Tsr)] in derivation (Aud), with which [argument] IM refutes the saying of S that the َعَزَّ in it is aug. [below]. It is also a condition of the augmentativeness of the َعَزَّ that its word should not be a quad. composed of two letters [repeated], like َثِيْرَةٍ marble, alabaster and َعَزَّ َمِهِّمَةٍ 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 َعَزَّ of َمِرْجَعُ [a comb, and a cooking-pot of stone or copper (Sn)], َعَزَّ manna, [a thing, like honey, exceeded by the َعَزَّ panic-grass, َعَزَّ gigantic swallow-wort, and َعَزَّ dwarf-tamarisk (Sn),] and َعَزَّ [272] (A) or َعَزَّ [above] or َعَزَّ [273], with Kasr, and sometimes Fath, of the َعَزَّ in all (Sn), which is judged to be rad., although it is followed by three rads. [only]. As for َعَزَّ [above], the opinion of S and most GG is that its َعَزَّ is rad., because of their saying َعَزَّ َمَرْجَعٌ The weaver wove the cloth decorated with figured work called َمَرْجَعٌ [below] (A); whereas, if the َعَزَّ were aug., they would say َعَزَّ by eliding it (Sn): IKh says "The َعَزَّ is a cloth
worked with circles like the مَرَاجِلُ [above], which are cooking-pots of copper” (A), or of stone (Sn). But AAMr holds that the م of مَرَاجِلٍ is aug., relying upon the rule mentioned; and pronounces its retention in derivation to be like the retention of the م in تَمَسَّكَنٍ [above] from مَسَكَنَةٍ lowliness, from تَمَسَكَنٍ [379], and put on the مِدْرَعَةٍ tunic, where the م is aug.; though he has no argument in that, because the most frequent [formation] is تَسْكَنٍ [483], تمَسَكَنٍ, and تمَسَكَنٍ, which, Mz says, is the most frequent in the language of the Arabs. As for منْقَرَنٍ [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 كَهْبُوا يَتَفَقَّرُونَ They went gathering منْقَرَنٍ [above], which is [here said by A to be] a kind of truffle. And as for مُرْعَيْنٍ [above], S holds its م to be aug. [above]: but some, and among them IM, hold it to be rad., because of their saying كِسَاءُ مُرْعَيْنٍ wrapper made of مُرْعَيْنٍ (A); while IM, says IUK, avers that S is bound to agree that it is rad. in مُرْعَيْنٍ, 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 م is not judged to be *aug.*, except by reason of some [plain (R)] indication, as in (1) [384, 681.A] (R,A); دَلْامِصُ, دَمْلِصُ, دَمْلِصُ [below] (A) in some MSS, but, in other MSS, دَلْامِصُ [below], and دَمْلِصُ, دَلْامِصُ [all with دَمْلِصُ], Fath of the second, and Kasr of the penultimate (Sn),] because of their saying دَرَعُ دِلَامِصُ [246] or دَلْامِصُ, and I made it glitter: (a) Mz holds that the م in دَلْامِصُ [and its fellows, adds IUK (Sn),] is rad., although دَلْامِصُ agrees with دَلاَمِصُ in sense; so that according to him, it is of the cat. of سَبْطُ long, extended and سَبْطُ [245, 392, 679, 681] (A), i.e., of syns. agreeing in the bulk of the letters, the ر not being *aug.*, but rad., since it is not one of the letters of سَلَتْسُوتُهَا [671], nor a duplicate of a rad. (Sn): (b) as for قَبَارْضُ sour, as لَبَيْنِ قَبَارْضُ sour milk, as though it يَقُرُّ الْإِلْسَانِ were biting the tongue, the م 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 إنَفَخْلُ and إِنَزَهُو [382] are *aug.*, because of their saying وَرَخَ عَنْهُ and تَحَلُّلُ 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 هَرْمَاسُ also,
which, according to what As transmits, is a name of the lion, is aug., its paradigm being

कः, according to what As transmits, is a name of the lion, is aug., its paradigm being

कः, because it is

कः from 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 [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 म is aug. here (IV) : (2) जःतः [below] (R, A) and its cat., [i.e., every tril. to whose final म is added for multiplication of the letter, and intensification of the sense (Sn),] as देलिक्ष, [667, 671] स्तेम [an old woman, and an aged she-camel whose teeth are broken (Sn)], [like जय चर, (392), a she-camel aged, or having some remains of youth in her, or old and giving little milk (Sn),] [a spacious place, and a man easy in mind (Sn)], and [with Kasr of the two त, a woman that comes and goes by night, and an aged she-camel (Sn)], because they are from जःतः blueness, स्तेम coming out, जःतः niggardly and नःः णिसः a she-camel giving little milk, नःः णिसः being spacious, and दःः दः losing one's teeth, becoming toothless, the qual. from which is अःः दः toothless and
.., 0,

..,)

(A), on the measure of \(ك \) [848] (Sn). When the \(م\) precedes three letters, one of which admits of being \(rad\.) or \(aug\.), the \(م\) is judged to be \(aug\.), and that ambiguous [letter] to be \(rad\.), unless some indication exists to the contrary: and therefore the \(م\) of مَوسَى [673] and مِزْرَد [674] is judged to be \(aug\.); while, as to the \(م\) of مِكْسَن [shield (Sn)], two sayings are transmitted from S, the sounder of which is that it is \(aug\.:\) but, if some indication shows the \(م\) to be \(rad\.,\) one judges in accordance therewith, as the \(م\) of مَهْدَد مَهْدَد Mahdad, [a woman's name (Sn),] and مَأْجَج مَأْجَج Ma'jaj, [a place (Sn),] is judged to be \(rad\.), and one of the two similar letters to be \(aug\.,\) since, if the \(م\) were \(aug\.,\) the measure would be مَفْعُوَل so that incorporation would be necessary [712]; though Sf allows the \(م\) of مَأْجَج مَأْجَج to be \(aug\.,\) their dissolution [of incorporation] being anomalous, like that of مَأْجَج مَأْجَج in مَأْجَج مَأْجَج (A), by Abu-nNajm al'Ijli, Praise be to God, the High, the Most Great, the Giver of bounty, the Liberal Giver, the Munificent! (MN, Jsh). When the \(م\) precedes four or more \(rads.,\) as in مَرْزُّوُجَش مَرْزُّوُجَش (above) or mouse-ear marjoram, [the arabicized form of مَزْرَكْتوُش مَزْرَكْتوُش (KF),] it is judged to be \(rad\.,\) except when the word containing it is one of the \(ns.\) connected with \(vs.\) [330,]
like an act. part. [343], and a pass. part. [347] and a n. of time or place [363] (R). As for [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 عَضْرُ مُطْرَكَّة [368, 401]; and its paradigm being مُنْطَلْق. And, as for مَنْكَبِنِيِّقُ ballista, the م in it is rad., and the ن after it aug., because they say in its pl. مَكْبَانِيِّقُ [283] and مَكْبَانِيِّقُ, 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 مُسْتَخْرُجُ [382] and مُسْتَخْرُجُ [387]. This is the opinion of S and Mz; and, according to them, its measure is فَتَعَلَّمَ لِكَ, like عَتْرِيسُ [283, 290, 674]. Others, however, say that the first ن and the م are augs., together, inasmuch as some of the Arabs say جَنْقَاهُمُ مَارِئَا نَحْيِنِقُ meaning We shot them with the ballista, while AU transmits from some of the Arabs مَعِينَا نَحْيِنِقُ We have not ceased to shoot with the ballista; and, according to this, its measure is مُنْفَعِيْلُ: but the correct
opinion is that of S, because of their saying, in the broken pl., مَجَالِيِّقُ [above] (IY). The م is made aug. when (1) first, as in مَرَحْبٌ spaciousness [60]: (2) second, as in دُمِلْصُ [above]: (3) third, as in دُمِلْصُ [above]: (4) fourth, as in ١زَرْقُ [above]: (5) fifth, as in ١ضِبَارِمُ sturdy, strongly made, because it is from قَسِيرٌ, which is strength of make; but IU holds that in ١ضِبَارِمُ it is rad. : (a) Jh says in the سَهَبٍ "The ١ضِبَارِمُ 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 l, and that this l be preceded by more than two rads. [below], the substantive and ep. being alike in that respect (Tsr), as in ١عُشْبَانُ [250, 274, 385] and ١عَضْبَانٌ [250, 348]; contrary to such as ١سَمَانْ protection and ١سَمَانْ spear-head (Aud), where the l 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 l 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 جنجبان [with Kasr of the first ج, orig. جنجبان head of a rib, like سَبْسَم (below) (Sn),] is rad., not aug.: and this condition is imported [above] from IM's saying "And judge [all (IA)] the letters of سَبْسَم [671, 674] to be rad." (A), because جنجبان is orig. جنجبان, like سَبْسَم, 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 غَضْبان [272], as غَضْبان [above], سَكْران [250; 348, 385], and سَكْران [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 [ن in substantives, such as عَمْرَان [4] and عَمْرَان [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 مُرَأَة (with Damm, a tree of which spears are made (Jh on مُرَأَة), spears, n. un. مُرَأَة (Jh on مُرَأَة),] is rad.; and that ن is [فعَال مُرَأَة (Jh)] from مُرَأَة i. q. لَيْس مُرَأَة softness, smoothness: (α) مَرَأَن, with Fath [of its first (Bk)] and doubling [of its second (Bk)], is the name of مَرَأَن.
a place (Jrb), [a journey of] two nights from Makka, on the road to AlBa'ra, wherein is the grave of Tamim Ibn Murr (Jh): (e) as for ُقَيْنَانَ [having beautiful long hair (MAR)], the derivation teaches us that three rads., exclusively of the ل and ن, are not attainable in the word, since it is [فَنَنَ (T)] from [branch (T), lock of hair, tress]; and similarly in حَسَّانُ Hassan [below] and حَمْارُ قِبَانِ [7], when triptote, we recognize, by the triptote declension, that the ن is one of the three rads. (R): (f) حَسَّانُ [below] is either from ُقَيْنَامَ (T) meaning Killed the people quickly, aor. ُقَيْنَةً, inf. n. ُحَسَّةٌ; or from حَسَّةٌ beauty: and, if it be from ُحَسَّةٌ, the ن is rad.; but, if it be from ُحَسَّةٌ, the ن is aug. (ID): analogy requires the ن to be aug., and حَسَّانُ to be diptote, in accordance with the most frequent [usage, vid. that the ل and ن, when final, are aug.]; but it may be derived from حَسَّةٌ, in which case the ن is rad., and it is triptote: (g) حَمْارُ قِبَانِ is properly قَبَانُ [from قَبْنَ ِذَهْبُ went away through the land, i. q. ذَهْبُ (IY on §. 7)], and diptote: but it may be ذَهْبَ i. q. ذَهْبُ [above]; and, according to this, it is triptote, because the ن in it is rad. (IY): (h) the looseness of IM's language [in the Alfiya, "And the ن at the end is like the Hamza" (672),]
requires the ن to be clearly aug. in the case where a double letter, as in حسَّان [above] and زَمَان pomegranate [below], or a [sound] letter and a soft letter, as in عُقْيَان [native gold (Sn)] and عَنْوَان superscription, title are interposed between the ف and the ن; and this looseness is in agreement with the opinion of the majority, who judge the ن in such as حَسَّان and عُقْيَان to be aug., unless some indication shows it to be rad., because the diptote declension of حَسَّان in the saying of the poet [Umayya Ibn Khalaf alKhuzâ‘i, satirizing Hassân (MN, Sn) Ibn Thâbit alAnšârî (MN)].

Now who will be conveying to Hassân from me a message carried from town to town, that will creep to ‘Ukâz? (MN, Sn)] shows its ن to be aug.: but in the Tashîl and the Kâfiya 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 augmentativeness of the ن when final, vid. that it should not be in a n. whose first is pronounced with Damm, and whose second is doubled, when [such n. is] a name of a plant, as زَمَان [above], in which case they make it rad., because نَفَال in names of plants is more frequent
than 

and IM adopts this [opinion] in the Kāfiya: but it is refuted by the fact that augmentativeness of the ٌ and ٍ, when final, is more frequent than the occurrence of [the name of] a plant upon [the measure of] ٌۖ;

while the opinion of Khl and S is that the ٍ of ـٌ is aug.: S says "I asked him", i.e., Khl, "about ـٌ 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 ٌ and ٍ (Sn),] 'since it has no meaning whereby it is recognizable', [i.e., because it has no sign whereby the state of its ٍ is recognizable (Sn)]: (j) Akh, however, says "Its ٍ is rad., like [the final of] ٌۖ [chamomile (Sn)] and ٌۖ [384], because ٌۖ is more frequent than ٌۖ", 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 ٌ and ٍ, when final, is more frequent than the occurrence of (the name of) a plant upon (the measure of) ٌۖ (Sn)]; but because the ٍ is retained in derivation, as ٌۖ [364]; whereas, if the ٍ were aug., they would say ٌۖ (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 [lion (Tsr)], [384, 671, 675]; contrary to ambergris, [where it is preceded by one letter, and followed by two (Tsr),] stork, crane, [an aquatic bird, long in the neck, where it is mobile, not quiescent (Tsr),] and [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, (a) that it there occurs in the place of what is certainly aug., like the of سَيْدَع [395], the of جُضْدِبْ [395], and the of عَدَادِرْ [395, 673] and [395]; (b) that it is mostly interchangeable with the soft letter, as in their saying شَرْبَتْ [671] and شَرَبَتْ [671]; (c) that it is found to be aug. in every [word] whose derivation or variation is known, [such as جَرَانْسَان (Sn)] and جَرَانْسَان [400] for a plant; (b) they say عْرَقْصَان [392, 395], 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 [392], with elision of the 
[first] ن: (c) they say صَدَبُ عَرَنَدَد i. q. *hard*, 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. عَرَنَدَد (below)]; while the 
last also is *aug.*, co-ordinating سَفَرَجَلُ عَرَنَدَد [401] (IX): (d) the first restriction [mentioned by IHSh 
above, vid. that the ن should be medial,] excludes the ن 
occuring as an initial [below], which is *rad.*, as in نَهْضُل [wolf (Sn)]; unless some indication decide it to be *aug.*, 
as in نُرْجِسَ narcissus, [681. A], because, if the ن we e 
*rad.*, its measure would be قَعْلُ [with Kasr of the first 
ل (Sn)], which is not found [392]: (e) the second restric­
tion, [vid. that the ن should be exactly in the middle 
between four letters,] excludes such as قَنْطَازِ a hundred 
weight, خَنْدَرِيُّ عُنْقُرُودٌ [253, 396, 674, 253, 401], and 
ْعَنْدَلِبَ nightingale, where it is *rad.*: unless some indication decide it to be *aug.*, as in (a) 
ْعَنْبُسُ lion, because it is from عِبَرُ frowning; (b) حَظَتِهِ آبِلَل [254, 681, A], because of their saying [The 
camels ate much colocynth (Sn)]; (c) عَنْسَلِ [373], 
because it is from عَسَلَانَ going swiftly; (d) عَرَنَدَد [374], 
because it is from their saying شَيْ عَرَنَدَد a hard thing
[above], i.e., صلَبَّ (c) كَتَبَ لَّ (394, 671), [with Fath or Damm of the ﺑ (Sn)], because they say, in place of it، كَتَبَ لَّ [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 فَعَلَلْ with Damm of the doubled ل, so there is among them no فَعَلَلْ with Damm of the first ل (Sn)]: (f) the third restriction, [vid. that the ﻦ should be quiescent,) excludes such as غَرَّنِيق [above], which is [an aquatic bird, and (Sn)] the exalted chief خُرُ دَوْب, a kind of tree, and كُنَٰعِبٌ Kuna’bil, [with a quiescent Hamza, the name of a place in AlYaman—so in the Tsr (Sn),] where the ﻦ is rad., since there is no فَعَلَلْ or فَعَلَلْ or فَعَلَلْ in the language: (g) the fourth [restriction, vid. that the ﻦ should not be incorporated,) excludes such as كَجَّنس [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 كَجَّنس is held to be فَعَلَلْ كَجَّنس [396], like كَسِّس [strong (Jh, KF, Sn), firmly made (Jh, KF)]: but A.H says "What I hold is that the two
s are *aug.*, its measure being ْتَعَالَ (A, Tsr); and the proof is that we find the two s to be *aug.* in those words whose derivation is recognizable, as ْمَفَطَط [with a double ن (Sn), *fat, flabby* (Kf),] and ْزَوَّنُك [short and *mean-looking* (Jh)], which are from ْمَفَطَط [*bigness of belly* (Sn)] and ُوُنَ [*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 *aug.* in the aor. [404] (Aud), as ْنَضْرِب We strike (Tsr). The ن is regularly made *aug.* in (1) the aor., as ْنَضْرِب [above] ; (2) إِنْفَعَلُ and its variations, like ْنَضْرِب [332, 667], [ْمُتَّلِقَ (483), إِنْفَعَلَ (382), etc.]; (3) إِحْرَنْجَام [332, 667], [ْإِحْرَنْجَم (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 ن of the du. [228] or pl. [234], the sign of the *ind.* in the five paradigms [405], the ن of protection [170], and the *corrob.* ن [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 *rads.* of the word as to become [like] part of them (A). The ن is made *aug.*, when (1) first, as in ْنَضْرِب [above]; (2) second, as in
[above]; (3) third, as in [above]; (4) fourth, as in [375, 671]; (5) fifth, as in (A, Tsr) [above] (A) [and] [250] (Tsr); (6) sixth, as in [283, 399]; (7) seventh, as in (A, Tsr) [283, 400] (A) or (Sn) [400], which is a sweet-smelling plant (Tsr, Sn). In other cases it is rad., except in such as (1) عَنْسُل [above] (2) عَقَرْنِي [258, 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 نَفَعْنَتَي, the ن and ن in it being aug. (IV): [248, 331] (M), meaning a pleasant life, as نَفَلَنُّ نَبَلِيَّةٌ مِنَ الْعَيْشِ. Such a one is in ease of life, i.e., فِي سَعَةُ نَفَعْنَتَي. (3) فُلُانُ فِي بَلَهَيْنِيَةٍ مِنَ الْعَيْشِ. (IV). 

§. 678. The ت is aug. in [four positions (A),] (1) the fem. [263] (IM), as (a) ضَارِبَةٌ [263, 265] and 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 š, meaning the n. un. from ْضَرَبَتْ; but ْضَرَبَتْ in other MSS, with an extended ْب, as being a pass. v.: (a) as for the notion that it is ْضَرَبَتْ [161, 403], with a ْب of the 2nd pers. pronounced with Kasr, it is a blunder, since this ْب 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], ْلَمْتَ [540], and ْلَتْ [109] (Sn): (c) "in the fem." means "in a sing." as IA exemplifies it; or "a pl.," like ْمُسْلِمَاتْ [234, 646] (M.Kh): (d) IHsh says "In my opinion, the [quiescent] ْب of [femininization in] ْقَامَتْ [above] and the like should not be reckoned in this cat., because it is an independent, self-supporting word [607], contrary to the š 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] š [679] of femininization, [which, like the quiescent ْب, is not mentioned in the SH under the aug. ْب, 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], (∞) that the ٌ is the pron. and ٠٠٠ a p. of support; and it is obvious that the ٌ, according to this, is not an aug. letter: (β) that the whole is the pron., the ٌ 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 تَفْعَلَ [165] (IA), like تُصَرِّبَ Thou [masc.] strikes or She strikes (A): (a) IHsh says “IM does not reckon [among the augs.] any of the aoristic letters except the ٌ, 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 ٌ of the du., the ٌ of the pl., and the Tanwin [677, 679] (R on the ٌ): (3) such [inf. ns. (A)] as (a) إِسْتَفْعَّالٌ [332, 667] (IM), where it is made aug. together with the س [680] (IA), and إِفْتَدَأَلْ (R, Aud, A, MKh), like إِسْتَخْرَاجٌ [368] (IA, A, Tsr) and إِتْتَبَأَرُ [667] (A, Tsr, MKh); [332] (R, Jrb, Aud, MKh) and تَفْعَّلْ (R, Jrb, Tsr, MKh), as تَكْسَرُ breaking [intrans.] in pieces [486] and تَجْبَلُ fighting together [487] (Tsr), like تَتَفْعَّلُ [332] and تَفْعَّلْ fighting together (MKh); and تَفْعَّلُ [like تُدْخَرَ (below)] (R, Jrb); and the deriv. thereof (R, IA, Aud, A, MKh), vid. the v. and part. (Tsr, Sn),
like [493] and [387] (IA) : (b) ُتشْخِرَ جَ [332] and ُشْخَالَ [332, 334] (R, A, Tsr, MKh), as much rejecting (A, Tsr), like ُتَفْعِيْل of *hallowing, sanctifying, consecrating (MKh), and ُتَدَأَدَ [334]; without their derivs. (A, Tsr, MKh), because there is no ُتَفْعِيْل in their derivs. (Tsr), as rejected much and ُتَدَأَدَ rejecting much (Sn), like ُقَدْسَ hallowed, etc., and rejected (MKh), which are without a ُتَفْعِيْل (Sn, MKh) : (4) the quasi-pass. (IM) of ُقَدْسَ [or ُتَفْعِيْل] (IA), from the tril. and quad. (Tsr), as (a) ُتَعْلِمَ He learnt [432] (IA, Aud, A), inf. n. ُتَعْلِمَ [332] (A), quasi-pass. of ُتَعْلِيْمَ I taught him (IA); (b) ُتَدَأَدَ ُحَرَّ جَ [495. A] (IA, Aud, A), inf. n. ُتَدَأَدَ ُتَبَاعَدَ [332]; (c) ُتَفْعِالْ [ُتَبَاعَدَ and ُتَفْعِالْ] [487], inf. n. ُتَفْعِالْ [ُتَبَاعَدَ and ُتَفْعِالْ] [332] (A). As for the ُتَفْعِيْل of such as ُتَرْمَسَ [482], its augmentativeness is not regular (Sn). In any [position] other than those mentioned, the ُتَفْعِيْل is not judged to be aug., except by reason of some indication (A). IM's confining himself to what is mentioned intimates that the ُتَرْجُعُ an interpreter, translator, with Fath or Damm of the ُتَفْعِيْل and ج, or Fath of the ُتَفْعِيْل and Damm of the ج, is rad.; and this is the sounder [opinion], as is proved by the retention of the ُتَفْعِيْل in the remaining variations of the word, which is arabicized, or, as is said, Arabic (Sn). The ُتَفْعِيْل
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 [below], [a Hijazi tree, whose thorns are like those of the ُعَوْسَجِ (373), and Tan`ub, a town near Makka (Sn),] ُتَتَثُّلُ [the fox, or its cub (372, 671) (Sn)], ُتُذَرَّأ [331, 372], and ُتَحْقَي (274, 372) (A): (a) as for the irregular augmentativeness of the [when initial], it is [also in] such as [283, 334, 379], which is ُتَقْعَالِ from ُتَحْقَي -the thing was dry and hard, i. q. and ُتَبْيَانِ (y) ُتَلْقَاءٌ (e) ُتَضَرَّابُ (c) ُتَلْقَاءٌ from ُتَبْيَانِ likeness; صَلْبُ (b) ُتَنْسَالِ [332, 334, 379] from ُتَبْيَانِ plainness; ُتَلْقَاءٌ (e) ُتَلْقَاءٌ from ُتَبْيَانِ meeting; ُتَضَرَّابُ (c) ُتَضَرَّابُ from covering: and, in all of that, the ت, but for the derivation, would be *rad.*, because it corresponds to the of ُقَرْطَاسِ [253] and the سُرْحَانِ [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 ت in (a) such as ُرَحْبُوتِ humbly petitioning, supplicating, ُرَحْبُوتِ mercy, pity, ُمَكْرُوتِ kingdom 681. A], and ُرَحْبُوتِ خَيْرِ مِنُ ُرَحْبُوتِ Fear is better than pity, [i. e., That thou
shouldst be feared is better than that thou shouldst be pitied (Md)] : (β) رَحْمَوتٍ and رَغْمَوتٍ are said, upon the measure of قُلْوَتٍ [272]; but this is rare, not to be copied (IY) : Mb says رَحْمَوتٍ خَيْرٍ مِنْ رَحْمَوتٍ (Md) : (β) تَرْنَمُوتَ twanging, which is the sound of the bow upon shooting, because it is from تَرْنَمُ trilling, quavering, its measure being [399, 646] (A) : (α) when the ِ is at the end of the word, after the aug. ِ, 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 سَبْرُتَ [a desert land, and a man having nothing (MAR.)] is فَعْلُولٍ [below]; but he holds augmentativeness in the like to be recognizable only by derivation, as in مَلْكُوت and مُلْكَ [above], because they are from مَلْكَة haughtiness and مُلْكَ dominion [681. A]; and so in رَغْمَوتَ [above], رَحْمَوتَ, and رَغْمَوتٍ : (β) similarly S does not hold the ِ which is at the end [of the word], after the [aug.] ِ, when preceded by three rads., as in عَفْرَیت [646, 674, 681. A], to be one of the prevalent [augs.], the augmentativeness of the ِ in عَفْرَیت being, according to him, recognizable by derivation from عَفْرٍ [343], which is the wicked, crafty: (γ) in سَبْرُتَ S makes unprecedentedness preponderate over derivation; and therefore says that it is فَعْلُولٍ [above],
like "عَضُفُور [253, 396]; not "فَعَلُوت [below], because this is extraordinary: but the better [course] is what some take, vid. to make derivation preponderate, and judge it to be "فَعَلُوت بُيُوَّر, although "عَضُفُور is extraordinary, on the evidence of the obvious derivation, because "سُرُوَت is the skilful guide, who سَبَر الطریق 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) : (8) the opinion of S is that the ن of "عَنْکَبُرُت is rad., because they say, in the sense of it, "عَنْکَبُت; 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 إِسْرَیْعَثل and إِسْرَیْعَال 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 يُسَتْعُر [401, 674], and a subst. for the كُلُّتا in [263, 307, 689] (A). In other cases, it is rad., [wherever it be found (IY),] except [when there exists an indication of its being aug. (IY),] as in (1) [274, 372] (M), i. q. أَلْشَیْء آلرَّابُت ترَتَّب the established thing, where the first د is aug., because, according to S, there is no [paradigm] in the language like جَعْفُر with دamm of the ج [392] while, according to
Akh also, it is *aug.*, because رَتَبَ is derived from *was established*; so that it is *aug.* because of the derivation, not on account of the paradigm: (a) the counterpart of this is تَضَبَ for a *kind of tree*, where the ُ is *aug.* because there is no [paradigm] in the language like جَفَر with ذَمَم of the ف [372, 681. A] for a *kind of tree*, where the ُ is *aug.* because there is no [paradigm] in the language like جَفَر with ذَمَم of the ف [392, 671]: (b) similarly تَفْعَّل [above] with ذَمَم, and تَفْعَّل [372] with فَثُ, of the ف are said, where the first ُ is unavoidably *aug.*, according to him that pronounces with ذَمَم, because of the unprecedentedness [of تَفْعَّل]; and is also *aug.* according to him that pronounces with فَثُ, because it is not *rad.* in one *dialect var.*, and *aug.* in another (IY): (2) تَرْجَ [689] (M), which, according to the Bdd, is تَفْعَّل, the ُ, 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) سَبْتَ [385], meaning a *period of time*, the first ُ of which is *aug.*, because they say, in the same sense, سَبَنَ and سَبَتَ, like تَرْمُ and تَرْمَ [254]; so that the elision of the ُ is an indication of its augmentativeness (IY).

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

فرَجْتَ أَلْطَلَامٍ بِأَمْهَاتٍ [below] (Tsır): (a) the s is added in أمَّاتُ mothers, as it is added in أَوْراقُ poured out, shed [below], where أَوْراقُ is said (K on XVI. 80.): (b) أمَّاتُ is said [by some] to be pl. of أمَّة [below], as

إِنَّى كَذَى أَلْصَبَرْ رَخِيَّ آلْبَيْبِ # مَعَتَّرُ أَلْصَبْرِ هَالِيَ النَّسِبِ أمْهَاتٍ خَنْدُفُ # أَلْيَاسُ أَپِي (Tsır), by Kuşayy 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 AlYās Ibn Muḍar [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
is anomalous (K): (b) \( \text{زَرَّاءة} \) (Aud), inf. n. of \( \text{أَرَاقِي} \) [below] (Tsr): (2) [of the J (Tsr)] in طَيْسُ (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 طَيْسُ [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 s [below] with such as لْئِب and لْئِمْ تَرْهَ [above], and of the J [681] with [the masc. and fem. dems. in distance (Tsr),] and دُلْنَك [173, 599], it is rejected, because the s 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] s of femininization, as in طَاّكْمَة [678], an entire word, not part of another [word]; and yet he exemplifies with it" (Tsr). The s 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. لَمْ governed in the gen. [648], as لْئِب [above]
(2) the v. whose J is elided for apocopation or uninflectededness [644]; (3) every [word] uninf. upon a vowel inseparable [from the word, as in \(\text{كیفیت} thrill\) and چـه, contrary to the (word) uninf. upon a vowel supervening for a cause that sometimes ceases, like the voc. and the sub. of ی (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 َ [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 َ in such as LXIX. 28. and یَا زیدَا [671]; or to make [pause, which is only upon a quiescent (Sn),] possible, like the َ in such as َعَ and َقَ [671]: so that it is [a specific augment (Sn),] like the Tanwin [608, 677, 678], [besides being a p., like the Tanwin] and the prep. ب [503]. But the correct [opinion] is that the َ is a letter of augmentation, although its augmentativeness is rare. The proof of that is their saying اَمَّاتُ [above] for اَمَّاتُ, its measure being فَعَلُّهَاتِ, because it is pl. of َmother; while sometimes they say اَمَّاتُ (A). The author of the saying

\[\text{إذا الأمهات فتبغس الوجهة و فرجت الطُّلكم، اَمَّاتي كا} \]

[above] *When the mothers are ugly in faces, those.*
dispellest the darkness with thy mothers has combined the two dials. (M). They say that, in most cases, أمٌّاَتُ for brutes, and أمٌّاَتْ for mankind: but sometimes the converse occurs, as in

إِذَا أمٌّاَتُ قَبْضَنَ الْحَم

When mothers are ugly etc. [above] and

Cuوأل مُعَرِّفِ وَنَعْلَةٍ أَعْقَرُ مَنْىٌ أمَّاَتْ آَتِبَاءٍ

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 أمٌّاَتْ [above] for أمٌّا (A), making the ُمَل in the sing., as in the pl. (Sn). The measure of أمٌّاَتْ is فَعْلِةٍ أمٌّا (A, Tsr), the ُمَل being multiplicative; or co-ordinative, according to those who authorize فَعْلِةٍ [392] (Tsr). But IS allows the ُمَل [here] to be rad., [the measure of (Tsr)] أمٌّاَتْ being فَعْلِةٍ, like فَقْرَةٌ and (A) أمٌّاَتْ (A, Tsr), which is grandeur (Tsr, Sn), splendour, and pride (Sn); and this is confirmed by [their saying (A)] كَأَمْهَتْ ُمَلَّا meaning I took as a mother, transmitted by Khūl in the Kitāb al`Ain: [so that the o.f. of أمٌّا is أمٌّاَتْ (Sn);] but afterwards the ُمَل is elided; and there remains أمٌّا, the measure of which is فَعْل (A, Tsr). And, if this be established, [i. e., both what is transmitted by Khūl, vid. that أمٌّا is a deriv. of أمٌّاَتْ, which alone is the o.f., and what is indicated by the preceding paragraph, vid. that the measure of أمٌّا is فَعْل (Sn),] then
and ُأمّة are two different o. f.s., like سَبَطُ and ُمَتَّر [676], and ُدمّر‏ (KF), ُدمّر (KF, Sn), [or ُدمّر (KF, Sn), i. q. ُسَهِيل smooth, level, said ofground (KF)]: so that, according to this، أمّات is pl. of ُأمّة [above], and أمّات of أمّة. But what IS holds is weak, because it is contrary to the apparent [weight of evidence] (A), since, in the case of ُأمّة، what imports augmentativeness[of the s] is found, vid. أمّة، contrary to أمّة and أمّة [above] is small: so says SBd (Sn). And, as for the transmission [of ُأمّة] 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 Kitâb 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 أمّات is pl. of أمّة، the o. f. of which is أمّة (Tsr). The s is also made aug. (84) آَهْرَقُ آثِيًا I poured out the water، aor. آَهْرَقْ نيَعُ.RE، the o. f. [of آَهْرَق، aor. آَهْرَق (382)، آَهْرَق (Sn)، آَهْرَق (Sn)، آَهْرَق (Sn)] being آَرَق [above]، aor. آَرَق، آَرَق، آَرَق (A). And [they say that (Tsr)] Mb has no answer to the augmentativeness of the s in آَرَق، except the allegation of blundering on the part of the
sayer thereof, who, since the Hamza is changed [into \(s(A)\) in ِهِرَّاَق (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 ِهِرَّاَق which is [the girl (Jh)] big in the hips, is aug., the measure being َتُرْكُلُ فِي مَشْيِهَا kicks in her walk; but most hold it to be rad., the measure being َعِمْلُ، and Akh says that it is aug. in ِجَرَعُ and ِهِلْلُعُ, [372, 392], which, according to him, are َعِمْلُ, because the first is from َبَلْعُ swallowing, and the second from َجَرَعُ, which is the level place; but the argument of the majority [for the radicalness of the \(s\) in ِهِجَرَع (Sn)] is that the Arabs say of two long or tall [things or persons], َهَذَا أَطْوَلُ مِنْ هَذَا This is longer, or taller, than that, i. e., َأَطْوَلُ (A); whereas, if the \(s\) were aug., they would say َأَجْرَعُ, with elision of the aug., and retention of the rad.; while [in َأَطْوَل] they elide the \(ع\), though it also is rad., without dispute, because elision is more suitable for finals (Sn). What Khl holds, however, [about the \(s\) in ِهِرَّاَق] 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 ِهِلْلُعَّا 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 سُلْهَبُ (IY). And in سُلْهَبُ [392] the s may be aug., because سُلْبُ means long, tall, as تَرْنَ سُلْهَبُ a long horn [or سُلْبُ (A)], i.e., طَرْيَلُ (IY, A), this being a good derivation, apparent in sense and letter (IY); or سُلْهَبُ may be of the cat. of سِبْطُ and سِبْطِ [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 ت (A),] in إسْتِفَاعَلُ [678] (Aud, A), like إسْتِفَاعَجَ [368] (Tsr), and its derivs. (A, Tsr): (2) as is said [by Z in the M], after the ل of the fem. in pause, as أَكَرَمَتِكَ I honored thee, which is [the س of] the كَسْكَسَةُ [617]: but this sayer is bound to reckon the ش of the كَسْكَسَةٌ, as أَكَرَمَتِكَ [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 كَسْكَسَةٍ 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 كَسْكَسَةٌ (SH), which, by common consent, is not a letter of augmentation. This
is a refutation of Z, who reckons the س of the گِسُکَةَ of the قَدْمُوس (1) among the letters of augmentation (R). In any other case the augmentativeness of the س is not regular, but preserved in the memory, like the س of the گِسُکَةَ ْبَذِمِن: i. q. ancient [681. A]: جُمَّٰعُ (2) [671, 681. A], with the disj. Hamza, aor. ُبِسْطِعُ [671], with Damm of the initial; [contrary to ِسُطَع، with the conj. Hamza, aor. ُبِسْطِعُ (382, 759), with Fath of the initial, i. q. ِسُطَعُ was able, aor. ُبِسْطِعُ (Sn) :] for, according to S [below], its o. f. is أَطَعَ, aor. ُبِطِعُ; 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 أَطَعَ is أَطَعَ (A), not for the departure of the vowel absolutely (Sn). أَسْطَعَ with Fath, 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 إِنْعَال, its o. f. being أَطَعَ, like أَقْرُ [703, 707]; but the ع being treated as unsound, and converted into ٰ 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 أَهْرَاقَ [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 $e$ has escaped because of the mobilization of the vowel of the $f$ with the vowel of the $e$ [below]. But, notwithstanding all of this, the putting of the $s$ and $e$ as compensation is anomalous. The aor. of $\text{أُسْطَاطِع}$, therefore, according to $S$, is $\text{يُسْطَاطِع}$ [671], with Damm. But Mb, supposing $S$ to say that the $s$ 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 $f$, "is remaining?": whereas $S$'s meaning is not what he supposes, but is that the $s$ is a compensation for the mobility of the $e$; and there is no doubt that the mobility of the $e$ has escaped because of the mobilization of the $f$ with the vowel of the $e$ [above]. Fr says that the o. f. of $\text{أُسْطَاطِع}$ is $\text{إِسْطَاطِع}$, of the conj. of $\text{إِسْتَفْعَل}$, the $t$ being elided for the reason assigned in the chapter on Incorporation [759]; so that there remains $\text{إِسْطَاطِع}$ [382], with Kasr of the Hamza, which is then anomalously pronounced with Fath, and made disj.: and, according to him, therefore, the aor. is $\text{يُسْطَاطِع}$ [759], with Fath of the aoristic letter. But, when the $t$ of $\text{إِسْطَاطِع}$ 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 $\text{نَٰمَا أُسْطَاطِعُ}$. 1214 a
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 ع, since he says "such as إستعمال" [678]; so that he seems to content himself with that, for which reason he says in the Kāfiya, in mentioning the augmentativeness of the ع, "and together with the س, it is made *aug.* in إستعمال and its *derivs.*" (A).

§. 681. The ج is *aug.* (1) in (M, IM) the well-known *dem.* [below] (IM) *ns.*, regularly (IA), as (IA, A) دُلِّيت [679] (IA, A), هُنَّاكِ [175] (M, IA A), and أُوْلَـِاَللَّهُ (A) [pronounced] أَوْلَـِاَللَّهُ [173], whence

أَوْلَـِاَللَّهُ قَاتِعِمُ اللَّهُ لَمْ يُكُونُوا أُشَابِهَةٌ • رَهْلُ يُعْطِى الْقَلْبِيَّةَ إِلَّا أَوْلَـِاَللَّهُ (M), by AlA‘shà, 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-err[ing]?, because of their saying, in the sense thereof, أَوْلَـِاَللَّهُ [171] and كَأَلْكَ [172] without a جث and تَيَك [175], and أُوْلَـِاَللَّهُ [pronounced]
(1177)

[172]: (a) the ج is added in the ñem. to indicate the distance of the demonstrated [173, 599], and therefore is the opp. of the premonitory ﻦاء [174, 552]; for which reason they are not combined [173, 552], so that ﻦاء ﺬﻠﻚ is not said; because, the حا indicating the nearness, and the ج the distance, of the demonstrated, there are incompatibility and contradiction between them: (b) [except in تَلْك (173),] this ج is [mobilized to avoid a concurrence of two quiescents ; and] pronounced with Kasr, lest it might be mistaken for the ج of ownership [604], if ﻦاء تَلْك that sounding like ﻦاء تَلْك This belongs to thee were said (IY): (2) in ûنَدُلٌ slave, servant [671], زَيْدُلٌ Zaidal [283], and نَتْحَجَلٌ [675] (M), where their saying ûنَدُلٌ slave, servant, زَيْدُلٌ Zaid, and نَتْحَجَلٌ [below] is an indication of the augmentativeness of the ج (IY): (a) ﻦيَقُلٌ [male ostrich (IY)] is ambiguous (M): if you derive it from ﻦيَقُلٌ [male ostrich, like ﻦيَقُلٌ (Jh, KF), the ﻦ being aug. (Jh), and slender, tall (KF)], the ج is aug., its measure being ﻦمَلٌ, and the ﻦ is rad.; while, if you derive it from ﻦيَقُلٌ [with Kasr (KF), young ostrich (Jh, KF), and tall, stupid (KF)], the ﻦ is aug., and the ج rad., its measure being ﻦيَقُلٌ; but the first [derivation] is more frequent, because they say ﻦيَقُلٌ and ﻦيَقُلٌ [i. q. ﻦيَقُلٌ (above), the ﻦ being aug.
and this is the meaning of Z’s saying “is ambiguous”, i.e., admits of the J’s being *aug.* or *rad.*, according to the derivation (*IV*). The J is one of the letters of augmentation (*A*). As for the J [679], it is rare, as in زيَدَلُ and عَبْدُلُ [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 *aug.*, because of its remoteness from the letters of prolongation, for which reason it is the least *aug.* 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) عَبْدُ for عَبْدَلُ [above]: (2) أَنْحَجُ نَسْحَبُ [675], which is *having the thighs wide apart*: (3) هَيْقُلُ [above]: (4) قَيْمَةُ شَمْلَةُ for هَيْقُلُ [above], which is the *gland of the penis* [below]: (5) طَيْسُ [679]. It is reported from Akh that the J of عبد الله is *rad.*, عبد ل* being compounded from عبد الله. *The servant of God*, as they say عبدَبُ[309, 311]; but this is rendered improbable by their saying زَيْدَلُ for زَيْدَ [above]. He says, however, in the Ausat [fi-nNaḥw (*HKh*)], “The J is made *aug.* in عِبَدَلُ alone”, [not in the remainder, vid. زَيْدَلُ, etc., as though he said that the remainder were of the *cat.* of سَبْطُ and سَبْطُ (Su);]
"and its pl. is عبادَة" so that he has two sayings (A) on عبَدُ (Sn). The remainder, indeed, [i.e., all except عبَدُ (Sn),] admit of being [derived] from two crude-forms, like سَيْطٍ and سَيْطٍ [676] (A); so that Akh’s saying “[The J] is made aug. in عبَدُ alone” is correct (Sn). Jr denies that the J is a letter of augmentation. And the J of distance in such as وَلِّ and وَلِّ [above] is not opposed to this, because it is a p. [599], like the Tanwin [608] (R). [For] the J of the dem. [above] ought not to be mentioned with the letters of augmentation, because of what we said on the s of silence [679], vid. that it is an entire word (A). And he holds that [above], فِيَعْلُ, فَيَعْلُ, and فَيَعْلُ are فَيَعْلُ, فَيَعْلُ, and فَيَعْلُ, 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 ثَرْقَاةٌ and ثَرْقَاةٌ [talkative woman (KF)], and دُمَتْ and دُمَتْ [679]. But all of that is forced, on his part: and apparently the J is aug. in all those [words]: for its augmentativeness, notwithstanding the rarity thereof, is conclusively established, as in عبَدُ and زَيْدَ [above], i.e., زَيْدَ and زَيْدَ: whereas دَمَتْ and دَمَتْ are not like that, since augmentativeness of the J is not established so that we are driven to judging it to be rad. (R).
\[\text{§ 681. A. Whatever is free from these restrictions [672-681] is judged to be rad., unless some proof of augmentativeness exists, for which reason (1) the Hamzas of }\text{ [672], the }\text{ م of }\text{ [676] and the }\text{ [677] and }\text{ s of corn, the }\text{ ت of }\text{ [678], and the [680], are judged to be aug., because of their elision in [inf. n. of meaning The wind shifted to the north (Tsr)] and [with two Fathas, swelling of the belly (Tsr)],} \text{ and [678] and [667] with Fath of its initial, i.e., dust, }\text{ قد تم antiquity and }\text{ [677] when they have been harmed by eating colocynth and }\text{ أسبد الزرع The corn put forth ears: (2) the [677] and [667] [with Dam of the , the name of a herb (401) (Tsr)], and the [667] and }\text{ (Aud) with Dam of the and [or Fath of the latter (KF) and Kasr, [with doubling (Tsr),] of the }\text{ (KF, Tsr), upon the measure of [677], with }\text{ [or Fath of the ] and Kasr, [with doubling,] of the (Jh), diptote [because of the verbal measure combined with the quality of} \]
proper name] (Jh, KF), i. q. [الباطل] (Jh, Ts:), as [رُفِّعَوا] فِي وَادِي تَحْذِيب They fell into the valley of Disappointment, i. e., [بالباطل] فِي [بالباطل] into] a vain, futile state (Tsr), [or] meaning [بالباطل] فِي بالبطل into the vain, etc. (KF)—so says Ks (Jh, Tsr)—are judged to be aug. (Tsr), because of the non-existence of [فَعْلُلْ] [with دِامَم of its first, فَث of its third, and كَسَر of its fourth (401) (Tsr)], نَعْلَلْ [392], and فَعْلُلْ (Aud), with دِامَم of its first and second, [or فَث of the latter,] and كَسَر, with doubling, of its third. But it is said that the mention of this [تَحْذِيب] requires consideration, because it is transferred from the v. [4], like تَعْلِم It was learnt [or تَعْلِم 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] أَنْصُبْتُ یَمُّمَ ۖ جَدَّ ۖ ظَافِرٍ [below]; so that such as اِطْلَمَ [below], orig. اِفْتَعَلَ, the [second] ز being put in place of the ب of اِفْتَعَل because of the intention to incorporate [756], is not adducible as an objection; for that is not named "substitution", since the ز 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 ز of جْدَّ and the Hamza of اِنْصَبْ [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 ِل (l) in such as ُل آبَعَيْنَ [306] is named "substitution" (KIF). And the restriction "unrestrictedly" excludes conversion [below], which is peculiar to the unsound letters [and 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 تَبْنِيَّة. XXVI. 63. Then it was divided to be an instance of it, i. e., [for which reason نَكَّانُ ُلْ وَُلْبِ] XXVI. 63. And each division was is said, the Ṣ and ِل being interchangeable (IKn)]; and it is transmitted from Khl that, in ٍفَجَاسُوا خَلَالَ الْدِّيَار XVII. 5. And they ransacked the interiors of the houses, ٍفَجَاسُوا is meant, the ِح which also is read [by Ṭaḥa (K)]; while F holds ُحَبَّ الْكِيْر. XXXVIII. 81. have preferred the love of horses [508], i. e., َلَأْ مَكَاه رَتْصِيدَة VIII. 35. Save whistling and clapping of hands [685], i. e., ْتَصْرِيدَة, the [second] د ِح being changed into َيْ (KF), to be an instance of it (IKn, KIF). And this sense [of substitution] is not identical with, but is approximate 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 125a
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 تُحْكَّبَة and تُحْكَمَة [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 و, ي, and ! [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) قَلَم, orig. قَلَمُ, the l being a, in the o. f. [684]; (b) مَوْسِر, [the, in] which is orig. ي [686]; (c) رَأس, and زَّمَّ, the l being orig. Hamza, the rising [658] of which is softened, so that it is transmuted into l [684]. Thus every conversion is a substitution; but every substitution is not a conversion (IY). I.M. [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 (S.n)] 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 ٌ of عَدَّة [699], the Hamza of إِبْن [667], and the [second] ي of سُفْرِيْجَة [283, 284]: (2) it is [given] for (a) a consonant, as mentioned; (b) a vowel,
like the لَسَطْعَ [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 ج, the خ, the غ, the ق, the ص, [the ط, ] and the ذ, as in لَزُعَ young camel brought forth in autumn [696. A]; لَطُعْ for لَعْنُ أَخْنُنْ speaking through the nose [696 A]; خَطْرَةَ for خَطْرَ for خَطْرَة [696 A]; لَنْاَمَّةَ for لَنْاَمَّةَ [699 A], which is the nest of the sand-grouse in the mountain; لَجَيْنَ for لَجَيْنَ hardy [696 A]; and لَتَعْلَمَمَ لَتَعْلَمَمَ for لَتَعْلَمَمَ 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 لِكَجْدَدْ صَرْفَ سُمْكِسْ آمِيِّ طَيَّةٍ كُثَبٍ عَرْقَتِهِ [below]; (b) what is necessary in etymology, vid. nine [letters], combined in the spelling of your [mnemonic] phrase فَهَدَأَتُ مُوطَيَا [below], i.e., the س, the د, the Hamza, the ت, the م, the ظ, the ط, the ى, 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 aug. is not considered in the letters of augmentation [671] (A). The letters of [the non-incorporative (Aud)] substitution [common (IA, Aud, A) in etymology (A)] are [nine, combined in (IA, Aud) IM's phrase (IA)] ہُدَاةُ ہُدَاةُ ہُدَاةُ I was still, finding [the camel-saddle (IA)] easy to ride upon [above] (IM), ہُدَاةُ ہُدَاةُ ہُدَاةُ meaning سُكِنتُ سُكِنتُ سُكِنتُ while ہُدَاةُ ہُدَاةُ ہُدَاةُ is [an act. part. (IA, Tsr)] from (IA, Aud, A), 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 ی for (a) the ن of ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ an irregular dim. of ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ [285, 286], like ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ dim. of ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ [286] ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ in ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ [691]; (b) the ی of ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ in ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ in ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ لَمَّا رَآَى أَنَّ ال۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ [647, 691]: (2) the rare, like the substitution of the ی for the double ی in pause, as in ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ ۸ِصَلِّ۸َلَّاٰ
[643, 694]; and sometimes (a) without pause, as in [694] for [the mountain-goat (Sn)]; (b) without doubling, as in [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 $ 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 $, which is like $ 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 $ (A)] is regular only in pause upon such as $ [638, 690], which is mentioned in the chapter on Pause [646]; while its substitution for any [letter] other than the $ is confined to hearsay, as in their saying $ [for $ (Tsr)], $ [for $ (Tsr)], $ [for $ (Tsr)], $ [for $ (Tsr)], $ [for $ (Tsr)], and $ [for $ (Tsr)], 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 Tar 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 لَجِنْدُ صَرْفٌ شَكْشَى آمِيَ طَلِىُّ ثُمَّ مَرَّتُه 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 طَرِيْتُ دَآثِيًا " [above]. This is his language, which implies that the remaining [seven] letters [above] of the alphabet, vid. the ح, the خ, the ذ, the ظ, the ص, 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 Al A'mash [or, as Z says in the K, of Ibn Mas'ud] فَدِرَدَ رَبُّه VIII. 59. Then terrify thou, by them [696 A], with the dotted ذ, that the ذ is a subst. for the ذ, as they say لْحَمٌ حَرَاءِدُل meat cut up small for حِرَاءِدُل [in the KF حِرَاءِدُل (Sn)]; the idea connecting the ذ and ذ being that they are vocal [734], and approximate [in
outlet (732)]: while Z explains the reading as a transposition by putting the ج before the ع, [in the sense of قَفِّرتُنَّ Then scatter thou (K), as though it were a transposed form of شَذَرُ مَدَرُ (K, B),] from their saying شَذَرُ مَدَرُ [211] (A), a comp. meaning in every direction (Sn). It implies also that the above-mentioned substitution of the ج for the ن and ض, and of the ج for the ى, and similarly the substitution of the ج for the ل [688], like their saying رَقْلُ رَنْسٍ, which is the long-tailed horse, and for the م, like their saying أَمْعَرْتِ اِلْشَّأْنَةُ أَنْفَرْتُ! The sheep gave its milk red, when its milk comes forth red, like مَعْرِه 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 ج 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 عنَصَجَةَ, [i. e., the substitution of the ى for the غ (Sn),] in the dial. of كُدَّاُرَ [694]: (2, 3) the عنَصَجَةَ, [i. e., the substitution of the ى for the Hamza (Sn),] as in their saying طَنْبَتْ عَنْكَ ذَاهِبَ جَثَّ. I thought that thou wast going, i. e., أَتَلَكَ [527, 580]; and the كَشْكَشَةَ [below], as in their saying, when addressing a female, مَا أَلَذِي جَاءِ بَيْتِ. What is that which has
brought thee?, meaning بِلَكِ, and in the reading of some قَدْ جَعَلَ رَبُّكَ تَحْتِيْشَ سَيِّئًا XIX. 24. *God hath made below thee a rivulet [617]: [both of which substitutions are] in the *dial. of *Tamîm, [this clause referring to the} عَنْعَنَّة also, as is proved by the language of the *CK to be shortly cited (Sn)]: (4) the كُسْكَة in the *dial. of Bakr, as in their saying, when addressing a female, أَبُوُسُ أَبْوَلُ and أَمْكِ أَمْسُ [617, 680]. And, says IM in the *CK; [even] this sort of substitution, [meaning the عَجَعْجَة and what follows it (Sn),] is fit to be mentioned [only] in books of *lexicology, not in books of *etymology, otherwise the ع was to have been mentioned, because its substitution for the mobile *Hamza is regular in the *dial. of Tamîm, that being named عَنْعَنَّة; and the ل also would have to be mentioned, because its substitution for the pron. is regular, as in يَا أَبَنِ آلِ ذَبَيْنِ آلِ حَمَّزَا [129, 169, 696 A], meaning عَصْيَتَ 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 مَالِ [278, 683, 703] (A), because the , must be converted into ! [684] (Sn); or difference from the most frequent [formation],
as in your saying [683] (A) fem. of سَقَاء [232] (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 حُمَّلَ يَوْمًا أُنْجَدْتُهُ He bestowed benefits on the day I succoured him (A), with the adv. pre. to the prop. [124] (Sn). Some drop the ج [691], reckoning them as eleven, which they combine in the phrase أَجْنَدْ طُرِبَتْ مِنْهَا Do well (mayst thou be destroyed for it!) [below] (A), where أَجْنَدْ is an imp. v. from إِجَادُ (Sn). And some add the ص and ج, reckoning them as fourteen, which they combine in the phrase أَنْصَتْ يَوْمًا رَلًا طَلَاءٍ جَدًّا A grandfather was silent on the day a cook slipped (A), where طَلَاء, act. part. of طَبَح, i. q. يَطَأْحُرُ, is ag. of رَلّ; while جَدًّا 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 يَوْمًا جَدًّا طَلَاءٍ رَلّ [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 إِسْتَنْجِدَة يَوْمًا طَلَاءٍ 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 حر and زرَّاط for road and صقر hawk; and adds the س [696A], which is not a letter of substitution. For, if إسْعَ be adduced [by way of exemplifying the occurrence of the س as a subst. (Sn)], then إلَّدَكَرَ [below] and إطِلَمُ [above] are adducible, because إسْعَ 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 إسْتَخْدَمَ to be orig. [696 A, 759]; so that they substitute the س for the first ث, as they substitute the ث for the [second] س in سُسَ, orig. سُسَ [689, 758]; and perhaps, therefore, Z takes that into consideration (A). [R, like A, asserts that] إسْتَنْجَدَهُ يَوْمَ طَالَ [above] is the phrase of [Z,] the author of the M (R): but, according to what Z [really] mentions [in the M] (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

He asked him for succour on the day some Zuuf [a race of Hindus, arabicized form of جتح 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 (IV).

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 ل and س; and three others, vid. the د, the ط, and the ج (A):

which are combined by جتح طويت منهها [above]. And some add seven others, vid. the ل in أصيللا [above], the جدف in ژز [695] and the جدف in ژز [above], the گ in گا [below], the ع in گا [580], the گ in گاشت [below], and the ب in گاشت [696A]; so that they become eighteen (B). But the first opinion, vid. that of S, is the well-known one (IV). S does not reckon the ص and ز [above] in the chapter on Substitution, but S reckons them at the end of [his commentary on] the Book. And with them he reckons the ش of the جتکشة [above], which is a subst. for the ل of the fem. [696A], as in تصحکت میني الیح [617]: but, as for that which is added after the ل of the fem. as in اکرمتنکش [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'qūb, the outlets for the water between the cross-pieces of the leathern bucket [above] for فُرُوعُهَا, which is from فَرَوعُ تَفْرَعُ emptying. And similarly the ب: F transmits, on the authority of As, بِاَلْسَّبَكَ [696A], i.e., ما أسْبَكَ What is thy name? (R): [while] مَّكَةُ بَكَّة Bakka and مَّكَةُ Makka and بَكَّة are two dial. vars. for the proper name of the Sacred City, like their saying آل البَيْت AnNubait and آل البَيْت AnNumait for the name of a place in AdDahnà; and similar instances of interchangeability are رَأَتْ أَمَرَ رَأَتْ, an established matter and لَأَمِّ 8َرَأَتْ (B on III. 90,) and حمَّى مَغْبِيَّة constant and لَأَمِّ 8َرَأَتْ (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),]

*ينفَضُونَ مِنْهَا كَلِبَا مَنْفُوحًا* لَمَّا يُرِى لَا دَارِيَّا مَقْذُورًا [They blow from it (the face) a flame blown, a gleam that is seen to be not blazing, nor struck from a flint, orig. مَنْفُوحًا (MAR)]; and Ru'ba says

ْعَمْرُ الْمَجْرَئِ كَرِيمٌ الْيَسْنِمَ * أَبْلَجُ لَمْ يُولِدَ بِنَجْمِ الْيَسْمِ (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 خ of خسفع for the exigency of the rhyme (MAR). The ج occurs anomalously as a subst. for the ل, as in and نَنَّثِلَة for a coat of mail [696A], because they say نَنَّثِلَة علیه درعه He put on him his coat of mail, not ننَّثِلَة; so that the ل, being more generally employed, is the original. The ف is a subst. for the ت:

F transmits, on the authority of Ya'kūb, قَامَ رَبِّي فَمَ عَمَرُ Zaid stood, and afterwards 'Amr [696A], i. e., فَمَ عَمَرُ [540]; and they say جَدَّ فَجَدَت and جَدَّ فَجَدَت [540], the ف being a subst., because they say أَجْدَات graves [below], but not أَجْدَاث [above] (R); [though] Fr says that the Arabs make the ف and ت interchangeable in the language, saying جَدَت جَدَت, pl. أَجْدَات and أَجْدَاث (Jh). The ل occurs as a subst. for (1) the ق, as عَرَبِىْ ثُمَّ a pure Arab and كُلُّ [696A], pl. أَكْصَاحُ, but not أَكْصَاحُ; (2) the ت, as يَا أَبَنَ الْزُبُرُ التَّمَمُ [above]; though this may be a putting of the acc. pron. in place of the nom. [169]. And the ع in [the dial. of (MAR)] تَمَم is a subst. for the Hamza in كُنَّ orig. (MAR) أَن [508], which is the عَلِينَة [above] of Tamīm; the poet says أَحْمَنَ فَرِسَتَ اللَّه [580, 683] (R); and they say
that Zaid is standing for أن [696A], and recite

فَقَمَكَ عَيْنَاهَا ٌ فَجَذَّكِ، ٌ جَدَّتَا

[617] except that the bone etc. (IV). 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 فُ [above], because in the pl. they say أَجَدَات [above] with the أَجَدَات [above] only: (2) prevalently, as in أَفْلَتَ [below], i.e., أَفْلَتَ saved, where the ٌ is a subst. for the ٌ because the ٌ is more prevalently used in it; and similarly in لَصَتُ [below] for لُصُ ٌ thief, robber [689], the ٌ being a subst. for the ٌلُصُ ٌ because its pl. لَصُرْسَ is more frequent than لُصُرْتُ (A): (a) the exemplification of the second [case], vid. reversion prevalently, by أَفْلَتَ [above] is not correct, because the prevalence of reversion to the ٌ is in أَفْلَتَ itself, which is more used with the ٌ than with the ٌ; not in its variations, like مُفْلَتٌ saving, مُفْلَتٌ saved, and
[act of] saving, because the ت, 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 لضت in exemplifying the second: (b) لص with Kasr of the ل is chaster than [لص with] Damm or Fath; but لضت [above] is with Fath of the ل: 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 o. fs., as أرخ and رخ dated, and كد and كد 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 contains the subst., but containing the original letter, for which it is substituted (Sn),] as in تأت inheriting, heritage [689] (SH, A), i. e., property inherited (Jrb, Sn), since “the paradigms of its derivation” are ورث he inherited, [ورث he inherits (482, 700) (R),] ورث heir, [and (A)] مورث inherited (R, A), all of which are derived from مورث inheriting, as تأت is derived from
it (R); and [similarly (R)] in ُوجبة [683] (SH), pl. of ُوجبة face (Jrb), since ُوجبة betaking oneself, مراجحة facing, and ُوجبة worthy of regard are derived from ُوجبة, from which ُوجبة is derived (R): (a) ُوجبة [above], ُوجبة and similarly ُوجبة, ُوجبة, and ُوجبة مراجحة can indicate that the o. f. of ُوجبة is ُوجبة; and similarly ُوجبة, ُوجبة, and ُوجبة مراجحة can indicate that the Hamza in ُوجبة is a subst. for ُوجبة (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, Su),] as in التعالب (SH, A) for the foxes, and التعالب for the hares; while S cites التعالب التعالب التعالب التعالب [685] (A): for, being more used than التعالب, the ُوجبة in the latter is known to be a subst. for the 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 التعلَّبُ [above], which are synonymous, while the first is less used than the second (R): (b) the substitution in التعلَّبُ is recognizable by "the paradigms of its derivation" [above] also, because التعلَّبُ is pl. of تعلُّبَهُ, the female of which is called تعلَّبةٌ, and the male تعلَّبانٌ (Jrb): (c) IJ says "And التعلَّبُ may be pl. of التعلَّبُ [7], being [orig. تعلَّتِلْ], but (Sn)] transposed [by putting the ل before the Hamza (Sn)]; so that it is like شرَّانعُ شرايئٍ for statutes, ordinances, [except that the Hamza, when postponed from its place, is changed into ی for alleviation (Sn)]: but what S says is more appropriate, in order that التعلَّبُ may be like أارَنیهَا [in the verse]; and also because التعلَّبُ 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 ل of ضارب (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 ضويَّرٍ [686] (SH, A), dim. of ضارب [273]; for, since the o. f., [vid. the
non-dim. (Sn),] is known, this is known to be substituted for the \( l \) (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 \( l \), and \( s \) of \( \text{مَرْيَمة} \) \((R)\), in which case the letter corresponding to it in the o. f., is a subst. for it \((Jrb)\)], as in \( \text{مَرْيَمة} \) [275] (SH, A), which is [a deriv., because it is \((Jrb)\)] the dim. of \( \text{مَرْيَمة} \) [683]; for, since the dim. is \( \text{مَرْيَمة} \) [with the \( s \) \((Jrb)\)], 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 \([\text{مَرْيَمة} \((Jrb)\)] is a subst. for the \( s \) \((Jrb, A)\): (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. [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 \( l \) of \( \text{مَرْيَمة} \) is a subst. for the \( l \) of \( \text{مَارْب} \); or for which the letter in the o. f. can be a subst., as the \( l \) and Hamza of \( \text{مَرْيَمة} \) are substs. for the \( l \), and \( s \), respectively, of \( \text{مَرْيَمة} \): (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 یم] is removed in مَعْيَة by the preceding letter's being pronounced with Damm, and as the cause of conversion [683] of the s into Hamza-[ىى یم], vid. the occurrence of the s, which is a quasi-unsound letter, after the 1, which is quasi-augmentative, [is removed in مَعْيَة by the disappearance of the 1,] 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 1 in ضَارِب into  ضَرِب 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) مُرْتَق [690] (SH, A), which is [judged to be (A)] orig. أَرَاق (Jrb, A), since, if it were not so, its measure would necessarily be مَعَعْلَم, which is an unknown formation (A), not recognized among the measures (Sn), because there is no مَعَعْلَم [482] (Jrb); (b) إِصْطَبَر [692] (SH), which is
orig. because there is no (Jrb); (c) 
\[667, 757\] (SH), which is orig. its \(ت\) being changed into \(د\) 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 \([إِفْعَالْ] (MASH)\), or \([إِفْعَالْ] (Jrb); (a) this [argument that such formations are unknown] is true of \(هَنَعَلْ\), but not of \(إِفْعَالْ\) and \(إِفْعَالْ\), because in every v. of the two formations, 
\(إِفْعَالْ\) and 
\(إِفْعَالْ\), when the \(ف\) of the first is a letter of covering 
\[734\], and the \(ف\) of the second is a \(ت, ث, د\), etc. \[757\], the \(ف\) of the first must be followed by a \(ط\) \[756\], and the \(ف\) of the second may have the preceding letter incorporated into it; so that these two are regular, not unknown, formations: (b) you recognize the two letters in these two formations to be subst. by the fact that the \(ط\) does not occur in place of the \(ت\) of \(إِفْعَالْ\) except when preceded by a letter of covering \[692, 756\]; while, the \(ط\) being akin to the \(و\) in outlet \[732\], and to the preceding letter of covering in covering \[734\], the substitution of the \(ط\) for the \(و\) is a probable supposition, because of the heaviness of the \(و\) after the letter of covering, and the affinity of the \(ط\) to the letter of covering and to the \(ت\); and the incorporated letter, as in
\[757\], 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 ˀ, ˼, and ˴ (IY, A); (4)
the ʃ; (5) the ɛ (M, SH, A); (6) the ɛ; (7) the ɛ (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 ˀ, as ٍugas and
ٰدا [328, 723]; (2) the ɛ, as ٨غاط and ٨وثغ [708]; (3)
the ʃ, as ٍجمُل [below]. And, since alteration is more
appropriate in the final [than in the medial or initial],
what has the substitution in its ˀ is put by IH [and
others] before what has it in its ɛ, and what has it in
its ɛ before what has it in its ʃ (Jrb). The Hamza is
[necessarily (A, Tsr)] substituted for the ˀ, and ˴ in
four cases, (1) where the ˀ or ˴ is final, [whether a ˀ or
a co-ordinative aug. (Tsr, Sn),] after an aug. ˀ, [whether
the initial of its word be pronounced with Kasr, Fath,
or Damm (Tsr, Sn)—so in the Tsr (Sn),] as ٍغس in
[above], ٍغبس [246], and ٍغتم prayer, [where the
Hamza is substituted for a ی, the o. f. being گیسار, طبیب, سمار, and دعاو (Tsr); and as 672, گیسار, gazelles [237, 260] (Aud. A), and ی فناو evanescence (Aud) and ی فقات decree (A), where the Hamza is substituted for a ی, the o. f. being ی فناو, طبیب, بناو, and ی فقات (Tsr); and, [says Kh in the Tsr (Su),] ی فقات and ی تویا, ی فقات [248], where the Hamza is substituted for a ی added for co-ordination with ی فرسان and ی فراتاس [273] (Tsr, Sn): contrary to such as (a) ی فراتا conversed with [703] and ی فراتا trafficked with [686] (Aud, A), ی فراتا helped one another and ی فراتا became separated (A), ی فراتا and ی فراتا [below] (Tsr), for want of finality (A), because the ی and ی occur as an ی (Tsr, Sn) in the first two [exs., as also in the next two]; while the last two words are formed with the [inseparable] ی of feminization [266], contrary to the adventitious [ی of] feminization, which does not prevent substitution, as ی فراتا fem. of ی فراتا builder [below] (Tsr): (b) ی فراتا غرزو [643, 719] (Aud, A), for want of the ة (A, Tsr): (c) ی فراتا [below] (Aud, A), the name of the [particular (Sn)] letter (Tsr, Sn), and ی فراتا [below] (Aud, A), pl. of ی فراتا [684] (Tsr, Sn) ی ا mark, and a verse of a chapter [in the Kur] (Sn), for want of augmentativeness in the ة (A), because the ة in both [exs.] is [converted from a (Sn)] rad. (A, Tsr), so
that there is no substitution [in the final], otherwise
two transformations, [vid. conversion of their \( \varepsilon \) into \( l \),
and conversion of their \( j \) into Hamza (Sn),] would occur
in succession, which is disallowed (A): (a) as for \( \varepsilon l \)
[723], its measure is فَعَلُّ with two Fathas: but as to
whether its \( \varepsilon \) be a ی or a ی', there are two sayings, the
first by F, and the second by Akh [698]; and, according
to both sayings, the \( l \) is converted from a rad. : (b) as for
ی[
302], its o. f. is یُیُیُ with two Fathas; but the first
is converted into \( l \), because mobile and preceded by a
letter pronounced with Fath [684] (Tsr): (c) the \( l \) shares
with the ی, and ی in that [predicament; so that, when
final after an aug. \( l \), it is changed into Hamza (Tsr)],
as یُتُرُ [273, 385]: for its o. f. is یُتُرُ [with an
abbreviated \( l \) (Tsr)], like یُسُکُرُ [250, 272]; but an \( l \) is
added before the final for prolongation, like the \( l \) of یُکُلُبُ
[671, 673] and ُعُلُمُ [369]; and, [two \( l \)'s then concurring,
which it is not possible to articulate (Tsr),] the second
[\( l \) (Tsr)] is changed into Hamza (Aud, A), because this
is from the same outlet as the \( l \) [732]; and the vowel
[of inflection], which was assumed on the \( l \) [16], appears
on it (Tsr): (d) this substitution is retained in company
with the adventitious ی of feminization, as یُبُنَّا fem.
of یُبُنَّا [above]: but, if the ی of feminization be unad-
ventitious, substitution is disallowed, as یُهَدَرَیَة guidance
enmity, because the word is formed with the [inseparable] ٍٍ, i.e., is not formed [without a ٍ (Sn)] as a masc. (A), being either not constituted as a masc. at all, like هَدَايَة [above]; or shaped as a masc. in another sense, like سَقَاهَة [above], since سَقَاهَة 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 [ٍ of femininization], the first as in the prov. إِسْتَقُى رَقَاشَ فَانَّهَا سَقَاهَة. 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], سَقَاهَة resembles what is formed with the [inseparable] ٍٍ of femininization; [but this, in my opinion, requires consideration, because it is good as an assignment of the cause for the ٍٍ’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 فَانَّهَا سَقَاهَة with Hamza, as when not in a prov.: and the second as in صلأٍٍ for صلأٍٍ [266, 721]: (f) the predicament of the two augments [228] of
the _du_. is like that of the 3 of feminization in being accompanied by this substitution, as ِرِدَآْنِ and ِكَسْآْنِ (A); i. e., allowably, which is not incompatible with IM's saying "And such as ِكَسْآْ، ِعَلْبآْ، and ِحِبَّآ (are dualized) with ا and or Hamza" [230] (Sn): but, if the word be [orig.] formed as a _du_., substitution is disallowed, as in their saying ِعَقْلَتْهُ ِيِشْتَدُّيْسِنِ (228, 230, 721): (g) it is objected that such a _rel. n._ [below] as ُهَأْرِي , 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 ا and ى , when final after an _aug._"] , because constructively "for every ا and ى" (Sn): for you say ُأَوْلِي ِي َيَا ُغَآْرُ ِتَأْنِاْبَٰسِنِ with _Damm_ of the ا , without substitution, notwithstanding that it falls within the rule mentioned; the reason that substitution is not employed being that ُهَأْرُ has already been transformed by elision of its ل [301], [on account of the ا 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._] ُغَآْرِي , without [the ا of] relation, is [similarly] curtailed, its predicament is like that [of the _voc._ ُغَآْرِي , since here also you say ُيَا ُغَآْرُ]; and hence Syt, when he quotes the language of IUK, omits this
expression ["rel. n."], from it: but the condition of the curtailment of or 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 of is not 'final'; but medial, the elision being accidental (Sn): (j) [A suggests that, if IM had put "when a J" in place of "when final", saying "when a J after an aug. !", it would have been right (A), because it would have excluded , where the is an but the expression "when a J" is open to the objection that it does not include such as and [above], where the Hamza is substituted for a added for co-ordination; and therefore IUK says that the rule should be corrected by saying "for a or that is a J or co-ordinated with one": while A's expression "when a J" and IUK's correction of the rule are both open to the objection that they do not include such as [above], where the Hamza is substituted for the of feminization (Sn): (k) the manner of this substitution is disputed:— (α) it is said that the and are changed into Hamza, which is apparently the language of IM: (β) critical judges of etymology say that an is substituted for the and and afterwards the is changed into Hamza: for, when and are said, the and are mobile
after a Fatha [684], there being no barrier between them except the "aug. "1, 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 ُ, because made to accord with [the ُ and ِ in] the cat. of ُّ صا and ُّ مه[719]; and, two quiescents then concurring, the second ُ is converted into Hamza, because this is from the same outlet as the ُ [732] (A): the first ُ 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 ُ or ِ occurs as an ُ of an act. part. from a v. whose ُ is transformed, [whether the act. part. mentioned be, or be not, denuded of the sign of the fem., du., and pl. (Sn),] as ُّ مهُّ and ُّ بَأَيْع [above] (Aud, A), which are orig. ُّ تَأَوْلُ and ُّ بَأَيْع; but are [transformed, because (Ts)] made to accord with the v. (A, Ts) in transformation (A), though the transformation in them is by conversion of the ُ into Hamza [below], and in the v. by conversion of it into ُ (Sn): contrary to such as ُّ ثُّرُ was blind of one eye [684], act. part. ُّ عَيْنٌ [708], and ُّ عَيْنٌ was large in the eye, act. part.
(1210)

(Aud, A), because the e, being sounded true in the v., from fear of confusion with गार rendered blind of one eye and गान 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 साल or when not an act. part., like जाति [247], which is [spelt with a ज and ज by Kh, who expounds it as (Sn)] a garden, whence

[419] (A), where it is spelt with a ज and [247] by Al' Aini, who expounds it as a place where water collects (Sn); and like जाइते, 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 v., 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 v. in transformation and sounding true, is dubious for two reasons, firstly that transformation is sometimes introduced into the act. part., when it has no v. at all, like जाटि [with the ज and ज, which is a garden (Tsr).] and [its fem. (Tsr)] जाटि, [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 ٨ or ڪ 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, ٢)] above, it
would have been better (Sn): (b) the majority say
"Nay, they are converted into ٥, [because each of them
is mobile after a Fatha separated (from it) by a not
insuperable barrier (Sn)]; and afterwards the ٥ is
changed into Hamza, as before mentioned [under case 1
(k, ٥)] in connection with ١٨١٨٣٩٢ and ٢٢٠٢٣٨: 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 ٥ of ٢٤١١١٢٤ is inserted before
the converted 1 in ُبَلَّل and ُبَلَّل [684, 703], and their likes; so that, two 1's then concurring, both of which are quiescent, [the one representing] the ُبَلَّل is mobilized, because it is orig. mobile; and the 1, when mobilized, becomes a Hamza [below] (A): (d) according to the saying of Mb, then, the ُبَلَّل and ُبَلَّل 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 IM, as well as] from the saying of the majority (Sn): (e) such [formations] as ُبَلَّل and ُبَلَّل are written with the ُبَلَّل, according to the predicament of alleviation [by softening the Hamza between pure Hamza and pure ُبَلَّل, as is proved by what follows (Sn)], because the rule of the Hamza in those [formations] is to be softened between Hamza and ُبَلَّل [658], for which reason it is written as ُبَلَّل: (f) as for changing the Hamza in those [formations] into pure ُبَلَّل, they categorically declare it to be a solecism: and so [do they declare] sounding the ُبَلَّل true in ُبَلَّل, [i.e., pronouncing it as though it were the rad. (ُبَلَّل)], not changed from the Hamza, so that this (solecism) is not the same as the preceding (Sn)]; while, if the ُبَلَّل might be sounded true in ُبَلَّل, the ُبَلَّل might be sounded true in ُبَلَّل: (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 كاتئل and باتئ is disallowed: MM says "The dotting of the ی of كاتئل and باتئ 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 كاتئl 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 or ی occurs [in the pl.] after the ی of مفادئل [18, 256], while, in the sing., it is an aug. letter of prolongation [third], as [عيمج, pl. (Tsr)] مختلفآمكز, and [صحیفة, pl. (Tsr)] صحیفآمكز [246, 703, 717]: (a) the ی shares with the ی in this case, as قلأنا, necklace, collar, pl. قلأنا, and قلأنا، رسلأة, pl. رسلأة [246, 717] (Aud): (b) IM indicates the third [case] by his saying "And the [letter of (Sn)] prolongation", [whether ا, ا, or an ی (Sn)], "when an aug. third in the sing., is seen as Hamza in the like of [the pl.] قلأنا [above]," i. e., The aug. letter of prolongation third [in the sing.] must be changed into Hamza in the pl. on the paradigm of مفادئل, مفادئل, pl. قلأنا [above]; معاذل, صحیفة, pl. معاذل; and معاذل, قلأنا.
(A): (c) that [conversion of such a letter of prolongation into Hamza] is because, when you pluralize [and مَفْعُولُ (Tsr)] on the paradigm of مَفْعُولُ، the ٰ of the pl. occurs third, while the ٰ of [and مَفْعُولُ (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 مَفْعُولُ; so that nothing remains but mobilization of the second [ٰ (Tsr)] with Kasr, in order that it may be like the ٰ of مَفْعُولُ; and the ٰ, when mobilized, is converted into Hamza [below]: while the ٰ of مُحَجَّرُ and the ٰ of صَحِيفَةٌ [above] are assimilated to the ٰ of مَفْعُولُ [and مَفْعُولُ (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 صَحِيفَةٌ، رَسَائِلُ، and مَجَبَانُ، 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 1, [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) قَسْوَر, قَسْوَرَة, which is a lion (Tsr, Sn)], pl. قَسَارُ [253, 675] (Aud, A), because the [in the sing.] is not a letter of prolongation (Tsr): (b) [c] مَعايْشَة, مَعايِش [A]. مُقاَرَة, [desert, pl. Mَقَارِر], مُقاَرَة, [Aud, A], and Mَقَارِبَة recompense, pl. Mَقَارِبَة (A), because the letter of prolongation in the sing. is rad., so that it is not changed [in the pl.] (Tsr): (c) Mَنَارَة, Mَنَارَة, and Mَصْاطِب; pl. Mَصْاطِب, [affliction, pl. Mَصْاطِب], and Mَنَارَة, pl. Mَنَارَة, and Mَنَارَة, Mَنَارَة, [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 Mَنَارَة and Mَنَارَة, which also are said (A): β consequently also, with Hamza in one version transmitted from Na'fi', is anomalous, the well-known [version] transmitted from him being with ی, as [mentioned] in [the Commentary of] IUK [on the IM] (Sn): (c) شَرَفْ [373, 674], شَرَفْ [373, 675], and Shَرَفْ [247]; and مُفَتْح [366, 379], مُفَتْح [253, 396], and مُكْرَلْ a certain dry measure [685]: because the unsound
letter is not third (A); while عَوْسَجُمُ صَيْرُف and عُوْسَجُمُ صَيْرُف are [also] excluded by the restriction to the letter of prolongation (Sn): (4) where the or ی occurs as second of two soft letters having the ] of مَقَامِل [18, 256] between them, whether the two soft letters be (a) two ی as in َنَبِّيُّ (Aud, A), which is the excess over the decimal number, from نَبِّع, aor. ِنِبِّيُّ; whereas the saying of Sht that its o.f. is َنَبِّيُّ, [like َنَبِّيُّ (251, 716) (Tsr),] is based upon [the theory] that it is from نَبِّع, aor. ِنِبِّيُّ (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (b) two ی, as in یُنِّيُّ [715], pl. of یُنِّيُّ [357]: or (c) different, [one being a ی, and the other a (Tsr), which includes two cases; precedence of the ی before the ی, and the converse thereof, both exemplified by A (and Kh) (Sn),] as in سَبِيلُ سَبِيلُ [251], [since it is (Aud)] orig. سَبِيلُ سَبِيلُ [685, 716] (Aud, A); and pl. of سَبِيلُ سَبِيلُ hunter (A, Tsr), where ی is a subst. for the ] of سَبِيلُ [247, 686] (Sn): orig. سَبِيلُ and سَبِيلُ [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 یُنِّيُّ a [sing. (Sn)]
like عُوَارِض, you would say تَرَانَّل, with the Hamza: this is the opinion of S and the majority (A, Tsr), and IM proceeds upon it in the Tashil (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 ⲝ, and of dotting's being disallowed, is [the same] as was mentioned in the case of تَرَانَّل and بَنَّع above (A). And here is a [fifth (A)] case peculiar to the ⲝ (Aud, A): when two ⲝ 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 ⲝ, then the first ⲝ 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 كَذَنَّ [357, 672, 674]; and, since reduplication at the beginning of a word is rare with sound letters, it is impossible with the ⲝ, from the heaviness of the latter: (2) that, since they allow [the initial ⲝ of] دُخَرَ [below] and the like, which is a single ⲝ, to be changed [into Hamza], on account of [the fact] that, by reason of the Damma, it is like two ⲝ, they are naturally disposed to make the change obligatory when two ⲝ are [actually] present, because two ⲝ are heavier than ⲝ, 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 زَاصِلَة joining and خُقَنَة preserver, where you say أُرَاسِلُ [357, 661] and أُرَاسِلَيُ (Aud), like أُرَاسِلَة ضَارِبَة, pl. [247, 333, 686] (Tsr), orig. أُرَاسِلَة and زَاصِلَة (Aud), with two s [below], the first of which is changed into Hamza, as ضَرِبَت صَدْرَهَا [48] (Tsr) : and the second [case (Tsr)] as in أُلْوَى fem. of أُلْوَي [357], orig. زُوَيْنِى [below] with two s, the first being a ف pronounced with Damm, and the second a quiescent ع (Aud), original as a, ; while its pl. is أُلْوِي [357], orig. زُوَيْنِى [below], which is treated as above mentioned [under the first case] (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) [the passives (Tsr)] زُوَيْنِى and زُوَيْنِى, [below], where [it is not necessary that the first should be changed into Hamza, because (Tsr)] the second is quiescent, [and] converted from the ١ of فَاعُل [490, 671] (Aud), with Fath of the ع, vid. زُوَيْنِى reached and زَارِى hid; so that it is not original as a, , because it is a subst. for an aug. ١ (Tsr): (b) زُوَيْنِى [below] with a, pronounced with Damm, and then a Hamza, fem. of أَلْوَيْنُ, the أَنْعُل [of superiority (Tsr)] of أَلْوَيْنُ [357], i. q. لُجَى 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 \( \); (a) allowability is to be understood from the negation of necessity (Ts\( \)). As for [this] substitution of the Hamza for the \( \), it is [said by Z to be] (II) for every \( \), occurring as an initial, coupled with another [\( \) that is] inseparable [from the formation], as in (1) \( \) and \\
(above), pls. of \\
[above]: (2) \( [661], \) dim. of \\
joining [below] \\
(M); and \\
[below], dim. of \\
[above]: orig. \\
and , in which there are two causes for conversion into Hamza, (a) the combination of two \( \) [above]; and (b) the [initial] \( \)'s being [permanently] pronounced with Damm [below], on account of the dim. formation [274]: (3) \( [ \) [below] and \\
[below], which you would say if you formed a n. like \\
[253] and \\
pronounced, threatened and with : (a) \\
if used as names, they would be triptote, because they are \\
like \\
Kauthar [671] and \\
Jauhar [369]; not \\
[18], like \\
Adra' and \\
Aulaj (II). The rule for it is [here said by R to be] this:—Whenever two \( \), \( \) 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) [and (2) above]; (3) [above], from رَقَعَةٍ [and (below), upon the measure of ٍتَرَفِّقُهُ (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 ٌتَرَفِّقُ [with Fath of the [Sn]], as in The age of maturity was reached and VII. 19. [686]; (b) a Hamza, as in alleviated from [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 ٌتَرَفِّقُ [482] from ٌتَرَفِّقُ, and then reduce it to the pass., [in which case you say the second (و) being an adventitious letter of prolongation caused by the supervention of Damma (436) before it (Sn)]: (3) aug., as when you form the paradigm of ٍتَرَفِّقُ [above] from ٍتَرَفِّقُ, in which case you say: (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 ١٤٢١ 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 ١١٢٠ (Sn),] since the Damma before it is unadventitious, [contrary to the Damma before the letter of prolongation in such as ١١٢٠ (Sn):] and this opinion is adopted by IU [and R]: (c) IM prefers the saying that both modes are allowable, because the second [١١٢٠], 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 [١١٢٠ (Sn)] converted [from the (Sn)] (A) in such as ١١٢٠ (Sn). And two cases are included, in which the change is necessary, vid. where the second [١١٢٠] is (1) not a letter of prolongation, as in (a) جل. of جل., fem. of جل., orig. جل. [above]; (b) جل. and جل. جل., pl's. of جل. and جل., orig. جل. جل. جل., جل. جل., جل., جل. جل., جل., with two ١٤٢١ [above], the first the ﬁ of the word, and the second a subst. for the ﬁ of جل. جل. [686], as it is substituted in the dim., like جل. جل. (A), dms. of جل. [above] and جل. preserver; though جل. جل. جل. جل. جل. جل. جل. جل. جل. جل. جل. [above] would be more conformable to what
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precedes (Sn): (c) ْعَدَتْ [above], which you would say if you formed the paradigm of ْكَرَبَةٌ [373] from ْعَدَتْ, orig. ْعَدَتْ: (2) an original letter of prolongation, as in ْأَلْرَلَيْ [above] (A). The condition is that the second 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 ْأَلْرَلَيْ [above] (A): (2) not a letter of prolongation at all, because not after دامم, whether it be (a) mobile, as in ْأَرْاسِلْ [and ْؤَرَاقِي] mentioned [above]; and in ْلُوْلُوْلَيْ pl. of ْأَلْرَلَيْ, orig. ْلُوْلُوْلَي [above]: or (b) quiescent, after a vowel other than دامم, as in ْلُوْلُوْلَي, orig. ْلُوْلُوْلَي with three ْل [357]. In all of that the change [of the first, into Hamza] is necessary: whereas, with the adventitious letter of prolongation, it is not necessary, but allowable, whether such letter be a subst. for the ٌ of فَانِغَلَ, as in ْوَرَى [above], where ْوَرَى [above] and ْرَى [below] with Hamza are allowable; or for a Hamza, as in ْأَلْرَلَيْ alleviated from ْأَلْرَلَي [above]; or for any other [letter], as detailed by A (MKh). The restriction of initiality [in the first ٌ] excludes such [forms] as ْهُـرَوي [661] and ْنَرَوى (Aud, A), rel. ns. of ْحُورَى love and ْنَرُى date-stones [300] (Aud, Sn), where the first ٌ is not changed into Hamza,
because it is not initial (Tsr, Sn). 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)] لَغَلَغَل [i. q. َعَدُّ, promising, threatening (Sn)], in which case you say لَعْبَرَّا، orig. لَعْبَرَّا، the first being converted into ى because of its quiescence after a Kasra [685, 699], and the last ى into ٰ 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 لَعْبَرَّا [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 لَعْبَرَّا [with two s pronounced with Fath, and then an I (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, 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 [أجرة] 278, 322, 682, 699 (M), رقت and أقت [278, 322] (IY); (b) an [doubled by having another, \] incorporated into [it], as [ أئزر] [278] (M), pl. of دار , and أئب pl. of ثوب : 'Umar Ibn Abi Rabî'a says

وَلَكَّنَا قَذَّلَتُ الْقُلْبَ مِنْهُمْ وَأَطْفَقْتُ

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

لِكُلِّ دُفْرٍ قَذَلَ كَيْسَتُ أَثْوَابًا

[242] (IY): (2) coupled [with another, \], when [the, permanently pronounced with Damm is] an غ , as in غوزر [below] and دوزر [278] (M). The formula for it is "Every, pronounced with a permanent [below] Damma, whether such, \ be initial, [as in أجرة;] or medial, [as in أئزر and دوزر:] and whether that which is initial be followed by an aug. \ converted from another letter, as in أئر [above]; or not, as in أجرة [above]" (R). As for
the substitution of the Hamza for the, pronounced with Damm, mentioned [in the last two paragraphs], it is good, regular, as in (1) اُلْحَرَّة, orig. اُلْحَرَّة [above]; (2) اُلْحَرَّة [above] and اُلْحَرَّة pl. of اُلْحَرَّة fire, orig. اُلْحَرَّة and اُلْحَرَّة [242]; (3) سَلَّحَة [237], pl. of سَلَّحَة shank, and شَرَّج inf. n. of شَرَّجَة The water sank, aor. يَفْغُرُ, inf. ns. يَفْغُرُ and يَفْغُرُ, where the conversion is not on account of the combination of two س, because the second is an aug. letter of prolongation (A). Our saying [that the Damma should be (A)] "permanent" [above] is to guard against the [accidental (IY)] Damma [arising because (IY)] of (1) inflection (IY, R, A), as in ٌذَلُو 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 incorporated into it]" is to guard against such as تَقُولُ taking refuge and تَكُولُ shifting. As for the substitution of the Hamza for the س pronounced with Kasr between an ل and a double س, it [also] is [an allowable substitution for a letter of softness; and occurs] in such as ذِي رَأَى [305], rel. ns. of ذِي رَأَى and ذِي غَابَى, orig. ذِي رَأَى and ذِي غَابَى with three س, 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) tho' in [a good number of positions (IX), such as (M)] (a) [665] (M, A), for [a gAntt number of positions (IY), as (M)] (n)

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 (IY); and [hence (IX)] (E, a), and (E, a), for [Ishā'āl, and] (E, a), and (E, a), for [Ishā'āl, and]

Dukain says

[1226]

And his milking was until his milk-pail became white;

and Kuthayyir says

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 ḍaṣḥāma; and they recite

And after the whiteness of hoariness from every side, which has so overgrown my head of hair that its black has become glistening, meaning Ishā'āl: 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‘Ajjāj (M, A), who says

يا دار سلمى يا سلمى ثم أسليي ثم أسليي ثم أسليي

(M) O abode of Salmūt, O hail, again hail! Then

Khindis [309, 679] is the head of this world (Jsh),

because the I would be a foundation in 

[above] (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
constantly mobilize the I before the ق of مُشْتَقِعٍ،
because it corresponds to the I of مُشْتَقِعٍ، 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 I was converted, since مُشْتَقِعٍ is مُفتَعِلٍ from شَرَقٍ, being orig. مُشْتَقِعٍ. حَمْزٌ (IY); and Fr transmits, in a case of no constraint, رَجُلٌ مِّثْلٌ a wealthy man (R), for لَبَّا الْرَّجُلُ مَأْلَ . The man discharged the obligation of performing the pilgrimage (R), for لَبَّى (MAR): (a) that [conversion of the I 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 I and Hamza [732] (R): (2) the ، not pronounced with داَمْم (M), (a) when ف pronounced with ك: or فاث (IY): (a) as for the substitution of the Hamza for the initial [below] ، pronounced with كَسَرٍ, it is (A) in such as [for البتريرم balsdric, الْعَدَّةُ embassy, and القُصُورُ cushion (IY, A)]; and [ for السَّلَّهُ and [ for السَّلْهُ sack, whence (IY) XII. 76. The sack of his brother [Benjamin (K, B)] in the reading of [Ubayy (A).] Sa‘īd Ibn Jubair (M, A), and IIU (A): S cites [the verse by Ibn Mu‘kbil (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 の pronounced with Kasr to the の pronounced with Ğamm, since they deem Kasra, as they deem Ğamma, to be heavy [on the の] (ΙV): (β) Mz holds this substitution to be regular [322] (M, R, A) in the [initial の (R)] pronounced with Kasr (M, R): but others restrict it to hearsay (ΙV, A): while I'm reports that IUH 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 の of طويل long [684], which is not converted, because the [ ] pronounced with Kasr, being lighter than the one pronounced with Ğamm, is not converted in every position; while the middle is more remote from alteration [than the beginning] (A): (b) [as for the (initial) の pronounced with Fath, it is not converted, because of the lightness of Fatha, except (A)] in [their anomalous sayings (A)] أَنَّا languid [699] (M, A), on the measure of َقَتْلَةُ spear-shaft (Sn), said of a woman, orig. (ΙV, A) i. q. فَتْرُ َقَتْلَةُ linguor (ΙV), [or] from َقَتْلَةُ [with Fath of the の, and quiescence of the في, as is understood from the KF (Sn)] i. q. بُطُولَّ slowness (A); أَسْمَى ِْْ Asma (M, A), a
woman's name (IY, A), to guard against اَسْبَآآَل pl. of اَسْبَآآل (A), its measure being فِعْلَا, beauty (IY, A); and اَحْدُ (M, A), when used as a num. (IY, A) in اَحْدُ عَشْرُونَ اَحْدَادٌ عَشْرَةٌ (IY), orig. اَحْدَادٌ عَشْرَةٌ unity; contrary to اَحْدُ (IY, A) in ما بَـَ~ اَحْدَادٌ مِن اَحْدَادٍ There is not any one in the house (IY), where the Hamza is [said to be (A)] original (IY, A), because اَحْدَادٌ is not in the sense of unity (A), since it denotes generality, not singleness (IY); though [here also] the Hamza is said [by some] to be a subst. for the, (Sn); and اَحْدَادٌ in the tradition (M) that Muhammad said to a man, who made the sign with his two forefingers in reciting the creed, اَحْدَادٌ اَحْدَادٌ Make the sign with one, one, i.e., اَحْدَادٌ اَحْدَادٌ (IY): (b) [when a letter of prolongation: for:] F recites

أَحْبَبُ الْمُوَتَّدِيْنِ إِلَى مُوْسَى # رَجُعَةٌ إِذْ أَضْعَفَهُمَا الْوُتُوْرُ (R), by Jarir, praising Hisham Ibn 'Abd AlMalik, The dearest of the kindlers (of fire) to me are, also related لَعْبَ الْمُوَتَّدِيْنِ Assuredly very dear to me are [476] the two kindlers (of fire), Musa and his sister Ja'da, when the blaze has lighted them up (Jsh), with the of مُوْسَى الْمُوَتَّدِيْنِ and pronounced as
a Hamza; while is [reported to have been (B)] read [by Ibn Kathîr with the (B)] pronounced as Hamza (R), because of the ūmma before it, like [for ُمُؤْتِم١ (686)] (B): (α) the reason of that is said to be that the ، being in the vicinity of ūmma, becomes, as it were, vocalized with ūmâm; while the ، vocalized with ūmâm is [regularly] pronounced as Hamza, as in [above] (R): (3) the ي (M, A), (α) when [initial, and] pronounced with Fath, in which case they substitute Hamza for the ي, as they substitute it for the [initial ، [pronounced with Fath], though more rarely than for the ، [above] (IY): they say (α) قَطَعَ اللَّهُ أَدْيَةَ God cut off his hand! (M, R, A), with Fath of the Hamza, and quiescence of the د (Sn), meaning يَدَّيْنِهَا [i. e., يَدَّيْنِهَا (A),] by restoring the ل [260, 719], and (IY, R, A) substituting a Hamza for the د (IY), [i. e.,] changing the [first (R)] ي into Hamza (R, A): so says IJ (R): (α) F says that أَدْيَةَ is a dial. var., يَدَّيْنِهَا and أَدْيَةَ being on a par with يَدَّيْنِهَا Yalâlam, [a mountain of Tihâma (BK, MI),] and أَلْبَلْمَ Alâlam; but his pupil IJ disagrees with him (Sn): (b) In his teeth is أَلْلَلَلِّ (M, R, A), i. e., يَلْلَلِّ [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 أَلْلَلَلِّ [663, 708] said of a
man, and ُيلَّةٌ of a woman (IY, A): (b) [when a letter of prolongation: for] they (M, R), [or] some of them (A), say ُشِيَّةٍ nature (M, R, A) with Hamza (A), orig. with ی (IY, R), the Hamza being a subst. for the ی (IY); and similarly ٌرَبْرَبُنُ, which is the lion (A). The substitution of the Hamza for the ُ[and ی (A)] is rare (IY, A), i. e., anomalous (Sn), irregular (IY). Its substitution for the ُis in (1) [such as (Jrb)] ُذَلِّلُ [304, 326, 682, 684] (M, Jrb, A), and [sometimes also in its pl. (Jrb)] ُقُرْنُ [below] (M, Jrb): (a) the o. f. of ُذَلِّلُ (IY, R, Jrb, BS, A) is ُذَلِّلُ [below] (Jrb, A), the o. f. of which (A) is ُقُرْنُ (IY, R, BS, A), as is proved by. [the dim. (IY)] ُعَلْئِلُ [275, 278] (IY, Jrb, A) and [the broken pl. (IY)] ُعَلْئِلُ [378] (IY, A), its ُbeing converted into ِ (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 ُعَلْئِلُ becomes ُذَلِّلُ [above] (IY): while its ُ, [being then assimilated to the unsound letters (IY, R), on account of its faintness, and being therefore like a ُ, or ی occurring as a final after an aug. ِ (R),] is converted [into ِ, and afterwards (R)] into Hamza, [as in case ِ (k, َ) 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 ُمُرْنُ [above]
with the s, which they sometimes change [into Hamza] (BS); [so that] in the pl. (IY, MAR) they also say ُنُمْرُ (IY, R) for ُنُمْرُ, for a similar reason, [vid. the assimilation of its s to the unsound letters, as explained above under ُمَمَ] (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 ميَّة [273], according to the o.f., with the s, not otherwise (BS): (d) the substitution in (Jrb) رُمْ 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 رُمْ it is not so (Jrb): (e) hence رُمْ [275, 278, 304, 326, 684], a [lexicological] pl. of رُمْ, orig. شَرْعَة [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 شَرْعَ: 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 letter pronounced with Fath
is converted into ٌ [684], the n. becoming ٌ; and, when it is pluralized, the ٌ of feminization is rejected, on the principle of ٌ and ٌ [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 ٌ and ٌ is elided [643, 684, 719], in which case the explicit n. would remain with one letter; and, that being impossible, they restore the ٌ elided from the sing., so that the word becomes constructively ٌ, restoration of the elided being more appropriate than importation of a strange, extraneous letter; and then the ٌ is changed into Hamza, so that ٌ is said (IY): (f) ٌ family is said to be orig. ٌ; then ٌ, the ٌ being converted into Hamza; then ٌ, the Hamza being converted into ٌ [658]: that is because conversion of the ٌ into ٌ 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 ٌ [684], because they, [i.e., the members of the family,] ٌ go back to a [common] stock, or origin (R): (2) ٌ آل تعلُّت (2) [599] and ٌ آل تعلُّت (A): (a) AU relates that the Arabs say ٌ آل تعلُّت [above], meaning ٌ (IY, R); while the Hamza here is
decided to be a subst. for the s, because in interrogation ُهَلُ is prevalently, and [ُلُuُl with] Hamza rarely, used, for which reason the s is [considered to be] original : (b) as for their saying ُهَلُ تَعْلَتْ (IY), it is said [that the Hamza here is a subst. for the s, and (IY)] that the o. f. [of ُلُا in excitation (R)] is ُهَلُ [573] (IY, R); but the truth is that they are two dial. vars., because their use in this sense is uniform, without predominance of either over the other, for which reason the s as original is not more appropriate than the reverse (IY). And its substitution for the ع is in the saying

(1285)

(M, A) And the deserts of intense heats were agitated at times, like a billow of a laughing, far-extending sea (Sn), cited by As, where ُعَبَبُ is meant (IY), ُعَبَبُ (A); but the poet substitutes the Hamza for the ع because of the proximity of their outlets [732], as the ع is substituted for the Hamza in such as ُأَهْيَنَ تَرْسَّبَتْ آلِحُ [580, 682] and the like (IY). Some, however, say that the Hamza [here (A)] is [original (IY),] not a subst. [for the ع (A)]; and that ُعَبَبُ is only [ُفُعَالُ (A)] from ُأَبَ meaning prepared himself [for going away (IY)], because the sea prepares itself (IY, A) to swell (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 ی, 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 anything else, it is [merely] by way of digression. As for its substitution for the ع and غ, it is [found in] their sayings صرى screamed, and رى [hearkened, and agreed, to it (Sn)], 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 , and ی (IY, A, MASH); (3) the Hamza (M, SH, A); (4) the [single (A)] ی (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 [703] (M, SH), رمي [719] دمًا and باع [703, 711], vid. where the , 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) ُل‎، according to one opinion (SH), since its o. f., according to Ks, is ُل‎ [683], because its dim., according to some, is ُل‎ ُل‎; but the ‏ل‎ is converted into ‏ل‎: while, according to the BB [below], the ‏ل‎ is substituted for the ‏ل‎ (Jrb): (2) irregular, [rare (IY),] in such as ِل‎ [below], ِل‎ حَارِي (M), where they substitute an ‏ل‎, from desire of lightness [below], for the quiescent ‏ن‎ and ‏ن‎, when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (IY). IM indicates the [regular] substitution of the ‏ل‎ for its two sisters by his saying “Substitute an ‏ل‎ for a َو‎ or َو‎ orig. mobile, after a conjoined Fath”, i. e., Change of the ‏ل‎ and ‏ن‎ into ‏ل‎ is necessary upon eleven conditions, (1) that they be mobile; for which reason they are sounded true in َل‎ ُتنَع and َل‎ ُتَنَع [703], because of their quiescence: (2) that their vowel be original; for which reason they are sounded true in ِل‎ َجِبَل [300, 658] and َل‎ ُتَرَم, alleviated from ُتَرَم جَيَل the she-hyæna and ُتَرَم جَيَل 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 Fath; for which reason they are sounded true in ُعَرَض compensation [711], ُجِبَل [685], and ُسُور chapters [238]: (4) that the Fatha be conjoined [with them], i. e., [be] in their words [without a separative (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 be original; so that, if such [a word] as ُعْلَبِيطُ [392] were formed from ُغَزْرُ and ُرَمَي and ُغَزْرُ 'raiding' and ُرَمَي 'shooting', would be said, defective (A), like ُقَافِس [16, 671], orig. ُغَزْرُ with two ى, s, and ُرَمَي with two ى s (Sn); and the [first], and ى would not be converted into ٰ, because the conjunction of the Fatḥa with them would be adventitious, caused by elision of an َ, since the o. f. would be ُعْلَبِيطُ [727] and ُرَمَي, because is orig. ُعْلَبِيطُ [401] (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] ى wherein doubling is customary": (b) for that reason
the ع is sounded true in such as بَيَان ِبَلْدُهُ perspicuity, خَرَّنِقٌ [348, 683], and خَوْرَنِقٌ Khawarnaq; and the ل in such as قَبْطَي ِبَنَيْمِي and عَصْرَٰنٌ, 719, 663 غَرَّى and عَصْرَٰنٌ, 719, 663 غَرَّى [299] and 3:00 (A), these [last] two exs. being combined by A because the ی in the first is converted from the second ی of عَلْوِي, ۳:۰۰, Ali, which is converted from a ی, and in the second is converted from the ی of فَتَى youth, which is converted from a ی (Sn): while the ع is transformed in بَعَّ ِبَاَبٍ قَامُ and بَعَّ بَاَبٍ نَابِ [703], because the letter after it is mobile; and the J in یَا َعَلَى and یَا َعَلَى [719], since there is no ی or double ی after it: (c) similarly [the J is transformed in یَبْخَشُونَ They dread and یَبْخَشُونَ They obliterate [with Fath of the ح, according to the dial. of those who say مَكِه أ, inf. n. مَكِه أ (Sn), orig. يَبْخَشُونَ and يَبْخَشُونَ [with two ی and s (Sn)], the [second] ی and [first] ی, respectively, being converted into ی, 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 عَصُرٌ, عَصُرٌ, ۱۳:۱۳, when used as a name [for a rational male (Sn)], you say قَامُ عَصْرَٰنٌ [properly عَصْرَٰنٌ The] ‘Aṣā’s [13] stood, orig. عَصْرَٰنٌ, [the first ی of] which is treated as mentioned [under (c)]: (e) according to this, if you formed from یَا َرُمُيْ and فَرُزَ a word ۱۳۲a
like [399], you would say غزٌرَوتُ and رَمْيَتُ [with Fath of their first and third, and quiescence of their second (Sn)], orig. غزٌرَوتُ and رَمْيَتُ, the [second] ی and ِ being converted [into ِ]; and [afterwards] elided, because of meeting the quiescent [و] : and that [formation] would be facilitated by the freedom from confusion [of the transformed with the o. f. (Sn)], since there is no [باللُّوتُ] in the language (A); so that [in رَمْيَتُ and غزٌرَوتُ] one would understand it to be transformed, orig. غزٌرَوتُ [399] (Sn): (f) some hold that this [unsound letter in the word formed on the measure of عَتْكُبُرتُ from غزٌرَوتُ and رَمْيَتُ (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 يَخْصِصَرُونَ [above], عَتْكُبُرتُ, and غَلَبُورُونَ, 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 ِ and the double ِ is that, (a) if they transformed [it] before the ِ and the double ِ is that, (a) if they transformed [it] before the ِ, two quiescent ِs would be combined, so that one of them would be elided [663]; and therefore ambiguity would result in such as [رَمْيَأ] غزٌرَوتُ [above], because it would become [رَمْيَأ] غزٌرَوتُ, and no one would know whether it belonged to the د.ع. or to the sing.;
while what would not involve ambiguity, [such as \(\text{نَفَعُ} (\text{Sn})\),] is made to accord with what would involve ambiguity, because it belongs to the same cat. [in that the \(\text{و} \) and \(\text{i} \) are followed by a quiescent \(\text{I} (\text{Sn})\): (b) the \(\text{و} \) of such as \(\text{عَكِرُ} \) is in a position where \(\text{I} \) is changed into \(\text{و} \) (A), because the \(\text{i} \) of relation necessitates conversion of the \(\text{I} \) [third] into \(\text{و} \) \([300]\); so that, if the \(\text{و} \) were converted into \(\text{I} \), because of its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, the \(\text{I} \) would be converted into \(\text{i} \), on account of the \(\text{i} \) of relation; and an endless concatenation of conversions [from \(\text{و} \) into \(\text{I} \), and [from \(\text{I} \) into \(\text{و} \), would be entailed \(\text{Sn} \): (7, 8) that neither of them be an \(\text{ع} \) of the \(\text{نَعَلُ} \) [with Kasr of the \(\text{ع} \) \(\text{Sn} \)], whose qual. is \(\text{أَفْعَلُ} \) \([348] \); or of the inf. n. of this \(\text{v.} \) \([331]\): (a) these two conditions IM indicates by his saying “But the \(\text{ع} \) of \(\text{نَعَلُ} \), as \(\text{غَيْدُ} \) squinting, “and \(\text{ع} \) of \(\text{نَعَلُ} \), as \(\text{غَيْدُ} \) was tender and squinted, “when possessed of” a qual. “أَفْعَلُ” \([\text{below}] \), like \(\text{غَيْدُ} \) [tender in body \(\text{Su} \)] and \(\text{أَحْوَلُ} \) squint eyed, cross-eyed, wry, is sounded true” \([703] \): (b) the reason why the \(\text{v.} \) in this cat. must be sounded true [in the \(\text{ع} \)] is only that it is made to accord with \(\text{إِفْعَلَ} \) \([707] \), as \(\text{إِفْعَلَ} \) squinted and \(\text{إِحْوَلَ} \) 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 أَنْفَعَلْ" [above] IM guards against such as حاف [403]: for it is أَنْفَعَلْ with Kasr of the ع [704], on the evidence of أَنْفَعَلْ felt saj (A), أَنْفَعَلْ being the opp. of حاف, 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 أَنْفَعَلْ, like حاف fearing, not أَنْفَعَلْ: (9) which is peculiar to the ع, that it be not an ع of the إفتعل 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 إفتعل, the ع, when a ع [below], is preserved, and is not transformed," i. e., When the إفتعل whose ع is a ع is i. q. تَفَاعَلْ [487], it is sounded true [in the ع], because made to accord with تَفَاعَلْ 703], on account of its being in the sense thereof, as إِجْتَزَأْوا [492, 707] and إِدْرَجْوا They intermarried [693, 707], i. q.

and إِدْرَجْوا, تَجْمَأْوَا: (b) by his saying "And, if reciprocity be plain" [above], he guards against إفتعل's not being i. q. تَفَاعَلْ, in which case its transformation is necessary, unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether its ع be a ع, as in لَزَكَب* doubted; or a ع (Sn),] as in إِخْتَانَ was unfaithful, i. q.
passed through, i. q. جاز: (c) by his saying "when a و" [above], he guards against its غ's being a ی, in which case its transformation is necessary, even though it be indicative of reciprocity, as إستاغوا إبتغوا They were distinct, one from another, إستافوا إبتاحوا They trafficked, one with another, and إستافيوا إبتاحوا meaning They smote one another with swords, i. q. تبأيعوا، تمايزوا، and تسبايفوا, because the ی is more like, [i. e., nearer in lightness to (Sn),] the ٰ than the ِ [686] is; and has, therefore, a better title to transformation [into ] 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 ی or two ی, or a ی and a ی, are combined in the word, and each of them is entitled to be converted into ٰ, 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: (a) the combination (α) of two ی is [in] such as یکو blackness, inf. n. of یکو ی خو black, [the fact] that the ٰ of یکو is converted from ی, being proved
by their saying حَوَارِي for its du. [229], and حَوَارِي for the pl. [249] and fem. [273] of أَحْرَئِي black; (b) of two ی s is [in] such as أَلْخَيَا for rain, its o. f. being حَوَارِي, because its du. [229] is حَيَيَانِ, but its second ی being transformed [into ی] because of what has been mentioned above [under (a)]; (γ) of the ی and ی is [in] such as أَلْهَرَى love [326], its o. f. being حَوَارِي, but its ی being transformed: (b) for that reason one sounds [both the ی and ی] true in such as حَرَوْانُ animal [698], because the [letter] entitled to transformation is the ی, transformation of which is impossible [under the sixth condition], because it is a ی followed immediately by an ی (A); (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 یَ عَبِيَة utmost extent [723], orig. عَبِيَة [with Fath of the two ی s (Sn)], the first ی being transformed [into ی], and the second sounded true, which is facilitated by the second 's not occurring as a final: (α) like عَيَيْة in that [respect] are كَايَة (305): طَيَة [305]: كَايَة (302, 305, 683, 723), according to Khl, its o. f. being عَيَيْة; 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
(1245)

[of accounting for ُأَيْةَ] : (b) the saying that its o. f. is (α) ُأَيْةٌ [commonly written ُأَيْةَ, as in B on II. 37.], with quiescence of the first ى [298], entails transformation of the quiescent ى, [contra: y to the first condition]: (β) ُأَيْةُ، on the measure of فَأَعْلَةُ، entails elision of the َى without any necessitating cause (A) for its elision, because the customary [procedure] in the like [formation] is conversion of the first ى into Hamza, as [the ى and َى are converted] in بَأَعْلَةُ and ُخَلَلْةُ [683], [respectively] (Sn): (γ) ُأَيْةٌ، like ُنَقْبَة [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 ُأَيْةٍ into ى, not into ى [661] (A), in order to give precedence to incorporation [in ُأَيْةٍ] over transformation [in ُأَيْةَ]: but Jrb holds that precedence should be given to transformation; while some hold that precedence should be given to incorporation in the َى, and to transformation in the ى, 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 ُأَيْةَ] are
six, the four mentioned by A [above in α (γ) and β]: the
fifth that its o. f. is أَبِيَةٌ, with دَامَم of the first ی, like سَرْطُ [254], the ی being converted into ۰, which, says Kh, is refuted by [the fact] that conversion of the دَامَم into كَسْرَة would be necessary, [so that this mode would be identical with the fourth]; but this requires con-
sideration, and the language of Frd is "and, it is said، أَبِيَةٌ with دَامَم of the first ی, the transformation of which [into ۰] is according to rule": [and] the sixth that its o. f. is أَبِيَةٌ with فَاث of the first [ی], as in the first saying, except that the second [ی] is transformed, according to rule; so that أَبِيَةٌ becomes أَيَةٌ, like حَبَّاء أَيَة, like i١ـ ۰ life; and then the ی is moved up to the position of the ی, in which case its measure is فَلْعَة with three فَاثُا: (d) the commentary of B [on II. 37.] contains two other modes، أَبِيَةٌ [like تَمْرُ a date (B)], with quiescence, and أَبِيَةٌ [like مُكَمَّل ١ a mare (B)], with فَاثُ, of the ی; so that the modes are eight: (c) if [only] one of the two [con-
secutive 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 عَصَا عَصِي، غَصَي ۰ pl. of عَصِي، مَعْدِي [685, 722], عَصِي ۰ مُعَدِّي [243, 685, 722], and عَصَي ۰ عَصَّان inf. n. of عَصَّان [685, 722]: so says YH: (d) the combination of two transformations is
allowable with a separative, as in یُفْرُن. They *fulfil, since its o. f. is یُفْرُن: nay, 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 سَیْلَة and سَیْلَة [683] and تَرَی [658], ori. سَيۡلَة and سَیۡلَة and تَرَی: but it is sometimes replied that these expressions are anomalous: so says YS (Sn): (11) that neither of them be an غ of what ends in an augment peculiar to ns. (A), like the l and ن, and the ة of feminization (Sn): (a) this [condition] IM indicates by his saying "And the غ of that [word (IA)], at whose end that [augment (IA)] which is peculiar to the n. has been added, must be preserved", i. e., The conversion of the، and ی into ۱, on account of their being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is prevented by their being an غ 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 گل میان [331, 698, 703] and سیلات flowing: (b) whatever instances of this sort, [whose غ is a، or ی، and at whose end are an ا and ن (Sn),] occur transformed are reckoned anomalous, as داران and ماهان Mīhān (A), [each of which is] a 133a
[proper] name (KF), by rule ُمَرْهَانُ (A, MKh), because orig. the du. of َمَثَرِان (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 ٰ and َ (Tsr, Sn)] is transformation (A, Tsr); and that there is no anomaly in َمَرْهَانُ and ُمَعْلَانُ, but the sounding true in ُمَهْيِمَانُ and ُجُلْفَانُ, being distracted by love is anomalous (Tsr); because the ٰ and َ do not exclude the n. from resemblance to the v., since they are constructively separate, which, says F, is confirmed by their saying ُزَعْفْرَانُ and ُزَعْفِرَانُ from [274, 282, 283], the ً and َ 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 ٰ of feminization [263, 272] in such as ُصُورَى Sawarâ, [on the measure of ْنَعَلٌ, mentioned by S (Bk),] which is a name of a water, Mz holding that this ٰ 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 ُصُورَى, in pronunciation, is equivalent to ْنَعَلَا. They two [masc.] did: so that the sounding of [the ٰ in] ُصُورَى true is, according to Mz, regular; but, according to Akh, anomalous, not to be
copied: and therefore, if the like thereof were formed from *saying*, then, according to the opinion of Mz, *saying* would be said; but, according to the opinion of Akh, *saying*: 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 feminization [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)] *s* is affixed to the pret. [607]; so that no incongruity [with the v., such as *said* *sold*] is established by affixion of the *s* in such as *said* and *sold* [247] (A), pls. of *saying* and *selling*, orig. *said* and *sold*, like *killed* [247], pl. of *perfect* (Sn); and, as for the sounding true in such as *weaving and unfaithful* [247, 711], [pls. of *weaving and 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 *e* be not a subst. for a letter not transformable, by which he guards against [with Fath of the *s*, though Kasr is more excellent, asSBd transcribes from the CK (Sn),] for *tree* [685]; for they do not
transform [this \( \text{i} \) (M.N)], because the \( \text{i} \) is a subst. for the \( \text{j} \) : the poet says

\[\text{إذا لم يكن فيك من طلل ولا جنبي فأبعد كن الله من شيرب} \]

[685] (A) If there be not in you any shade, nor any fruit, then God curse you for trees!, where \( \text{ش} \) is subst. with Fath of the \( \text{ش} \), is orig. \( \text{ش kter} \) (MN). And the other is that the \( \text{ع} \) 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 \( \text{ا س} \) i. q. \( \text{ي بس} \) despaired, since its \( \text{ع} \), though mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is not transformed [into !], 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 \( \text{ع} \) is treated in the same way, because of its occurrence in the place of the Hamza. So he says in the C.K: “and”, says he, “it may be that the \( \text{ع} \) in \( \text{ا س} \) is sounded true because, [even if it were transformable (Su),] its transformation would be negatived: for it was [orig.] before, but has since been put after, the liamza; so that, if it were changed [into !], two alterations, the alteration of transfer, [i. e., transposition (Su),] and the alteration of change, [i. e., transformation,] would be combined in it”. This is his language: but some mention that the reason why [the \( \text{i} \) in \( \text{ا س} \) is not transformed is that the conjunction of the [preceding]
Fatha with it is adventitious, because the ى 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 ى should be original makes this condition unnecessary. And IBdh mentions another condition for this transformation, vid. 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], صيد ى a certain disease in a camel's head [703], and جيد ى , i.e., length, and beauty, of neck; حييد ى , حييد ى [272]; and حركة ى and خرونة [above]. But this is not needed because these [ns.] are anomalous [in that their ى or ى is not converted into ] notwithstanding their fulfilment of the conditions (A); though ى حييد ى 's being anomalous proceeds only upon the opinion of Akh [above] that the ى of feminization does not prevent, not upon the opinion of Mz that it does prevent, transformation (Sn); and like those [ns.] in anomalousness are ى روح and غيب , [lexicological (Sn)] pl. of رأى going at evening and غائب ى absent [257]; ى جعف pl. of عقوم a young ass; هيبة Huyawa, [a stronghold belonging to the Banu Zubaid in AlYaman (MI)]; ى أر ى , pl. of أر ى , which is the very cunning man; and قرُة ى pl. of قر ى , 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 AlHira, [a city near AlKufa, and (Jh, KF) also (Jh), irregularly (Jh),] as though, deeming the combination of the two Kasras with the [three] ىs to be heavy, they substituted a Fatha for the Kasra of the ح, and an ل for the [first] ى: (2) of ى karī [302], converting the quiescent first و into ل [311]. And [the Prophet's saying (KF)] رجعت مازرلا غمر ماجرلأ Repent ye when laden [with sin], unrewarded occurs in tradition, orig. مازرلا, the [quiescent] و, being converted into ل for lightness [above], as we have mentioned (IY): [or] for conformity (KF), because of the influence of ماجرلأ (Jh); whereas, if it stood alone, مازرلا would be said (Jh, KF): so says IA1 (Jh). And hence their saying ی立法ل for یی立法ل, ی立法ل for یی立法ل; ی立法ل for یی立法ل, converting the [quiescent] و, and ى into ل, because they consider the combination of ى with ل to be easier for them than the combination of two ىs, and than ى together with و (IY). But such as ی立法ل: ی立法ل], [though regular in some dials. (R),] is weak (SH), because of the conversion of the quiescent و, [or ى], preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha,
into ṭ (R). And the most likely [opinion] is that the saying تَزُّوَدْ مَنَا آلِهَةٍ [16] and its counterparts are in-
stances of that [conversion of the quiescent ي into ṭ] (IY). Substitution of the ṭ for the Hamza is (M, SH) (1) obligatory [below] in such as َآَدن [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 رَأَسُ [642, 658, 682] (M, SH), where the use of the original, or of the
deriv., [letter] is allowable, for which reason the substi-
tution is not obligatory (IY), except according to the
people of AlḤijāz [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 زَايْدَ مَا [640] (M, R): (2) that [v.] to which
the single [corrob. (IY)] ن preceded by a letter pro-
nounced with Fāth is affixed (M), as in لَنْسَفُما XCVI.
15. [153, 497, 608, 610, 649] (M, R, A); and similarly
[614, 649]: AlAʾshā says َلاَ تَعْبِدُ الَّذِيْسَطَانَ آلِهَةٍ [497, 649], meaning َتَعْبِدُنَّهُمْ [154, 424], meaning that shall
assuredly blaze up brightly, [orig. تَأْجَجِجْنَ, as explained
below]; while Inra alKāis, in his saying َقِفَا نَبِكَ آلِهَةٍ
[115, 640], is said to mean \( 	ext{nafs} \) [649]; and the counterparts of that are numerous (IY: (a) \( \text{tājākka} \) 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 (a) \( 
ār \) 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 \( 
ār \) is only fem.; but that the poet makes the pron. masc., because by \( 
ār \) he means a flame, which is masc., or because the feminization of \( 
ār \) is improper [263], being analogous to \( 
ār \) [21, 263]: (b) \( \text{ḥubbā} \) 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, \( 
ār \) and \( 
ār \); while the pron. is made masc. because of the predominance of [the masc.] \( 
ār \) over [the fem.] \( 
ār \) [320]: F says "Akh says that he means the fire and the firewood": (b) some say that \( 
ār \) is an aor. v., from whose beginning the [aoristic] \( w \) is elided; but that the \( l \) is substituted for the single corrob. \( n \), the o. f. being \( \text{tājākka} \) [above]: and in that case the latent pron. [165] belongs to the fem. \( 
ār \), for which reason the v. is made fem. (AKB: (3) \( 
ādān \) [594, 640], as \( 
ādān \) XXVI. 19. [201] (M). The \( l \) is
substituted for the $\ddot{\text{n}}$ in these positions because of the $\ddot{\text{n}}$'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 $\varepsilon$ is [authorized by IH] in $\ddot{\text{I}}$ [above], according to one opinion (SH), i. e., that its o. f. is $\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}$, which is the saying of the BB [above]. This is valid, as respects [both] sense, because $\ddot{\text{I}}$ is i. q. $\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}$; and [letter,] because its $\ddot{\text{a}}_{\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}}$ is $\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}$; although the saying of KS [above] is nearer to analogy in changing $\ddot{\text{i}}$ into $\ddot{\text{a}}$. And for this reason the author of the KF adopts the opinion of the BB, saying "Its o. f. is $\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}$": [though he does not follow IH and Jrb in holding its $\ddot{\varepsilon}$ to be converted directly into $\ddot{\text{a}}$; but prefers the indirect conversion described by R in § 683, adding] "the $\ddot{\varepsilon}$ is changed into Hamza, [so that $\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}$ becomes $\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}$ (KF):] and then [two Hamzas occur consecutively, so that (KF)] the [second (KF)] Hamza [is changed (KF)] into $\ddot{\text{a}}$" (MASH).

§. 685. The $\ddot{\varepsilon}$ is the letter most extensively substituted (A). It is substituted for (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), the $\ddot{\text{i}}$ and $\ddot{\text{u}}$ (MASH); (3) the Hamza; (4) one of the duplicate [or triplicate] letters; (5) the $\ddot{\text{u}}$; (6) the $\ddot{\text{u}}$; (7) the $\ddot{\text{b}}$; (8) the $\ddot{\text{s}}$; (9) the $\ddot{\text{a}}$ (M, SH). Its substitution is frequent because it is a vocal [734] letter, whose outlet is from the middle of the
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 ۰, the ۵, and the د (IY). Its substitution for the ۰ is [regular] in two cases, vid. where the letter before the ۰ is (1) pronounced with Kasr, as in مصباح [18, 253, 256], and pl. of مفتاح [253, 386]; and similarly in their дим. (Aud). مفتاح [274, 283] and مصباح [274] (Tst): (a) hence ضاربُ inf. n. of ضاربتةُ, and صيرابُ inf. n. of ضاربتةُ [332]: (b) the reason why the ۰, when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, must be converted into ۰ 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 ۰ of the дим. [279], as in ۰ dim. of ۰ علیم [369, 374] (Aud), because the letter after the ۰ of the дим. is only mobile [274], whereas the ۰ does not receive a vowel; while the letter before the ۰ is only mobile, whereas the ۰ of the дим. is only quiescent: so that, after the ۰ of the дим., the ۰ 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 ۰, because of
its affinity to the preceding letter; and because, if the แห were converted into ظ, it would afterwards have to be converted into ی, as in سید [below] (Tsr). Its substitution for the ظ is [regular] in ten cases, (1) where the ظ occurs after a Kasra, when the ظ is (a) final, [whether it be in an act. or pass. v., or in a n. (Tsr),] as in رقصى was pleased [686, 719] and was strong, دعوى was effaced, the raider [301] and the caller (Aud): (a) the ظ in these five exs. is converted into ی because of its occurrence as a final after a Kasra, their o. f. being رضى and ظور [728] from رضوان رضى and ظور [729], pleasure and ظور ظور [728] from ظور ظور and ظور ظور from ظور ظور raiding and ظور ظور a call (Tsr): (b) before the ظ of feminization, as in شجية sad (Aud), said of a woman (Jh), an act. part. [on the measure of عُلْلَة (Jh)] from مُعْلَم sadness (Tsr); أكسيسة [246] (Aud), pl. of كسبًا شجب [683] (Tsr); عراة raider [724] (Aud), a [fem.] act. part. from عر [Tsr]; and عرية (Aud) and ترقيقية [283] (Tsr), dim. of عرية [248, 301, 675] (Aud) and ترقيقية [385, 675]: (a) the ظ in the whole [of these exs.] is converted into ی because of its occurrence as a final after a Kasra, since the ظ of feminization is virtually separate [266]: (b) the ظ in عربية [or ترقيقية] ought not to be converted into
because the word is [orig.] formed with the is, as is proved by [the fact] that we have no infl. n. ending in a preceded by Damma, which shows that [or ] [721]; but they make no distinc-
tion here between the word's being [orig.] formed with the is and its not being so (Tsr): (c) of [with Fath of the is, i. q. ) equal, as [above] in The people are equal in this matter (Tsr),] and meaning servants [below] are anomalous (Aud): (α) is, as it were, pl. of [above] by elision of the augs., except that another is added in it (Tsr): (β) its measure is : and it is anomalous in several [other (Sn)] respects, firstly the repetition of the in the pl., notwithstanding its not being repeated in the sing., which is the counterpart of the repetition of the [in the dim. (Tsr)] in (Tsr, Sn), dim. of , notwithstanding its not being repeated in the non-dim. (Sn): secondly the pluralization of upon this measure, the pl. required by analogy being , like pl. of tunic [246]: thirdly [the repetition of the as an aug., notwithstanding that the is not repeated with it, since (Sn)] the rule is that, when the as an aug., the also (Tsr) should be repeated with it, as in [370, 671]; and
that, when it is repeated alone, it should be *rad.*, as in 

سُنُدُّ (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (γ) مَقَتِّيَةَ [above] is [said by Dm to be (Sn)] *pl. of* مَقَتَّةَ *act. part. (Tsr, Sn)* of خَدْمَةٍ *served (Sn), from* مَقَتَّةَ *i. q. خَدْمَة (Tsr), being orig., [as in the Tsr (Sn),]* مَقَتَّةَ; but having the [second (Sn)] ُوُسَدُّ, converted into ُوُسَدُّ, because final after a Kasra; and being then subjected to the same transformation as قَافِصَ [16] (Tsr, Sn); [so that its sound *pl. is* مَقَتُّوُنَ, like تَأَضَّونَ (234),] as

When were we servants to thy family? [below] (Tsr): [but the author of the KF says that] اِفْتُوُتَهُ is *i. q. إِفْتُوُتَهُ* took him as a servant, anomalous, because إنْفَلُ is *intrans.* [494A, 496]; and [that] the sing. of مَعْتَرَقَةٍ and مَقَتِّيَةٍ [below] is مَعْتَرَقَةٍ, مَقَتِّيَةٍ [like ُّمَعْتَرَقَةٍ sing. of ُّمَعْتَرَقَةٍ (253, 265)] (KF): (δ) the servant is called مَعْتَرَقَةٍ with Fath of the ُوُسَدُّ, and doubling of the ُوُسَدُّ, as though it were a rel. *n.* [300] from مَعْتَرَقَةٍ *service, which is an inf. *n.*; but the ُوُسَدُّ of relation may be made single, [as in ُيُبَارِ (311), in which case مَعْتَرَقَةٍ becomes مَعْتَرَقَةٍ, the sound *pl. of which is* مَعْتَرَقَتُونَ, like تَأَضَّونَ (234),] as in the saying of 'Amr Ibn Kulthum
[above] (Jh) 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 مَقْتَرُونَ in the nom., and
مَقْتَرُونَ in the acc. and gen. (EM): S says "They asked
Khl about مَقْتَرُونَ pl. مَقْتَرُونَ; and he said that it was on
a par with مَقْتَرُونَ pl. [253]" (Jh): (e) these two
[anomalous formations] have no third: ISd says in the
Muhkam that F said "IAmb told me, on the authority
of Th, that the latter had not heard any [formation]
like مَقْتَرُونَ, except one word that AUri had told him,
vid. مَسْتَرُونَ سُوَيّاً i. q. مَسْتَرُونَ is
predicable of one or more, as لَيْسَ سُوَيّاً III. 109. They
are not equal, because it is orig. an inf. n. [143], i. q.
equality (ML): (η) they say سُوَيّة also, accord-
ing to the general rule in transformation (Tsr, Sn); and
the pl. of مَقْتَرُونَ ought to be مَقْتُرَةً [above]: (θ) IBr says
in the Glosses on the Jh that سُوَيّة is a heteromorphous
pl. of سُوَيّاً, like بَاطِلُ pl. of بَاطِلْ [255]; as though it
were pl. of سُوَيّاً: and that the measure of سُوَيّة is
فعّالةُ, like [that of] agile; not فَعّالةُ, because
the cat. of سِلّس [674] is extraordinary; nor فَعَلْة because the cat. of كَرَب [373, 671, 672] is extraordinary; nor فَعَلْة, because the ف is not repeated alone: so that فَعَلْة’s being سَوَاسِية or فَعَلْة or فَعَلْة is vain; and it must be فَعَلْة: and this is a fine discourse, which the author of the Aud transcribes in the Glosses [on the IM]: (c) before the ا of feminization, (a) abbreviated, as when you form from غَزْر like هِنِدَبَى [397, 399], in which case you say غِزْرَيْا; (b) prolonged, as when you form from غَزْر a word [on the measure of افْعَلْتَ] like أَغْرَيَانَ (Tsr): (d) before the aug. ا and ن, [which resembles the two اs of feminization (Tsr)], as in your saying غَزّيٰان [686] on the pattern of غَزْرَان [385] from غَزْر (Aud), because the two اs of feminization [263] and what resembles them are virtually separate [from the n. ending therein] (Tsr): (2) where the ا occurs as ا of an inf. n. of a v. transformed in the ا, and is preceded by a Kasra, and followed by an ا, as in fasting and standing [713] (Aud), inf. ns. of the [unaugmented] tril. (Tsr); and انتِيّاتَ submissiveness [713] and اغْتِيّانَ accustoming oneself (Aud), inf. ns. of the augmented [tril.]: orig.
and ʿeṣṭrān ʿeṣṭrān and ʿeṭṣrān ʿeṭṣrān, the ʿ in which is converted into ʾ, because it is transformed in their vs. by conversion into ʾ [684, 703]; while its remaining sound in the inf. n. after a Kasra, and before a letter resembling the ʾ in prolongation, would be deemed heavy; so that it is transformed in the inf. n. by conversion into ʾ, 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 ʿ] (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) ʿṣawar ʿṣawar bracelet [below] and ʿṣawān tooth-pick (Aud), generic ns. [3], where the ʾ is not converted into ʾ (Tsr), because the quality of inf. n. is non-existent; (b) ʿlīʿān ʿlīʿān inf. n. of ʿlīʿān sought refuge, one with another, and ʿjawār ʿjawār inf. n. of ʿjawār was neighbour to, [where, though they are inf. ns., the ʾ is not converted into ʿ (Tsr),] because the ʿ of the v. [ʿlīʿān and ʿjawār (Tsr)] is sounded true; (c) ʿaḥār ʿaḥār inf. n. of ʿaḥār went in the evening, for lack of the Kasra (Aud) before it (Tsr); (d) ʿdrīf ʿdrīf [below] inf. n. of ʿdrīf shifted and ʿāra ṣīna ʿāra ʿāra ʿāra ʿāra inf. n. of ʿdrīf visited the sick, [where, though they are inf. ns. whose vs. ʿāra and ʿdrīf are transformed by conversion of their ʿ into ʾ, the ʾ is not converted into ʾ (Tsr)] for lack of the ʾ (Aud) after them (Tsr): (a) in this case, [i. e., where the ʾ is lacking (Tsr),] transformation
is rare, as جعل الله لكم قيمًا and it is rare, as جعل الله لكم قيمًا وآزرتهم. 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 نافع and Ibn 'Amir, [i. q. قيمًا, like غون i. q. قيمًا بحثًا seeking protection (K, B),] and جعل الله الكعبة البيت 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 whereeto the pilgrims and settlers shall repair (B),] in the reading of Ibn 'Amir (Aud), their o. f. being قومًا, but the ب being converted into ب because the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr (Tsr): (α) is an inf. n. on [the measure of] بعل, like قيم شبع [348], its ب being transformed [into ب], as it is transformed [into ب] in its v. (B on V. 98): (β) sounding [the ب ] true, notwithstanding the fulfilment of the conditions, in كارت الطبية inf. n. of دوار. The doe-gazelle shied away, i. q. نفرت, is anomalous (Aud): (α) by rule it should be نفرت; but it occurs with the ب sounded true, as in the saying of Al' Ajjāj

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 ذرّاما.
with the ج [in IV. 4. above]; but [this is not an inf. n., since] جـمـم is what a thing is supported by, like جـمـم for what a matter is governed by (K): (3) where the ج occurs as ج of a pl. sound in the ج, and is preceded by a Kasra; while, in the sing., it is (a) transformed, [i.e., converted (Tsr),] as in جـمـم pl. of جـمـم house, جـمـم pl. of جـمـم artifice [684], جـمـم pl. of جـمـم pl. of جـمـم pl. of جـمـم value, price [238, 278], and جـمـم pl. of جـمـم stature [238] (Aud): (a) the ج. ج. is جـمـم, جـمـم, جـمـم, and جـمـم جـمـم; but, since the ج 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 ج in the intermediate [exs.], it becomes weak, so that the Kasra overpowers it: (b) we deduce from the multiplication of the ج. that, when the ج is transformed in the sing., the occurrence of the ج after it [in the pl.], as in جـمـم [above], is not prescribed as a condition, contrary to the opinion of IUK (Tsr): (c) حـجـج pl. of حـجـج need is anomalous (Aud), the regular form being حـجـج, because the ج 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 جـمـم pl. of جـمـم whip [242, 713], جـمـم pl. of جـمـم cistern, and جـمـم
pl. of روض [238, 254, 713] (Aud): (α) their o. f. is سَوَاطِر, جُواَضَر, and روَض : but, since the 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 ! (Tsr), because of what is mentioned [in case 2] above, that the ! resembles the ى [in prolongation] (Sn): (b) it results that conversion of the ى into ى in this case has five conditions, (α) that the expression be a pl.: (β) that the ى in its sing. be dead by reason of quiescence; (γ, δ) that the ى in the pl. be preceded by a Kasra, and followed by an !; (ε) that it be sound in the ى (A) : (ε) if the ! be missing, the ى is sounded true, as in كُوْرُ pl. of كَرْز, and عِرْدَة pl. of عُرْدَة with Fath of its initial, meaning an old camel (Aud), because, when the ! is lacking, the work of the tongue is less; so that the articulation of the after the Kasra is lightened: for which reason the ى is sounded true; and may not be transformed, because to the lack of transformation [in the sing.] is joined the protection of the ى by its distance from the end [of the word], in consequence of the ى of femininization, [which is regarded as an outwork protecting the ى, on its weak side, i.e., towards the end, where alteration is prevalent] (Tsr): (α) عَرْدَة [pl. of عَرْدَة bull, by
change of the , into (Tsr),] is anomalous (Aud), the
regular form being with the , sounded true: (β) it
is said that the o. f. is with quiescence of the ,
which is transformed [into (257)] by conversion of
the , into [case 5 below]; and that the is afterwards
pronounced with Fath: (γ) Mb asserts that it is con-
tracted from [237], being orig. , for which
reason it is transformed, [because of the presence of the
!] ; and that it is afterwards contracted [into ]: se
M transmits from him: (δ) the [explanation generally]
recognized as his, however, is that they say in order
that the conversion [of the , into ] may be an indica-
tion that it is pl. of bull, meaning the animal, not of
slab, meaning of dried curd, the distinctive peculiarity
[of in the former sense] being that, since they say
[256], by conversion of the , into , because
quiescent, and preceded by a letter pronounced with
Kasr [case 5 below], as pl. of bull, meaning the
animal, they make its pl. accord therewith; whereas
the pl. slabs, meaning of dried curd, has no [such alterna-
tive] form, wherewith it might be made to accord
in conversion: so says Jrb (Tsr): (δ) the , is also sounded
true, (α) if it be mobile in the sing., as in pl. of
The horses standing upon three legs and the point of the toe of the fourth leg, the courser (Aud), pl. of جُوارٍ (Tsr): though جَبيَّانَ [in the text (Tsr)] is said to be [not anomalous, but only (Tsr)] pl. of [ courser or (B)] جُيٰدٍ [251], not of جَوَانٍ (Aud); and, says IM in the CK, as for طُويلٍ pl. of طَويلٍ, possibly it may be regarded as [a heteromorphous pl.] of the cat. of جَبيَّانَ pl. of جَوارٍ, as though it were pl. of طَائلٍ from meaning surpassed him in tallness (Tsr): (β) if the ج be unsound, [a or و, the first (Tsr)] as in رَيٰانٍ [343, 348] (Aud), رَيٰانٍ from رُيٰانٍ [348], orig. رَيٰانٍ; the ج, being converted into چ, which is incorporated into the چ [case 7 below] (Tsr); and [the second as in (Tsr)] جُوٰرُ 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)] رِجَالٍ [278, 713] and رِجَالٍ [below] (Aud), like رِجَالٍ [235, 237] (Tsr), with the ج, [vid. the ج (Tsr),] sounded true (Aud),
orig. ٰٓٔٓٔٓٔٓ and ٰٓٔٓٔٓٔٓ, the ی and [second] ُ, being changed into Hamza, because final after an aug. ِ [683]; while transformation of their ٰٓٔ is not allowable with that [transformation of their ٰٓ] (Tsr), lest two transformations occur consecutively (Aud); so that one is restricted to transformation of the ٰٓ, because it is the seat of alteration (Tsr): and similarly in what resembles them (Aud), i.e., where the ٰٓ is transformed by being changed into Hamza, and the ٰٓ is [therefore] sounded true (Tsr): (4) where the ُ 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 ُ be in a n. or v. (Tsr):—you say عَطْرَتُ [I took (Tsr)] and ٰٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓ [I threw, by retaining the ُ in its own form, because it is third (Tsr)]; but, when you put the Hamza or r. duplication [483], you say گِئِتَ and ٰٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓ [I gave and I purified, [by changing the ُ into ی, because it becomes fourth (Tsr)]: and you say, in the pass. part. [of گِئِتَ and ٰٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓ, when the sign of dualization is attached to it (Tsr)], ٰٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓ (Aud), by changing the ُ into ی [229]: (a) the reason why it is changed into ی in the pret. and pass. part. of the augmented v., although it is not after a Kasra, is that (Tsr) they make the pret. [ٰٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓٔٓ (Tsr)]
accord with the aor. [نَزَكِيّ (Tsr)], and the pass. part. [مُرَكَّبَةٍ] with the act. part. 
and 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, 
[i. e., 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 تَغَازَّرَبَّنا
We raided one another [727] and تَدَعَّمُّبَّنا We called one another, [orig. تَغَازَّرَبَّنا and تَدَعَّمُّبَّنا, the, being changed into ي (Tsr),] notwithstanding that the aor. [نَتَغَازَّرَبَّنا 
and نَدَعَّمُّبَّنا (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 تَغَازَّرَبَّنا and 
نَدَعَّمُّبَّنا, for conformity with [the aor.] نَتَغَازَّرَبَّنا and نَدَعَّمُّبَّنا [with Kasr of their penultimate (Tsr)]; and that it was 
afterwards retained in company with the ت [of تَغَازَّرَبَّنا 
(Aud), as with the ت of femininization in such as مُعَطَّلَةٍ] 
given (Tsr), the ت of which is converted from a ي, 
because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with 
Fath [684]; while this ي is converted from a ج, 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.] 

\(\text{شَأَرُ} \) [with Fath of the Hamza, as likewise is the aor., (Sn)], meaning *preceded, outwent*, is anomalous, the regular form being \(\text{يُشَأَرُ} \), because it is from \(\text{شَأَرُ} \); while [in the aor.] there is no Kasra before the \(\text{ي} \), on account of which it might be converted into \(\text{ى} \); nor is the \(\text{ى} \), 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 \(\text{يُشَأَرُ} \) [in the pass. (Sn)], for conformity with the act. (A), \(\text{يُشَأَرُ} \), the \(\text{ى} \), of which is converted into \(\text{ى} \) on account of the Kasra before it (Sn): (5) where the \(\text{ى} \), when quiescent, [and] single, follows immediately after a Kasra, as in \(\text{مَيْزَانٌ} \) a balance, [orig. 

\(\text{مِيْزَانٌ} \), because from \(\text{وَزَنٌ} \) *weighing* (Tsr),] and \(\text{مِيْقَاتٌ} \), time appointed for performance of an action [278] (Aud), orig. \(\text{مَرْقَاتٌ} \), because from \(\text{رَكَّت} \) time, where the \(\text{ى} \), is converted into \(\text{ى} \), because quiescent [and single] and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) \(\text{سَوَانٌ} \) receptacle of a thing (Tsr) and \(\text{سَوَارُ} \) [above] (Aud), because the \(\text{ى} \), in them is mobile, not quiescent (Tsr); (b) \(\text{إِجِلُّدُ} \) (Aud) continuance, together with swiftness, of journeying [332, 482, 494] (Tsr), and \(\text{إِعْلُوَأْ} \) (Aud) clinging to the neck, as
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  of  with Damm, when an ep. [272], as in *Verily We have adorned the heaven nearest [to you (K, B)] and your saying  Al'ulīyā For the pious is the highest rank* [725] (Aud), orig.  and  because from  nearness and  elevation, the , in them being converted into  , 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  is lightened by conversion into  : (a) the proof that  [here] is an ep. is its being preceded by its qualified, as exemplified: (b) this is the original use [of  ]; 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  ] (Tsr): (c) as for the saying of the Hijāzīs (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)]  mastered, and [the substantive, like (Tsr)]  [684, 711] (Aud), by rule  and  136a
with transformation, which is omitted for notificati- 

of the o.f. [725]: (d) the Banû Tamîm say َلاَّ ةَقْصَيَا َّمَا َتِحْزَىَّ َنَفْعلَىَّ َبِعَرْبَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ 

[725] (Aud) O abode in Huzwâ [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 َّمَا َتِحْزَىَّ َنَفْعلَىَّ َبِعَرْبَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ retained in its [original] state: and they do not reverse [the rule], because the substantive is lighter than the ep.: (f) in what the author of the Aud mentions, vid. that the َّمَا َتِحْزَىَّ َنَفْعلَىَّ َبِعَرْبَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ of the Aud mentions, vid. that the َّمَا َتِحْزَىَّ َنَفْعلَىَّ َبِعَرْبَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ َخُزَىٰ َفَ اللْهِ ِلِّعْبَاتِ ِعَبْرَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ َخُزَىٰ َفَ اللْهِ ِلِّعْبَاتِ ِعَبْرَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ that the substantive is lighter than the ep., 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 َّمَا َتِحْزَىَّ َنَفْعلَىَّ َبِعَرْبَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ in the substantive, not in the ep., so that they make َّمَا َتِحْزَىَّ َنَفْعلَىَّ َبِعَرْبَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ 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 ep., or by الدَّمَيَا, where the substantivity is adventitious; and they assert that the sounding (of the َّمَا َتِحْزَىَّ َنَفْعلَىَّ َبِعَرْبَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ َخُزَىٰ َفَ اللْهِ ِلِّعْبَاتِ ِعَبْرَةٍ ِنَّمَا َالْهُوَى ِبَرْضَنَّ أَوْ يَتَرْتَقَىَّ”]
is anomalous, like that in ḥāʾīrə (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 (Tsə)] the Masters of lexicology: [for] Az quotes Fr and JSk as saying that whatever ep. is like ḥāʾīrə and is with the ی, since they deem the, heavy with the Դamma of its initial," [and with the heaviness of the ep. (Sn)]: "nor is there any dispute about it, except that the people of AlḤijāz display the ی in ی، the ی، above], while the Banū Tamūm say ی، the ی، (above), while the Banū Tamūm say ی، the ی، (above); and, as for the saying of IH "contrary to the ep., as ی، the ی، [725], meaning the fem. of 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 ی، the ی، should be said, as ی، the ی، is said" (A) : (7) where the, and ی, meet, [and are combined (Tsə)], in a [single (Tsə)] word (Aud), or what is virtually a [single] word, like مُسْلِمَى 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, (α) where the ی precedes [the ی (Tsr)], are میت and سید [251, 703], orig. سید and میت [683, '16] (Aud), because from ساد was lord, aor. یِسُود by cons. consent, and مات died, aor. یِمْتُ according to one of the two dials. [482]: (α) their measure, according to critical judges, vid. the BB, is یَبِیعَل with Kasr of the ی: (β) the Bdd hold it to be ینیعَل with Fath of the ی, like و صیرَف transferred to یَبِیعَل with Kasr of the ی, because, say they, we do not see, in the sound, any n. on [the measure of] یَبِیعَل 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 فَعَلَة pl. of فَعَلَ, as and زَمَة [247]; and, if were یَبِیعَل with Fath, they would say میت with Fath (Tsr): (b) where the ی precedes [the ی (Tsr)], are یَلَى and لَى [278, 302], inf. ns. of یَلَّت I folded and یَلَت I twisted, orig. ۱ُروُی طَوْعُی and لَقِی (Aud), with Fath of their first, and quiescence of their second [letter], their, being converted into ی, and incorporated into
the ی (Tsr): (b) sounding (the ی (Tsr)] true is necessary, (a) if the ی and ی be in two words, as یَّدَعُو يَّسِر Yūsir calls [with the ی preceding the ی (Tsr)], and یَّرُوٰى وَاعْدُن A threatener will shoot (Aud) with the ی preceding the ی (Tsr): (b) if the first of them be (α) mobile, as یَّرُبِّل یَّرُبِّل (with the ی mobilized with Kasr (Tsr)], and ۴۸۴,۷۱۴ (Aud) with the ی mobilized with Damm (Tsr): (β) 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 ی [۶۸۶], as ۴۸۴,۵۱۴ [۷۱۶] substituted for ی [۶۸۶], as when you form from یَّبِّع a [v.] commensurable with یَّبِّع [۴۸۲], saying یَّبِّع یَّبِّع, and then put it into the pass., saying یَّبِّع یَّبِّع; and substituted for a Hamza [۶۵۸] (Tsr), as ۴۸۴,۵۱۴ alleviated form of ۴۸۴,۵۱۴ sight (Aud): for in the whole of that there is no change [of ی into ی], nor any incorporation, because the first [unsound] letter is [allowably] adventitious; contrary to ۳۳۷ alleviated form of ۳۳۷, which is on the model of ۳۳۷, being without husband, or without wife: since the second Hamza is changed into ی, [as in ۴۸۴,۵۱۴], because the one before it is pronounced with Damm [۶۶۱], so that ۴۸۴,۵۱۴ becomes ۴۸۴,۵۱۴; and this change is necessary [۶۶۱]: and then the ی is converted into ی, which is incorporated
into the [second] ي، so that ٍ١٠٢٢٢٢٣٢٣٢١٠٢٢٢٢٢٣٢٢٢٢ ١٠٢٢٢٢; and this [process also of] change and incorporation is necessary, because the ي 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 ١٠٢٢٢٢٢٢ ١٠٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢ [with quiescence of the ي (Tsr)], orig. [١٠٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢] with Kasr [above] (Aud), because it is a pret. v. (Tsr); but made quiescent [in the medial] for lightness, as ١٠٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢ [with quiescence of the ي (Tsr)] is said for ١٠٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢ [482] (Aud) with Kasr of it: though some allow ١٠٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢ [with incorporation after conversion (Tsr): (c) three sorts deviate anomalously from what we have mentioned, (α) a sort [in] which the ي is transformed, though it does not fulfil the conditions, like the reading [١٠٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢٢] in XII. 43. [498] with change [of the Hamza into ي، and of the ي into ي،] and incorporation [of the first ي into the second] (Aud), although the ي 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 ي is sounded true, notwithstanding [its] fulfilment of them, [i.e., of the
conditions (Tsr),] as ون (Tsr), [male cat (Tsr),] [below], 
inf. n. of جَاءَ الْكَلَبُ [above]. The dog howled, and Rajā Ibn Haiwa (Aud) : (α) you do not incorporate in ضَيْقَةَ الْمَعَى [below], because it is a [prim. (Jh)] substantive, which is not conformable to the v. (Jh, Tsr); and similarly in جَوَاءَ الْكَلَبُ [below], a man’s name; both being different [in this respect] from سَلِّمَ, مَيْت, كَيْنِي 251 (Jh): so says Jh : (β) يَوْمُ أَيْمَسِ هوَ on the measure of فَعْل: they say, on a day wherein hardship has befallen them, يَوْمُ أَيْمَسِ a most hard day, i. e., كَثِيرٌ الرِّسَالَةَ containing much hardship (Tsr): (γ) جَوَاءَ Haiwa, [says Jh in the سَهَّل (Tsr),] is not subjected to incorporation, [as مِّيْت and كَيْنِي 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 ی is changed into َ, into which the [preceding] ی is incorporated, [according to the converse of the rule (Tsr),] as عَوْةَ [inf. n. of نُهُوَ عِنْ مِّنْ نَكَّر (above), by rule عَوْةَ (Tsr),] and نُهَوُى َ (Tsr) 686 (Aud), by rule نُهَوُى [722], because orig. نُهُوَى, being نُعَوْلُ from نُهَيَ.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] [369] [18, 253, 256], as جَدَّوْلُ (Aud), pl. جَدَّوْلَ (253); and أسَّوْنُ (Jh, Tsr) denoting serpent (Aud), pl. أَسْوَرُ (Jh, Tsr), because it is a substantive; whereas, if it were an ep. [below], its pl. would be سُوْنُ on [the measure of] جَدَّوْلُ (Jh): so that, in the dim. of جَدَّوْلُ and أسَّوْنُ, you say أَسْوَرُ جُدْبَيْلُ [279], by sounding [the] true; and أَسْوَرُ جُدْبَيْلُ [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 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 جَدَّوْلُ and أَسَّوْنُ [279], since the ی of the dim. and the ی of the broken pl. are each put to denote a meaning; (b) if أسَّوْنُ were an ep. [348], transformation would be necessary in [the dim. of] it, because it does not take the pl. أسَّوْنُ: so says BD (Tsr); [but Jh says that] the dim of أسَّوْنُ black is أسَّوْنُ, and, if you will, أسَّوْنُ, [meaning blackish,] i.e., approximating to blackness [287] (Jh): (c) by our saying “mobile in the,” [above] we guard against such as عَمْرُ و عِكْرَز, because, though their broken pl. [246] is on [the measure of] مَقَاعِدُ [above], transformation [of the] is necessary in their dim., as
[279] and وَضَيَّنَكَ [279] and sounding true is not allowable: the difference being that the mobile is strong [279], and the quiescent weak; while the vowel of [the و in] the dim. [347] and sounding true is not taken into account, because it is adventitious: so says IAز (Tsr)

(d) the pl. of ضَيِّئُون [715], the being sounded true in its pl., because sounded true in the sing.: but, for its dim., S says ضَيِّئِين [715] [which is allowable as dim. of أسْيَدْ serpent.] although its pl. is أسْيَدْ; while there is nothing to prevent those who say أسَيْدُ for the dim. [of أسْيَدْ] from saying ضَيْئُون (Jh): (8) where the ل is the ل of the مَفْعُوْل [of the v. (Tsr)] whose pret. is on [the measure of] فَعْل with Kasr of the v [the trans. and intrans. being alike in that respect, the first (Tsr) as رَضِيَّة approved it, pass. part. مَرْضِي approved [722]; and the second as (Tsr)] قَوَّى عَلَى زَبِيد overpowered Zaid, pass. part. مَرْضُو [722] and مَقْرُو, with two s after the v, the first being the ل of مَفْعُوْل [347], and the second their ل: (a) their ل is converted into ً 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 متضررةٌ and مَّفْرَرٌ, in which the ٌ and ی are combined, while the first of them is quiescent [case 7], for which reason the ی is converted into ی, and the [first] ی incorporated into the [second] ی; while the داوما is changed into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved from conversion into ی, (Tsr): (a) the reading رَاضِيَة مَّضَرَّة LXXXIX. 28. Approving [what thou hast been vouchsafed (K, B)], approved [before God (K, B), with the sounded true (Tsr)], is anomalous (Aud); but IM in the Tashil pronounces it to be [merely] inferior (Tsr): (b) if the ی of the r. be pronounced with Fath, sounding true is necessary, as مَّدَعَر raided [722] and مَّدَعَر called (Aud), orig. مَّدَعَرَ and مَّدَعَر, with two ٌ, the ی of مَّدَعَر [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] (Tsr): (a) transformation [here] is anomalous, as in

وَقَدْ عَلَمْتِ عِرْسَي مُلْيَةٍ أَنَّى # أَنَا أَلْتَهُ مَعْدِيًا عَلَيْهِ وَعَادِيًا [722] (Aud), by 'Abd Yaghūth [Ibn Waqqās (MN)] alHārithī, And my wife Mulaika has known that I am the lion, when assailed, and when assailing, where he transforms [the ی of] مَعْدِي [684], orig. مَعْدِر (MN,
(1281)

Tsr), upon the measure of َمَفْعُولٗ (MN): (α) Mz recites this verse with َعَدَّ أ, by sounding [the J] true: but others recite it with transformation (A, Tsr); and I'll indicates the allowability of this by his saying "And sound the [J of] َمَفْعُولٗ from such as َعَدَّ A 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 (Ts:):(γ) َمُقِدِّيَّا عَلَيْهِ ٍغَرَابِيًا َجَيْلَةٗ occurs thus, with the undotted ُع and ُد, in the MSS of [the commentary by] IUK: but َمُقِدِّيَّا عَلَيْهِ ٍغَرَابِيًا when raided, and when raiding, with the dotted ُع and ُد, occurs in Z's book, [the M,] where he says "They say ُعُتَوُر َمَغْرِيَّا َعَتَوُر َمَغْرِيَّا; but they do say ُعُتَوُر َمَغْرِيَّا, as

وَقَدْ عَلِمَتُ عُرْسِي مَلِيَّةٗ أَنْتَيْ ُعُتَوُر َمَغْرِيَّا َعَتَوُر َمَغْرِيَّا َجَيْلَةٗ [722];" and the more correct [version] is what is mentioned by Z, [because he is as trustworthy as Ḥadhām in the adage] "When Ḥadhām says [anything], then believe her; for verily the [true] saying is what Ḥadhām has said" [194] (MN): [so says Al'Aini, who perhaps saw this version in some MS of the M; but Broch and Jahn print َمُقِدِّيَّا آلَع in the text of the M; and this is the version given by IY, as also by R, IHsh, and A;
while either version suits the argument in the Aud:]

(9) where the, is the J of [with Damm of the (Tsr)], when a pl., as عصَّا [243, 299, 684, 722], قُفَيَ pl. of [328], and pl. of دُلْي [237, 243] (Aud):

(a) the o. f. is قَفُّو، عُصُّو، دَلْوُ: but, deeming the combination of two, s heavy in the pl., they convert the last, into قَي; and then the first is transformed by conversion into قَي, and incorporation [case 7]; while the letter before the [first] قَي is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the س may sound true (Tsr): (a) sounding [the J] true [in the pl.] is anomalous, as أَبَأ and أَخَر، [pl. of أَب father and أَخَير brother, both transmitted by IAr (Tsr)]; ح [with an undotted ح (Tsr)], pl. of نَحْر i. q. جَهَة direction; نَجْزَر, pl. of نَجْر, which is the cloud that pours down its water; and بَهْر pl. of بَهْر, which is [the cavity of (KF)] the chest (Aud), transmitted by AHm on the authority of AZ: (α) the pl. mentioned are pronounced with Damm of the first and second [letters], orig. بَهَرُ، نَجُر، أَخِر، أَبَأ, with two, s, the first of which is incorporated into the second (Tsr): (b) if نُعَوُل be a sing., sounding [the J] true is necessary, as XXV. 23. And have exceeded [the limit in wrong-doing (K, B)] with great excess, XXVIII. 83. Seek not
elevation in the earth, جَنَّةٌ inf. n. of جَنَّةٌ The wealth increased, and دَوَّر inf. n. of دَوَّر زَيْلَان. Zaid was exalted (Aud), all of these exs. being sing. inf. ns., pronounced with دَامَّم of the first and second [letters], orig. وَهُنَا, نُمْو, عَلَّوٌ, سُبْو, and دَوَّر, with two , s, the first of which is incorporated into the second (Tsr): (a) sometimes, however, the sing. is transformed (Aud), by conversion of the last, into ى, and transformation of the first, like the transformation of [the ى in] ۲١٠ طَي [case 7] (Tsr), as دَرِئُ [684, 722], inf. n. of دَرِئُ آلْشَيْحَ. The old man became decrepit; and ۲٢٠ قَسِّي, inf. n. of قَسِّيَةً قَلْبَهُ His heart was hard (Aud): (c) what is [said by IM] in the Alfiya necessarily implies that the pl. [۲٣٠ فَعُول] and the sing. ۲٤٠ فَعُول are equal [in this respect, that sounding true is preferable to transformation]; for [immediately after "And sound the (ج of) مَفْعُول from such as عَمَّا true; or transform, etc.], cited above under case 8,] he says "Similarly the فَعُول from the [crude-form] containing the ى, when this letter appears as a ج 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 ى is an ِع of فَعُول [with دَامَّم of the ف, and doubling of the ِع (Tsr)], when a pl. sound in the ج, like ۲٥٠ صَيْم [pl. of ۲٥٠ سَيْم (Tsr)] and ۲٦٠ نَّيم (Aud) pl. of ۲٦١ نَّيِّم, the ِع [in
both of which is a, [247, 715, 716, 722]: (a) their o. f. is صَمَّمٌ [below]; but, two، ا and a Damma being combined in the pl., it is as though three، ا were combined, in addition to the heaviness of the pl., which therefore deviates to alleviation by conversion of the two، ا into ی، ا, because two ی، ا are lighter than two، ا (Tsr): (a) the more frequent [method] is to sound [the، ا] true, [according to the o. f. (Tsr),] as صَمَّمٌ and نُومٌ [above] (Aud); but a frequent, common, [method] is transformation, which is indicated by IM’s saying “And such as نُومٌ for صَمَّمٌ is common” (Tsr): (b) sounding true is necessary if the ل be (a) unsound, lest two transformations [of the ع and ل(Tsr)] occur consecutively, as شَوَى and غُوَى، pl. of شَارُ roasting and غَارٌ erring (Aud), or. غُوَى شَوَى، the ل being transformed by conversion into ل [684], because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; and then elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents, [the ل and Tanwin]: so that, if the ع 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 ع [by an ل(Tsr)], as صَوَامٌ [384, 715], because the ع is then far from the end, [which is the seat of alteration (MKh)]; while the saying
الآن طرقتنا مية أبنة منذر، فما أرى لليام إلا كلامهم
[715, 716, 722] (Aud), by Dhu-r-Rumwa (IY on § 715),
[or] by Abu-l-Ghamr alKilâbi, 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 by IAr (IY),
is anomalous (Aud), by rule النوم, with the, sounded
true, which IM indicates by his saying "But the
anomaly of such as نَيْام is attributed" (Tsr) to the
learned (Sn, MKh) in Arabic (Sn), i.e., is transmitted
[by them] (A, Tsr) in فَمَا أَرَقَّ آلحُم [above] (A). And
the ِ is [regularly] substituted in place of the ٣ and ِ,
in [the gen. and acc. of] such as مُسْلِبَان [16, 228] and
مُسْلِبُونَ [16, 234] (R). Its substitution, (1) for the ٣, is
(M, SH) (a) regular in such as (M, R) (α) مَفْتَيْعَحٌ
[above] (M), قرَّطْيِسٌ [274, 283] and قرَّطْيِسٌ [253]
(IY, R); (b) حَبَّرٌ [281, 282, 293, 298] (R): (b) anom-
alous in such as حَبَّلٍ [643, 686] (SH): (α) حَبَّلٍ with
the ِ 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) مِيقتاتٌ (M, SH) and ﻣِبْرَانٌ [above], whence
wind and 
still rain [278], because from 
being windy, breezy, cool and 
The cloud 
rained continually (IY); (b) [above] (M); (c) [above] (M, SH) and 
[above]; (d) [243, 741] (M); 
and 
[above] (M), (f) [above] (M, SH); (g) [above] (SH); (h) [above] (M, SH) and 
[above] (M), -orig. being 
[above] (M, SH); (i) [above] (SH); (j) [above] (M), SH) and 
[above] (M), -orig. being 
[above] (M, SH) and 
[above] (M), [336] from 
put off his creditor (IY); (i) I equipped for 
raiding [629, 674, 719, 727] (M, R) and 
I urged to raid (M), for conformity with the aor. 
I was a boy, or boyish, 
aor. where the 
is converted into 
because of the Kasra of the 
before it, they between them 
not being [regarded as] a separative, because of its 
weakness by reason of quiescence (IY); (b) [above]; 
(M), fem. tall, corpulent, from 
I was high, where they convert the into 
because of the Kasra before it, not taking the quiescent [l] 
between them into account [as a separative], because of 
its weakness (IY); (d) [above] (SH); (e)
[333, 701] (M, SH), with conversion of the ل into ل without Kasr of the aoristic letter [404], by treating the mobile ل here like the quiescent, for which reason they convert the ل into ل, on the principle of سيد and ميت [above], as they treat the quiescent ل and ل like the mobile in دار and طائي [684] (IY on §. 684): (α) [according to R, however,] such as صيم is regular, though weak: (β) so is such as نيكسل: F says “It is regular, according to some folk, although it is weak”; but Z decides that نير, نيبج, and دير are anomalous (R). Its substitution for the Hamza is (1) [regular, but not obligatory (R),] in such as ذيب [278, 642] (M, SH), for ذيب wolf (IY on §. 658), orig. with Hamza (Jh, Jrb); and مي [by alleviation of متورد pl. of متورد, 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 converted into ل when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr [658] (IY): (2) necessary in [such as هيئ [659, 661] (R). The [necessary] substitution of the ل [686] and ل for the Hamza occurs in two cases, (1) the pl. upon [the measure of (Tsr)] مفاعل [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 (1) and ﺂملّیَت (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 ﺂملّت [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 ُقِصْصُت and ُتقدّصُت ُالبَارِيَ [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 ی for ِلَا زَرَبْیَک ِلَا زَرَبْیَک [below], it is anomalous: (c) they also substitute the ی for the first of the duplicate letters in [the n. on] the measure of یعَّال, when a simple substantive, not an inf. n., as in ِدیِّسَاس , َشِیْرَاز , دِیْنَار , دِیْنَاج [below], according to him
that says [in the pl.] [دَنَامُرُ (MAZ),] ـلا، ـلاضفَـ (MAR) [278], and this substitution is regular, since 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 كُتْبَ inf. n. of كَتْبٌ [332]:

(a) when the simple substantive is with the ی, as in صَنَاة [head of the spindle (MAR)] and ُدَنَابة [short (MAR)], it is not changed, because of the freedom from ambiguity: (b) as for him that says دِمِاتُ and دِمِاتُ, 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 فِيِعَالُ [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 سَرْدَاح [396] (IY): (c) as for their saying شَوَاریزُ, with the , in the pl. of شِیراِز [below], it is based upon [the supposition] that شِیراِز is orig. شِیراِز, although there is no فِيِعَالُ in their language [377]; or شَوَاریزُ may be orig. شَوَاریزُ, the ی being changed into , by assimilation to the pl. ـلا [247, 686], in which case its o. f. [in the sing.] is شِیراِزُ [713, 716] and اِخَرِیدَوُ اَعْطُ (d): شِیراِزُ occur in
the *inf. n.* of أَمْلَأْتِ [332, 482, 494] and أَجْنِّبْتُ [482, 494, 667, 675] (R): (e) the substitution of the ی for one of the duplicate [or triplicate] letters is [exemplified] in (a) أَمْلَيْتَ الكِتَابَ: I dictated the writing (M, Jrb), aor. inf. n. أَمْلَأْتِ [for إِمَلْأَتِ (Jrb), orig. أَمْلَأْتْ [above] (IY); the Kur has فِيَ نَحْي عَلَيْهِ بَكْرَةً وَأَصِيلًا XXV. 6. And they are dictated to him morning and evening (IY, Jrb) and وَلَيْبِلِ الَّذَى عَلَيْهِ الْحَقُّ II. 282. And let him on whom lies the debt dictate [below] (IY); and the poet says

فَأَمُلَّتْ لَا أَمْلَأْتْ حَتَّى يُفَارِقَا

Then I swore I would not weary of him until he should depart, i.e., لَا أَمْلَأْتْ: (α) they say that the o. f. of أَمْلَأْتِ is أَمْلَيْتِ, inf. n. إِمَلْأَتِ, 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 أَمْلَيْتَ الكِتَابَ, aor. يُبْلِي, أَمْلَأْتِ إِمَلْأَتِ, aor. يُبْلِي, inf. n. إِمَلْأَتِ (IY); so that to make one of them original, and the other deriv., is not more appropriate than the converse (IY, Jrb): (b) قَصَصْتُ أَظَفَّارِي: I clipped my nails [below] (M, Jrb), transmitted by ISk (IY), for قَصَصْتُ (IY, Jrb), where they substitute ی for the third ص, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): (c) لَا نَبِيْكَ لَا أَنْفُلُ: No, by thy Lord, I will
not do! (M), meaning [above], where they substitute a ی for the second ب, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): (d) تکرر ی (M), orig. I took a concubine, تکرر ی from i. q. نکاح [331], which is named سر secrecy, because he that intends it hides, and seeks to conceal himself (IY): (α) concubine is سریة, فعالیة, [a rel. n. (Jh)] from سر (Jh, IY), i. e., copulation, [for the reason just given,] or concealment, because the man often secretes 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 ارض سهمة دعهر and سهمه دعهر [311], rel. ns. of دعهر سهمة and سهمه دعهر.

smooth ground (Jh): but Akh says that it is دعهر سهمة (IY), derived (Jh) from سر الر gladdness, because her master is gladdened by her (Jh, IY): (e) تکرر ی (M), orig. تکرر ی, one of whose تکرر ی 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. لم یتسسن It hath not been altered from مسنوی مسنوی 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 ی.
because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684], so that يَتْسَنَّ يَتْسَنَّ becomes يَتْسَتَنَّ; and the ٰ، ٰ ٰٰ, ٰ ٰٰ ٰ ٰ being afterwards elided for apocope [404, 720], so that لَمْ يَتْسَتَنَّ becomes لْمْ يَتْسَتَنَّ: this is the saying of IAl [below] (IY): (f) The falcon stooped, or swooped (M), i.e. تَقْصَتَ الْبَارِيَ The bird dropped in its flight (IY): (α) they do not use its تَقْصَتْ except changed (Jh, IY), as تَقْصَتْ, where, deeming three فٰ s heavy, they substitute ی for one of them (Jh): Al’Ajjağ says تَقْصَتْ الْبَارِيَ إِذَا الْبَارِيَ كَسَرُّ [below] (Jh, IY): (g) the saying نُزْرُ أَمَّرُ أَمَّا إِلَّا الْلَّهُ نَيْتَقُيُّ، أُرُمُّ أُرُمَا بِفَعْلِ الْصَّالِحِينَ نِيَأَتِيَ 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 يَأْتِمُ, but substitutes ی for the second م (IY): (h) تَصْدِيَةُ (M), [as] in وَمَا كَانَ صَلَوْنَاهُمْ إِنَّ الْلَّيْبَ إِلَّا مُكَأَءٍ وَتَصْدِيَةٍ VIII. 35. [21, 682], where the ی is a subst. for the [second] د (IY), according to those who pronounce it to be from صَدَّ, aor. يَصُدُّ (M); i.e., clapping of hands and making a noise, whence إِذَا كُرِمْنَ مَنْهَ يَصِدُّنَ 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 $й$:
this is the saying of AU: [being orig. $قسامة$، $قسامة$، then by incorporation $قسامة$، $قسامة$] like
expiration and $ célibة$ diversion; but, when the second $й$ is converted into $й$, incorporation is impossible, from the difference of the two letters (IY): (i) [$ثلة$ [$I ate
endive (IY)]] from لُعَاة[$endive (M)], which is a delicate herb, according to what ISk transmits, on the authority of IAr; whence, says As, the world is called لُعَاة: (α) its $o.f.$ is $ثلة$; but they substitute a $й$ for one of the $ع$s, from dislike to the combination of [three] $ع$s (IY):
and [below] (M): they say (α) $دَعَدِيَت$ [$I rolled the stone down, aor. أَدْعُدُى$, inf. n. $دَعَدِيَت$ and $دَعَدِيَت$ quasi-pass. It rolled down, i.e., 
$دَعَدْيَة$ quasi-pass. (IY), a $й$ being substituted for the [second] (Jh): Dhu-r-Rumma says

As rocks roll down from the mountain (Jh, IY); and Abu-nNajm says

As though the sound of her hurried swallowing were a stone that thou hadst rolled down from stones: while their
saying for what the black-beetle rolls together indicates that the o. f. is [below], for meaning I said “Hush! hush!” [187], i.e., “Be silent”, the ی being a subst. for the a, from dislike to the reduplication (ІV): (ل) مکاکیك (مکاکیک) pl. of مکرک (below) (M), according to what AZ transmits, the [second] ی being followed by two ی s, the first a subst. for the ی of مکرک [683], which becomes a ی in the pl., because the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr; and the second a subst. for the [third] ی, because of [the heaviness of] the reduplication (ІV): (ل) دیاچیپ pl. of دیاچب [below] (M) dark, as دیاچب meaning intensely dark night, orig. دیاچب, where, disliking the reduplication, they substitute a ی for the last ج; and, this ی being then combined with the one before it, they lighten [the word] by elision of one of the two ی s; so that it becomes دیاچب, of the class of the defective [16] (ІV): (م) دیوآن register [332, 716], دیباچ, brocade [above], and قیراط carat [278, 332] (M), orig. دوآن, the paradigm of which is فعال, the ی in it being a ل, because they say دوئت I registered, and, in the dim., دوئت: if, then, it be said “Then wherefore do you not convert the [of دیوآن] into ی, because of the
s occurring quiescent before it, on the principle of its conversion in سِّجْدَة and مَيْتَ [above]?

the reply is “Because that would lead to destruction of the object: for, disliking the reduplication in دَرَان, they change [the first ¯ into ى], in order that the two letters may be different; so that, if they were afterwards to change the [second] ى [into ى], saying دَرَان, they would revert to [a reduplication] such as what they have fled from: and besides the ى is not inseparable, being only substituted for lightness, since they say ٰکَوَّارِين, restoring the ى, when the Kaara is removed from before it; so that it is plain to you that this ى is not inseparable; because, in some circumstances, it return to its o. f.; though some say ٰکَوَّارِين, making the subst. inseparable: (ب) دَبُّاج، that being indicated by their saying دَبُّاج [above], with the ب, in the pl., as though they disliked reduplication [in the sing.], and therefore changed [the first ب into ى]: (ب) ۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚ
(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 دماسين سرارير and [above] (M) in the pl. (IY); (o) the saying of the poet, [describing a wild cow in search of her calf (Jsh),]

قامت بها تنشد كل المنشد قايتصلت بيدل ضوء الفرد [below] (M) She stood in it (the patch of ground), seeking with all inquiry, المنشد in the shape of the pass. part. being a mimi inf. n. [333], and joined a calf like the light of the asterism called AlFarqad (Jsh), by which one guides oneself (KF), where he means اتصلت ً اناسی (2) [689], but dislikes the reduplication (IY): ً اناسی (SH), orig. اناسين [248, 274], because it is pl. of انسان (Jrb); (a) اناسی may be pl. of اناسین, in which case the ی is not a subst. for the ین: so says Mb: (b) انسان, [by conversion of the ین into ی (K, B on XXV. 51.),] its o. f. being اناسین [above], which also is used; so that it is like طبران [248, 274], pl. of طبران [237, 385] (R), the o. f. being طبراین [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

\[\text{ مدينة ليس لها حوارن و لمضافي جيبه نفاذق} \]
(1297)

[below] (R) 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 ضفادعٍ, but substitutes the اى for the ع by poetic license (IY) : (2) the saying

[682] (R), by Abū Kāhil AnNamir Ibn Taulab alYashkurî, describing a female eaglet, named غبة 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 أزنيها the fouls and أزنيها the fouls; but, being constrained to make [the ب] quiescent, which is not possible for him, he substitutes for the ب اى, [which is] quiescent in the position of the gen. [16, 720] (IY) : (3) the saying

إذا ما عدى أربعة نسال فزع جيك خميس و أديك سادي

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

يَفْتَمِيك يَا زَرَع أَبِي وَحَالِي * قَذَّ مَرْ يَهْمَٰل ِرَهْدًا الْقَالِيُّ

و أنت بِالله مَهْرِكِ لَن تَبَالِي
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 for the second [of the second (Jsh)], as though he disliked the cat. of the second (Jsh) and the third (Jsh), and thou carest not for the desertion, where the poet substitutes a for the second (Jsh) (IY). But Al'aran (and Al'taalii, Al'saffadi, Al'sadid, and Al'taalii) are weak (SH), because unheard from trustworthy Arabs (MASH). And sometimes the ñ is substituted for the ñ, as though he disliked the ñ and the ñ for the ñ [684] and the ñ (R). It is therefore said by Al'aran (to be) substituted for eighteen letters, (1) the ٣ as in [above]: (2) the ٣ as in [above] and the variations of the inf. n. (Sn) thereof, [as yugri and mugri (Sn)]: (3) the Hamza, as in [642, 658]: (4) the ٣ in and the variations thereof [as in above]: (5) the ٢ in [above]: (6) the ٢ in and the variations thereof [as in above]: (7) the ٣ in and the variations thereof [as in above]: (8) the ٢ in (a) and [above]; (b) [above]; (c) as IAl holds, [above]; (d) [above], orig. ٢٣٠٢, because of their saying [18] and ٢٣٠٢, with the ١, for ١٠٠٣, [278] ٢٣٠٢ and 'E'san, (e) ٢٣٠٢, with the ١, for ١٠٠٣, [above]: (9) the ٣ in [above]: (10) the ٣ in [above]:
When the generous hasten to the noble deed, he hastens with the swoop of the falcon, when the falcon contracts his wings (Sn), i.e., تَقَضَّصَ اَلْبَارِى إِذَا اَلْبَارِى كَسَرَ.

From above, (A) when the generous hasten to the noble deed, he hastens with the swoop of the falcon, when the falcon contracts his wings (Sn), i.e., تَقَضَّصَ اَلْبَارِى إِذَا اَلْبَارِى كَسَرَ.

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 أَمْلِيَتُ [above]: (12) the م in نُرُزُّ أَمَرًا أَلَمُ [above], where, says IAr, the poet means. تَلْعَيْتُ [above]: (13) the ع in (a) مَمْهَلِيَ أَلْحِ [above]; (b) يَأْتِمُ [above]: (14) the د in تَصَدِّيْتُ لِلأَمْرُ [above], orig. تَصَدِّيْتُ لِلأَمْرُ (A); and so in تَصَدِّيْتُ لِلأَمْرُ: Fm says in the Msb "I applied, and devoted, myself exclusively to the matter, orig. تَصَدَّدَتْ, then changed for lightness" (Sn): (15) the ٌ in رَأَيْتَلَّتْ بَيْنَتْ أَلْحِ [above]; (16) the ت in تَفَصَّلُتْ بَيْنَتْ أَلْحِ [above], i.e., the َثُلُثُ أَلْحِ [above], (b) يَتَفَصَّلُتْ بَيْنَتْ أَلْحِ [above], orig. يَتَفَصَّلُتْ بَيْنَتْ أَلْحِ (A): YH says "so that the ُي of the pl. is elided, and the [last] جُ then converted into ى"; and analogy requires that the like of this should be said on A's saying "orig. مَكَأَكَيْكَ" [below]: but this is correct only when the ُي of يَتَفَصَّلُتْ بَيْنَتْ أَلْحِ َثُلُثُ أَلْحِ [above]: (17) the ج in (a) دَيْجِيَ [above], or دَيْجِيَ [above], i.e., دَيْجِيَ [above], or دَيْجِيَ [above], i.e., "مَن شَجَرَبَ" [684].
and [with Tanwin ꝏٓٔ] is single; not when it is double, as the ل of مَكَّكَكٓٔ is marked in such correct Mss of the KF as I have seen: nay, [in مَكَّكَكٓٔ and دَنِٔٔ] the quiescent ل is the ل of the pl., [being a subst. for the ل of مَكَّكَكٓٔ and دَنِٔٔ, which becomes a ل in the pl., because the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr;] while that which follows it is a subst. for the ج [or ل] (Sn): (18) the ل in مَكَّكَكٓٔ pl. of مَكَّكَكٓٔ [above], orig. مَكَّكَكٓٔ [above] (A).

§. 636. The ل is substituted for (M, SH, A) three letters (A), (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), by which are meant (IY) the ل and ل (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 ل, it is in one case, vid. where the letter before it is pronounced with Damm [below] (Aud), whether it be in (1) a v. (Tsr), as in ضَرُّب and ضَرُّب [below] (Aud): (a) their o. f., before they are put into the pass., is بَانِع trafficked with [683], swore allegiance to, and مَازَب fought with [490]; but, when you put them into the pass., you pronounce their initial with Damm [436]; while it is impossible for the ل to remain after a Damma, because the letter before the ل is pronounced only with Fath; so that the ل is converted into ل, for homogeneity
with the vowel of the letter before it (Tsr); (b) the Revelation has 
with the vowel of the letter before it (Tsr); (b) the Revelation has 
What was hidden 
from them [683] (Aud): or (2) a n., as in ُضْرُبُب dim. of 
ضَرَبُب [below]; if the ی be not second, converted from a 
ی meaning [canine] tooth, [fang,] in which 
case it returns to its o. f., vid. the ی , as in ُتْمْبُب [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 ْدَامِم (IA), whether it be in (a) a n. (Tsr), as in 
ْمَرُتُب [278] and 
ْمُسِرَت [278, 682, 699] (Aud), orig. ْمِسَرَتْ and ْمِسِرَتْ, act. 
parts. [of was certain and ْيَسَرَت was well off (A)] from certain and ْيَسِير easy, the ی in both being 
changed into ْيُرُتَت because occurring after a ْدَامِم ; or (b) 
a v., as in ْيُرُسُت is certain and ْيُرُسُت 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 ْحَيْمَ (Aud), i. e., says Jh, most 
volent 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 ْحَيْفَت (Aud), pl. of ْحَايْفُت [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 [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 پ: but this ex. [ چیش ] 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 حاضض [384] from پیغ , saying پیغ , [the ی in] which, for the [first] reason that we mentioned [in the case of حیش ], 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 هیم and یلآ (248, 249, 710), like یلآ enthusiasts, or of another [measure], like یلآ pl. of بیض white (Aud), pl. of بیض and یلآ ظافح; or of another [measure], like یلآ п in the principle of یلآ pl. of بیض white [247], یلآ п being the she-camel that does not conceive [718], pl. یلآ and یلآ (247) (Tsr): (2) where the ی occurs after a Damma, and is the ل of (a) [468, 476],
like َنَهْوُ الْرَجُلُ How intelligent the man is! and َقُصُرَ What a good judge he is! [with Fath of their first, and Damm of their second (Tsr),] i. q. َعَقَّلُهُ, i. e., َمَا أَنْهَأَهُ, and َمَا أَقْضاَهُ (Aud), i. e. أَحْكَمُهُ, َنَهْيٍ and from َنَهْيٍ I forbade and َقُصُرَ I judged, the َيِ in them being changed into َو because occurring after a Damma (Tsr): (b) a n. ending in a [fundamental, inseparable] َىَ [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 َرَقِيَ a [n. ending in َىَ (Tsr),] like َمُقْدَرَةَ [333], [with Damm of the َدَ (Tsr),] in which case you say َمُرَمًّى [with the َو, َنِرَمَيَةٌ, the َيِ being changed into َو because occurring after a Damma (Tsr)], contrary to [what happens when the َىَ is affixed after the formation of the word, in which case the Damma must be converted into Kasra, in order that the َيِ may be preserved, as in (Tsr)] such [formations] as َتَوْأَتِي flagg[336]: for its o. f., before affixion of the َىَ, is َتَوْأَتِي with Damm [of the َنَ, because it is of the cat. of تَفَعَّلُ, since تَرَيْنِ َتُوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. un. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagged [336]: inf. n. of تَتَوَأَتِي flagge
the ș supervenes, to import unity [336]; while the transformation [of the Ɗamмa into Kasra (Tsr) remains in its state (Aud), the predicament [of the ّ] not being altered by restoration of the Ɗamмa to its original place, and change of the ی into ٌ, because that would lead to the occurrence of an inf. n. ending in ٌ preceded by an inseparable Ɗamмa [721], since the adventitious ș, being virtually separate [266], is not taken into account (Tsr): (c) a n. ending in the [aug. (Tsr)] ٌ and ٌ, as when you form from رَمْی [a name (Tsr)] on the measure of سَبْعَان سَبْعَان [with Ɗamмa of the ب (Tsr)], the name of the place about which Ibn Aḥмar [or rather Tamm Abn Abi Muķbil, according to the correct opinion (Tsr),] says أَلَا يَا دِیْکَر اَلْحَمْیَ الْحَمْیَ, in which case you say رَمَوْان Ramуwān (Aud) with Ɗamмa of the م, orig. رَمْیَان, the ی being changed into ٌ, because occurring after a Ɗamмa: (a) you may, however, say that, when a [n.] like عَضَد [237, 250] is formed from عَزْو, then عَضَد [685, 723] is said, the letter before the ٌ and ٌ being given the predicament of what occurs as a genuine final, like [the ّ of رَمْی [685]: while this necessarily requires that, in the like of سَبْعَان from رَمْی سَبْعَان, the letter at the end [above], رَمْوْان, should not be said, because, in the paradigm of عَضَد [368] from رَمْی, it is not allowable to say رَمْوْان, since we have no decl. n. ending in an inseparable, 
after a Ḍamma [721]; but the Ḍamma must be converted into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved, so that you say زِمْبَانُ [724]; and similarly یَمْلَكُ 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 فَعَلَی with Fath of the ف when a substantive, not an ep., as تَقْرِي ی piety, reverence [689, 725], [i. q. مَثِلُ Thou hast its like, or match, i. e., مَثِلُ, transmitted by IJ (Tsr),] and یَنۡوِی [248] (Aud), orig. فَتْیاَ, شَرَیاَ, تَقْرِيَاَ, because from I feared, reverence I feared I sold, and فَتْیتُ I was youthful, the ی in them being changed into ل 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 سَعْیاَ Sa'ya'd, [a name (Tsr)] for α [certain (Tsr)] place, [a district in AlYaman or its immediate neighbourhood, by rule, says IJ, سَعُوی (Bk),] and رَبَّی for the [nice (EM)] odour, and طَفِیاَ [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. سَعْیاَ from striving (Tsr),] may be
transferred from an ep. [4], like صَدِيبَا and حَرْحَيًا [725],
fems. of صَدِيبَان and حَرْمَان thirsty (Aud), the
sounding [of its ی] true being retained as an accompani-
ment after its being made a name, as F explains (Tsr);
while the second, [vid. رَیَا from رَيْيَ (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 رَائِحَة رَیَا a fragrant odour, i. e., filled with per-
fume; and the third, [vid. طَفْيَان inordinate
wickedness (Tsr),] is more often pronounced with ِذَامَم
of the ـل [below], so that perhaps they retain the sound-
ing [of the ی ] true as an accompaniment when they
pronounce [the ـل] with فَاتِح 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 ‘anomal-
ous’] is anomalousness in usage; for I have read, in his
[own] handwriting, a marginal annotation here ‘The
substitution of the َ for the ی , when a َل of نَفْعَلَى , is
not to be taken as a precedent, because there is no cause
[for it], while it necessarily involves increase of heav-
iness’": (c) various spellings of طَفْيَان [272] are trans-
mitted: As says “with ذَامَم of the ـل [above], like
حَبْلٍ”; while Th says “with فَاتِح of the ـل [above],
on the paradigm of سَكْرِی”; and AU says “with فَاتِح
of the ط, and Tanwīn”: so says ISd (Tsr): (a) where the ظ is the غ of فُتْلِى [718], with Dumm [of the ط (Tsr), when (a) a substantive, like طيبة happiness, [i. q. طيب (Tsr),] an inf. n. of طاب was happy (Aud), aor. طيب (Tsr), like بشرى [272, 331] and رقى [272] (K, B on XIII. 28.); or Ṭubd, a name for Paradise (Aud), whence the tree of Paradise (Tsr): (a) the meaning of طيبة لِلَّ Mayst thou be happy! or Happiness be thine! is أَصَبْتَ حَيْراً طيبةاَ Mayst thou find good fortune and happiness! while the [syntactical] place of طيبة is the acc. or nom., as in طيب or طيبة لِلَّ, and سلامًا لِلَّ [41] or سلام [25, 28], its two places being indicated to you by the reading of طرَبِى لِهِم وَحُسنَ مَآبَ طرَبِيَّ لِهِم وَحُسنَ مَآبَ 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 ل denotes explanation, as in سفِيًا لِلَّ [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 ops. (Tsr)], which is the فيَّلَ of فعلُ [272, 355], like the happy state, or life, أَكْعَرَى the shrewd woman, and أَطَیِّبَ أَخْيَسَ, and أَخْيَسَ [351] (Aud), ns. of superiority acting as prim. substantives (Tsr): (a) what indicates that
they are acting as [*prim.* (Tsr)] substantives is that the
*ancestor* of superiority takes the pl. *ancestor* [249], as
the learned and the great, [pl. of *ancestor* and
(Tsr),] like *ancestor* pl. of *ancestor* [249] (Aud), which is a
*prim.* substantive: (b) the o. f. is *learned*, *great*,
with Damm of their initial; but the *i* is
changed into , because quiescent and preceded by a
letter pronounced with Damm (Tsr), as in *mutation* and
*above* (K on XIII. 28): (c) if *be a pure
ep., [i. e., preceded by a qualified (Tsr),] its Damma
must be converted into Kasra, [in order that the *i* 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., a *wrongful*, [from *deprived, or defrauded, him of his right, aor.*
*diminished, to him his right and
wronged him (Tsr),] and an elegant, or
affected, gait, i. e., wherein the shoulders move [272, 718]
(Aud), from *meaning moved his shoulders
in his walk, orig. and with Damm of their
initial, the Damma being changed into Kasra in order
that the *i* may be sounded true, as in *pl. of
[above] (Tsr): (d) this is the language of the GG: but IM [in the Alfiya (Tsr)] and his son [in the C (Tsr)] say that before the ـ of ُعلِّى, when an ep., the Damma may [either] be preserved, the ی being converted into ـ; or be changed into Kasra, the ی being preserved: so that you say ُعَلْيُ the happiest or ُعَلْيُ the shrewdest or ُعَلْيُ the narrowest or ُعَلْيُ (Aud), from vacillating between conformity with its masc. [by retention of the ی] at one time, and observance of the measure [by retention of the Damma] 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 ُعَلْي when an ep.: whereas the GG decide upon one of them, saying that the ی [occurring as the ـ of ُعَلْي, when a substantive, is converted into ـ, as ُعَلْي and ُعَلْي; while, in the ep., it is not converted, but the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, so that the ی is preserved, as ُعَلْي and ُعَلْي: (β) that the GG mention the fem. of ُعَلْي ُعَلْي in the cat. of the substantives [718, 725]; and assign to it the predicament of the substantives in retention of the Damma and conversion of the ی into ـ; 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: (j) Shl says "No instance
of this [formation] occurs [with its غ] converted, except the فَعْلٍ of فِعْلَاءٍ "آفِنَعْلَاءٍ" [apparently regarding فِعْلَاءٍ as an ép. throughout case 4] (Tsr): (g) Makwaza alA‘rābi reads طُبِّي‍ّبَتُ لهُم in XIII. 28. [above], pronouncing the ﺖ with Kasr [in the substantive], in order that the ﻰ may be preserved, as ﺔيِضْ [above] and مَعِيَّشَةٌ [333, 710] are said (K). Its substitution, (1) for the ﺖ, is (a) [obligatory (SH)] in such as (α) ضُوْرَبٌ [247, 278, 383] (Jrb); and ضُوْرَبٌ (M, SH), dim. of ضًوُرَبْ [278, 682] (Jrb): i. e., in [the ultimate pl., and the dim., of (R) such as (IY)] فَعَلْلَ [above] (IY, R), like ضَوْرَبٌ حَاتْمُ [373]; and فَعَلْلُ فَاوُلُ, like ضَوْرَبٌ سَابَاطٌ [377]: for, whenever you mean to form the dim., or [ultimate] broken pl., from any of those [ns.], you convert its ﺖ into ﷲ, as ضُوْرَبٌ [above], and ضُوْرَبٌ حَوْتًَمُ, and ضُوْرَبٌ عَرَقْيَلٍ, and ضُوْرَبٌ سَوْبْيَبٍ: (α) the cause of its conversion in the dim. [278] is obvious, vid. the fact that the letter before it is pronounced with دَامَّ [above]: (β) as for its conversion in the broken pl. [247], it is by conformity with the dim.: for, when you say ضًوُرَبْ [above], there is no دَامَّ on the ﺖ and necessitating conversion of the ﺖ into ٌ; but, since you say حَوْتًَمُ
in the dim., you say \( \text{کو} \) 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 third preceded by a Fatha [274], and the sign of the [ultimate] broken pl. is a quiescent third [256], preceded by a Fatha, while the ی is the sister of the ل, as above shown; and that the letter after the ی of the dim. is pronounced with Kasr [274], as is the letter after the ل of the [ultimate] broken pl. [256] (IY) : (b)

\[ \text{ضیرب} \] [below], dim. of 

\[ \text{لترب} \] [278], inf. n. of یارب [332, 685] : (c) یودم and یودم [247, 278, 661] (M), which they treat like یودم and یودم [above], since the substitution is obligatory, because of the combination of two Hamzas (IY) : (d) یودب [above] (IY, R) and یودب (R), where you convert the ل of the [act.] یارب [and یاردب] into ل. یارب, according to the rule mentioned [above], because the letter before it is pronounced with Damm (IY) : (e) یودب and یودب [294, 300] (M, SH), and the like [rel. ns.] from the abbreviated (IY), where the ل third or fourth [300] has the ی of relation affixed to it, in which case you convert the ل into ل (R), whether the ل be [converted] from ی or ی (IY, R), because of the occurrence of the 141 a
double ی after it: (α) the reason of its being converted into ۸, and the reason of this ۸'s not being converted into !, notwithstanding its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, have been explained [300, 634] (R): (ج) [229, 639], du. of ۸ا [500], when [used as (IY)] a name (M); and similarly ۸ا ۸ا ۸ا [229], إذ [205], لکی ۸ا [204], whether [an adv. of] time or place, ۸ا [559], and ۸ا [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 ۸ and ۸، you would say ۸ا ۸ا [234], and the like: (α) the cause of the conversion of such ۸ا as those into ۸ 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 ۸ is assigned to them, and therefore they are converted into ۸ when they need a vowel: (β) if it be said "Since they are original, not substituted, why is their conversion into ۸ not disallowed, because they have no o. f. as ۸ or ۸؟", the answer is that the matter is so, except that, when these words are used as names, they are translated to the predicament of ۸: so that what is predicated of the ۸a in those ۸a which it is not good to pronounce with Imāla,
such as sand-grouse, is predicated of their ١; and, as you say, you say ١٨٦٨٢ and ١٨٦٨٢, and somewhat similarly, if you named a man ١٨٦٨٢, you would inflect it, saying ١٨٦٨٢. This is داراب, I saw داراب, and I passed by داراب, although, before use as a name, it is not invaded by inflection [٤٠٢, ٤٠٣]; so that, as, when used as a name, is transferred to the predicament of ١٨٦٨٢, and is therefore inf. [١٩٤, ٢٠٦], so ١٨٦٨٢, and ١٨٦٨٢, and when used as names, are transferred to the predicament of ١٨٦٨٢, and their ١٨٦٨٢ are decided to be [converted] from the ١, since they are original, and ١٨٦٨٢ has not been heard in them (٢٥): (b) weak in [such as] انغ١٨٦٨٢ for انغ١٨٦٨٢ viper [in pause] (٦٧), [where] some of ٢٥١ say ٢٥١ with the ٢٥١ (M on §. ٦٤٣); (a) فاضرا and some of ٢٥١ convert every final ١, whether for feminization, as in [٢٤٨, ٢٧٢], or not, as in ٢٥١ [٤٠١, ٦٧١, ٦٧٣], into ٢٥١ [in pause]; so say the GG; but IH makes that peculiar to the ١ of "such as ٢٥١" [٦٤٣, ٦٨٥], which is not proper: (b) the reason why they convert it into ٢٥١ is that the ١ 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 ١ 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 ٰ of silence [615] after it; so that in pause they substitute [for it] a letter homogeneous with, but plainer than, it, vid. the ى; (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 ى, which is heavier than the ٰ; and also because the letter before it is pronounced with Fath, which somewhat lightens the heaviness of the ى: (d) this is also an excuse for the conversion of the ٰ into Hamza [648], although it is heavier than the ٰ: (e) Tayyi leave it, in continuity, in the same state as in pause, saying ٰٰٰٰٰ with the ى in both states: (f) some of Tayyi convert the ٰ into ى [in pause], because ى is plainer than ى, and plainness is intended: for the ٰ is [sounded] farther in the mouth than the ى, because it is [emitted] from the throat [732]; and after it the ى, because it is from the middle of the tongue; and after it the ى, because it is from the lips: (g) the ى is more frequent than the ى 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 ٰ into ى [in pause] leave the ى, 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 ٌ is converted into ی or ٌ is that the three resemble one another in prolongation and width of outlet (R on Pause): (2) for the ی, is (a) [obligatory (SH)] in such as (ا) مترن (M, SH) and مترن [above] (IY), طرمی [above], and بطر (M, SH), orig. بطر (Jrb), pass. of بطر [482] (IY), from بطر [332], whence بطر [377] (Jrb); vid. where the ی is quiescent and unincorporated, and is preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm (M, R), and followed by two or more letters [below], except in such as پیسان [249], and جیکی and ضیری [above] (R): (α) if the ی in مترن and مترن become mobile, or the Damma before it be removed, the word reverts to its original ی, as in the dim. میتسرمیتیقین [278], and the broken pl. میتسرمیتیقین and میتسرمیتیقین [252] (IY): (β) our saying “[and followed by] two or more letters” [above] is to guard against such as پیض [above] (R): (γ) as for ضریب [above], the ی in it is a subst. for the ی substituted for the ی of نام: while the last ی is a subst. for the ی of فعال [332] (IY): (b) sparing, taking compassion on [725] (M, SH), orig. بقیا, [a quasi-inf. n. (KF)] from بقیعه أثنی علیه spared him, i. q. أثنی علیه took compassion on him, from بقیعه remained,
as though he desired him to remain (Jrb); and though he desired him to remain (Jrb); and نَقَرَ [above], from وَقَرَتْ [689] (IV): (c) فَضَرُّتْ [294, 301] (R): (b) [anomalous, weak (SH),] in such as (α) هُدّأ أَمُرُ مَضْرٌ عِلْيٍ. This is a matter accomplished (M, SH), orig. مَضْرُتْ (Jrb), from مُضْرِ [below] (Jrb), the last, in it being a subst. for the ي , which is a ل in مَضْرِتْ (IV), because it is from مَضْرِي, aor. يُضْرِي (R): [He is (M, R) a strong enjoiner of good conduct (IV, R),] a strong forbider of bad conduct [685] (M, SH), which is from نَكِيتْ I forbade (IV), [being] orig. نَكِيتْ (R, Jrb), from نَكِيتْ (Jrb), as though the ي were converted into , in order that نَكِيتْ might correspond to نَكِيتْ; whereas, if they converted the [of نَكُول] into ي , the ذِمَمَة would be turned into كَاسَرْي, and نَكِيتْ would become نَكِيتْ [722], which would not correspond to نَكِيتْ (R); and I drank a purgative (IV, R), which is the medicine that moves the stomach (R), from مَشَيْتْ I moved, because the laxative necessitates motion: (α) they change the ي into , because they mean the formation نَعُول; and therefore dislike it to be confounded with the formation فَعَّل, [as would happen] if نَعُول and مَشَيْتْ [722] were said (IV): جَبَرُتْ [Jbar] (M, SH), for جَبَرَةُ inf. n. of جَبَرَتْ (M, PH), for جَبَرَةُ inf. n. of جَبَرَتْ.
I collected the tax (IY, R, Jrb) : (x) [the assertion] that the [last] of مَصْرُو is a subst. for the ی is said to require consideration, because one says مُضْرَيْنَ عَلِّي الأُمْرِ I accomplished the matter, inf. n. مُضْرَيْنَ [above], and مُضْرُعُ عَلِّي الأُمْرِ, inf. n. مُضْرَعَةٌ; and similarly [the assertion] that the ی, in چَبَرْةٍ یَبَرْةٍ is a subst. for the ی, because چَبَرْةٍ یَبَرْةٍ and چَبَرْةٍ یَبَرْةٍ are two dial. vars., since Jh says in the Sahāh: "[Ks says (Jh)] یَبْيَتُ النَّاَبُ في یلْفُرُض I collected the water in the trough or cistern and یَبْبَهُةٍ", the inf. n. of the first being, it is said, یَبَيِّن, and of the second یَبَرْةٍ; and Jh also says "іَبْنَتُ یلْفُرُض, inf. n. یَبَرْةٍ, and یَبْنَةٍ, inf. n. یَبَرْةٍ": 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 غَرِينة and غَرِينة as dims. of thing and عَنْيَنَ eye, respectively, converting the ی in them into ی: but the chastest [practice] is to say یَبَيْنَ and یَبْيِنَةَ with retention of the ی, and یَبَرْهُ with retention of the ی, and یَبَرْةَ. 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 ضيّعة and بَيْتٌ as *dems.* of ضيّعة *real property,* or estate,* and tent,* house,* respectively:* whereas the form adopted in them is ضيّعة and بَيْتٌ, as in a verse by AlKhalil Ibn Ahmad that I have had recited to me

إن لم يكن لله جدهي أو أُعدَّاك حَذْل قَبْيَت
أو لم يكن دَا وَأَا كَيْسِرَة قَبيَت

*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 fragment of bread, and a little tent (D); or [ضيّعة and بَيْتٌ] [274, 721] (Jh, KF), with Kasr of the initial, as also in the *dems.* of شَيْعٌ غَيْرِ، [274] شَيْعٌ [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 و ] 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 و, (1) necessarily, if it be an ى converted from a و; so that you say بَيْتٌ as *dems.* of بَاب [278]: (2) allowably, though less approvably, if it be a ى or an ى converted from a ى; so that بَيْتٌ and شَريعٌ and
are allowable as *dim.* of شَيْحُ and نَابُ [278]. And similarly ضُرِعَة and نُوبَتِ [above]. And what H dis-allows is allowed by some, who transmit it from the KK., saying "They say شُوْرَى as *dim.* of شَيْحُ": so that what H mentions is of no account (CD). Or شُوْرَى is a weak *dial. var.*, on the authority of Idris Ibn Mūsā, the Grammarian (KF). The substitution of the ع for the Hamza [685] is (1) [allowable (R)] in such as جُوْنَة [642], *pl.* جُوْنُ (M, SH), orig. جُوْنَة and جُوْنَ with Hamza: (a) the ex. is said to be a blunder, because the composition جُوْنَ is neglected in the language, and thus the ع in جُوْنَة is not known to be orig. Hamza: the author of the ٍة*ة says "And جُوْنَة with ُب is the *inf. n.* [331] of the جُوْنِ intensely black, [pl. جُوْنُ (Jh);] of horses, [like غَبِسَة dingy whiteness and بَرَّر bright bay color (Jh)]; and جُوْنَة is also the جُوْنَة 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 ع: (b) "the جُوْنَة of the perfumer" [above] is his حُقَة. *small round box (Jrb): (2) necessary in (a) [such as (MASH)] I believe [661]: (b) such as حَمِّرَائِياٍ
[230, 726], according to the most recognised [usage]; and ۱۳۲۰ [248]; and حَمْرَوَاتٍ [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 ۱۶ [16, 667] (M, SH, Aud, A), according to most (A), alone (M, SH), the م not being substituted for the ، except in ۱۶۰۳ , but this substitution being obligatory (R), lest [the ، be elided, so that (R)] the infl. [n. (Jrb)] remain unil. [below] (R, Jrb), according to what has been mentioned [278] (Jrb): (a) its o. f. is فُرْقَةٌ [16, 306] (IY, R, Aud, A), like فُرْقَةٌ crowd (A), its ئ being a ، , and its ۱ a س (IY), as is proved by [its broken pl. (IY, Tsr)] فُرْقَةٌ (IY, R, Aud, A) and its dim. فُرْقَةٌ [275] (IY), because the broken pl. [or the dim.] restores things to their o. f. [260, 278] (Tsr), and by فُرْقَةٌ wide-mouthed and I opened my mouth (R); and its measure being فَعَلُ with Fath of the first [letter], and quiescence of the second (IY): but the س [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 ۱۲۱ and ۱۲۱ [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 ۱۲۱ would be said, which would be deemed heavy (A);
and, when the  зависимость is elided, the  зависимость remains of two letters, the second a, , and the first pronounced with Fath [below]: while its retention in this state would lead to conversion of the  зависимость into  [684], on the principle of [the conversion in]  عَضْمَا and  رَحْي [719], because of its being mobile with the vowels of inflection, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; and, this  зависимость being elided, as in  عَضْمَا [643, 683], because of the concurrence of two quiescents, upon affixion of Tanwin to it, the decl.  зависимость would remain  عَضْمَة. [below], which is not found (IY): and [since, according to what has just been mentioned, the  зависимость requires the  зависимость to be retained (IY),] they substitute the  م for the  (IY, R, Aud, A), because the  م is a sound letter, on which the vowels are not heavy; and (IY) is from the same outlet as the  [732] (IY, Tsr), both being from the mouth; and has in it a nasality akin to the softness of the  : (a) if it be said "What is the proof that the  зависимость 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  فَم and  فَم, with Damm and Kasr, for  فَم", 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  ف in this  зависимость vary, when
the n. is pre. [otherwise than to the ي of the 1st pers.], as جُلْدُ كَفَانِي This is thy mouth, I saw thy mouth, and تَرَى كَفَانَي 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'Affajj (AKB)]

"O would that it, by which he may have meant كِيلْيَة 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, حَقَّ قَ فَ أَهْلِهِ (AKB), it is related with Damm and Fath of the ف, together with doubling of the م:—as for the Damm of the ف, 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. أَفْواَل, and for its dim. أَفْواَلَة [above], not أَفْوَالُ [below] nor أَفْوَيْم; but the explanation of it is that they double the م in pause, as they double [the final] in خَالِدَة يُجْعُل [640]; and that continuity is then treated like pause [647], as in القصَبَا and سَبْسَبَا [640, 647, 648] (IV): (c) if مَمُّ be pre. [to an explicit n. or a pron. (Tar)], it is returned to the o. f., [vid. the م (Tar),] as [فرَتَ ذِي Zaid's mouth and (Tar) نُوْكَ thy mouth [below] (Aud, A), because prefixion
restores things to their o. fs. (Tsř): and the substitution seldom remains, as in [the saying of the Prophet (Tsř)]

Absolutely 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’Ajja (MN)]

[16] (Tsř), where is i. q. عُدَمْا، which thus occurs in some places (MN); but F asserts [in the Baghdadīyāt cited below] that the م is not retained except in poetry, which is refuted by the preceding tradition (Tsř): (b) Akh says that the م is a subst. for the s [below], its o. f. being دَوْءَ، which, being transposed, becomes دُهرَ، whereupon the أ is elided, and the s made into a م; and, in proof of that, he cites هُنَا نَفَّذَا أَلْعَبَ [below], which, according to him, is like لَا تَفْلَوْا أَلْعَبَ [153] in restoration of the elided [ ] by poetic license (R): (c) as for [the explicit n. in] فِرْقَ [above], it has three states, (α) severance from prefixion, where the أ must be changed into م from the impossibility of eliding or retaining it, because by elision the decl. n. would remain uninfl. [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. ₡ بَوْيَيْنِ , like عَدَتِ my morrow; then نَاق ق [684], because of the ₡ 's being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha, but since, in what is infl. with vowels, [like فَلَامْ , ] custom runs that, when it is pre. to the ₡ , [as in غَلْامِي , ] 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 يَا ₡ِ is assimilated to the inflectional, so that the ₡ and
are put in its place in یَا ەۤۖ and یَا ەۤۖ; and
[as] the uninflectional Fatha in ۚۚۚ is assimilated to
the inflectional, so that the ی is put in its place in
ۚۚۚ and ۚۚۚ [99]; all of this being because of
advventitiousness: and therefore, since the ی, which is
an ە in ە ە becomes assimilated to the inflectional [ی],
and what is before the inflectional ی in the six ns. [16]
is pronounced with Kasr, therefore the ف in ە ە is pro-
nounced with Kasr: (β) sometimes ە ە, and
ە ە [above] are said in all the states of prefixion, as
ە ە [16]: (γ) the first [dialect. var.] is more
correct and chaste, because the cause of the need for
change of the ە into م, upon severance from prefixion, is
fear of elision of the ە on account of the [concurrence of]
two quiescents; whereas, in the state of prefixion, there
are no two quiescents, since there is no Tanwm in the
pre. [110, 609]; so that the change of the ە into م is more
properly omitted: (c) prefixion to [an explicit n. or a
pron.] other than the ی of the 1st pers., where the more
recognised [practice] is to inflect it with consonants, as
mentioned [16]; but ە ە [or ە ە ] occurs, as above
shown: (α) the poet has combined the م and ە, saying
ە ە ە ە ە [231, 238, 306], which is a combination of
the subst. and original, [vid. the م and ە (A.K.B)]; but
some endeavour to excuse it by saying that the م is a subst. for the ی [above], which is the ج put before the ع (R. on IH upon the Genitives). (b.) 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 ق ف with the م substituted for its ع, as in دلیلبخیر نیما [above]; and then puts the ی, which is an ع, though the م 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 لقول یا علیههم الع [56], where the poet combines the premonitory ی [551] and the two م which are a compensation for it [52]: and, according to this account, two poetic licenses are combined in ترجمه, prefixion of مم with the م, its predicament being that it should not be pre: therewith; and combination of the subst. and original: but I say that prefixion of مم with the م is chaste; and is not a poetic license, this being refuted by the tradition لعملی نم آسمان آسم [above]: (y) 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 الإسحاق, says the following words: — "As for مم, 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 aprotethic 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 \* to \* restores the \* to \*\*, putting it into the place of the \* as they put the \* into the place of the \* in \* : the poet says ُمَن يَقْتَمَ آخِل, and they say ُمَزَّرُون [231] (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 ُنَامِي has the option of saying, at his will, ُنَامِي or ُقَوْيِي; while he that says ُقَوْيِي says ُقَوْيِي in every case [306]": this is the language of S: (8) F in the Baghdádiyát, although he does not report the opinion of S there, reports another mode of accounting for ُنَامِي, saying "It is said that AlFarazdák substitutes \* for the \*, which is a \* as it is substituted when the n. is aprotethic; and then substitutes \* for
the \( s \), which is a \( J \); and that substitution of \( s \) [686] is not strange, its permissibility being indicated by [the fact] that they are [sometimes] interchangeable in a single word, like عِصْةٌ [306], the \( J \) of which is judged sometimes to be \( s \), because of their saying عِصْةٌ [275, 311]; and sometimes to be \( \dot{s} \), because of their saying عِصْةٌ [234, 244, 275, 311].

(c) IJ holds to be du. of [below] with abbreviation, saying on يَا حَبَّدَا اللّٰهِ [233] that may be an abbreviated \( n \), like عِصْةٌ [16]; and that عِصْةٌ نَفَقَتَا اللّٰهِ occurs accordingly (AKB): (d) \( n \) has [ten] dial. vars.: —–(a) the most notorious and haste of them is (α) inflection with consonants in prefixion to [an explicit \( n \) or a pron.] other than the \( \text{i} \) of the 1st pers. [16]; (β) Fath of the \( f \), together with a single \( m \), in the state of severance [from prefixion]; and (γ) change of the \( o \) into \( i \) upon prefixion to the \( \text{i} \) [180]: (b) the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th are \( f \), with the \( f \) triply vocalized, and the \( J \) elided as forgotten, unrestrictedly, [i. e., in the three states (α–γ) just detailed,] together with change of the \( o \) into \( m \): (α) the triple vocalization of the \( f \) is founded upon [the fact] that, in the state of prefixion, the \( o \), for which the \( m \) is substituted, is converted into \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{i} \) [in the acc. and gen. respectively], for which reason the \( f \) is then triply vocalized in the three cases [of inflection], not for inflection, [but
for affinity]; so that, in the aprothetic state also, it is allowed to be triply vocalized otherwise than for inflection: (c) the 5th, 6th, and 7th اَمْنًا, with the ف triply vocalized, [and the ] 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 ل were a subst. for the ل put before the ع, as above mentioned [in (c, c, α)]; so that is لَمْيَمًا [above]: (d) the 8th and 9th are فَمْ فَمْ, 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 in لُىَّي لِيتها قدْ آلَح [above]: (α) IJ says “It is a poetic license, and is not a dial. var.”: (β) it is as though the two م s were substituted for the ع and ل; and the pl. is اَمْنَمْ [above]: (c) the 10th is making the ف imitate the م in the vowels of inflection, as هُدَيَا فَمْ This is a mouth, I saw a mouth, and نَظَرْتُ إِلَى نِعم I looked at a mouth: (α) it is as though the state of prefixion without a م — I mean فَرَك [above], فَلُك, and فِلْك — were considered here: (β) sometimes the ف of مْرَك also is made to imitate its inflectional letter [in its vowels], as مْرَك, مْرَك, and مْرَك; while the اَلْصَّمُ is اَلْصَّمُ and اَلْصَّمُ imitates the inflectional letter, by common consent [16] (R on IH upon the Genitives):
(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 اللَّهِ [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 ُذَٰلِكَ خَلَقَيْلَى اللَّهِ [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 ُعَنْبَرُ [677] (M, SH, A) and ْعَنْبَاءٌ (M, SH) having sharp, serrated, canine teeth (MASH), fem. of َأَشْتَبُ (Jrb, MASH), and ْعَنْبَرُ from Bakr (IY), whether the ن and ب be (Aud) in one word or two words (R, Aud), as ِعَنْبَرُ [above] and َسُبْعَ يَصَبُّ ْعَنَّبَرٌ XXII. 74. All-hearing, All-seeing (R), [and] as ٍإِذَا أَنْبَعَتَ أَشْتَبَا XCI. 12. When the most wretched of them arose, [i. e., of Thamūd, vid. Ḳudār Ibn Sālīf, or he and those who abetted him in the slaughter of the she-camel, because the َفَعْلَ of superiority, when you prefix it, is applicable to the sing. and pl. (B),] and مَنْ بَعَنَا XXXVI. 52. [182] (Aud): (a) IM indicates that by his saying "And before a ب convert [below the ن when it is
made quiescent, into م (Tsr), like مَنْ بَتَّ آنِمَدًا [below]” (IM), i.e., Whoso cuts (thee), do thou surely cast ou
(from thy mind, and reject), where the / of آنِمَدًا 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 com-
bined the two in his saying “like مَنْ بَتَّ آنِمَدًا” [above]
(A) : (d) it is written as a ن , but pronounced as a م
(Jrb) : (e) they often term change of the ن into م “con-
version”, 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
(Aud, A), without a ب , when the ن is (α) quiescent, as in [254, 677]: (b) mobile (A), as in بَنَانُ (SH, A) for بَنَانُ (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 AlAjjāj (MN Jsh)]

"يا هالَّ ذات الْبَنَانِ التَّسَامُ وَ كَيْكَ الْمَخْضُوبِ الْبَنَامَ (M, R, Aud, A), meaning َيا هالة [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 [above], حَمْطَلُ, etc. (MN), for observance of the rhyme (Jsh), anomalously, since it does not precede a ب (Tsr); and in طَائِمَةِ آللَّهِ عَلَى الْبَيْنِ God disposed him to good (M, SH), transmitted by ISk (IY), i.e., طَائِمَةُ (IY, R, Jrb), from تَبَتَّبَتْ (IY, R) disposition (IY, R); (α) the converse of that, [vid. substitution of the ن for the م (Tsr),] occurs in their saying [in describing hair (Tsr)] أسْوَدُ تَأْتَينُ black, dusky, orig. بَنَانٌ مَّخْضُرٌ [688] (Aud, A): (4) the ب in (a) بُنَانٌ مَّخْضُرٌ (M, SH, A), transmitted by As (IY), for بَنَانٌ مَّخْضُرٌ, [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 п being the original (Jrb), because مَحَّر is from مَحَّر (Jrb, A): (a) IAS says that it is [taken (IY)] from مَحَّر vapour, exhalation (IY, R), because the clouds are from the مَحَّر vapour, or exhalation, of the ground; and, according to this, the п is original, and the م a subst. for it (IY); but IJ says that, if مَحَّر were said to be from مَحَّر i. q. شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ شَقَّ Shading. XXXV. 13. And thou seest the ships in it cleaving [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 مَحَّر sea, because the clouds are from the vapour, or exhalation, of the sea (IY): (b) عَلَى هَذَا (IY) مَا رَتَّب رَتَّاب (IY, A)] I have not ceased to be constant (M, SH, A) to this (IY, A) matter, transmitted by IAl (IY), i. e., رَتَّاب [below] (IY, Jrb), from رَتَّاب, inf. n. رَتَّابٌ, i. q. قَاتِب what is constant (Jrb), the م being a subst. for the п, [as is deducible] from the frequency, and versatility, of the ب, since you say رَتَّاب [above], aor. يُرَتَّاب, act. part. [682], i. e., قَاتِب constant; but do not say رَتَّم, aor. يُرَتَّم, in this sense: so that the п is the original (IY): (a) AASh says that مَا رَتَّاب رَتَّاب عَلَى هَذَا is for
[above], i.e., مُقِيبًا keeping, the م being a subst. for the ب , because رَكَب like is not said: but IJ says that the م admits of being original, from رَكَب , 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 enjoinest 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)

I saw him (M, Jrb, A)] from a near spot (M, SH, A), according to ISk (A), transmitted by Ya‘kūb (IY, R), for كُتِبٌ i. q. ْكُتِب (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 كُتِبَ لَكَ اللَّهُ الْأَمْرُ

The matter has drawn near to thee and رَمَةٌ مِنْ كُتِبٍ He shot him from a near spot, i.e., مِنْ قُرْبِ (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 IAr (M),] ُنُفَّبا (M, A), pl. of ُجَرَّة gulp (IY). The [reason why the م is used as a subst. for these four letters is that the] م and ﷲ [and ﷽] are labial; while the م is akin to the ﷲ and ن in being vocal, and [intermediate] between rigidity and laxity. [734] (R).

§. 688. The ﷲ is substituted for [four letters (A),] (1) the و, [anomalously (SH),] in ُبَهْرَانَيْنِي and ُصَنْعَانَيْنِ 311 (M, SH, A), rel. ns. of ُبَهْرَاء and ُبَهْرَاء (R, A),

orig. ُبَهْرَأْيُي and ُبَهْرَأْيُي 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 ُصَنْعَاء and ُبَهْرَاء should be ُبَهْرَأْيُي and ُبَهْرَأْيُي, as you say ُصَنْعَأْيُي and ُبَهْرَأْيُي from ُصَمْحَرَأ from 304, and ُحُنْفَسَأْيُي from ُحُنْفَسَأ 247, 278, 390, substituting a ﷲ for the [aug.] Hamza, to distinguish it from the rad. Hamza (IY), as before explained [304] in [the chapter on (A)] the Relative Noun (IY, A); but they say ُبَهْرَانَيْنِ and ُصَنْعَانَيْنِ 311, irregularly : (b) authorities differ about the ﷲ (IY) : —
(a) according to S, the ٌ is a subst. for the ٍ (IY, R), as though they said ٍ ٌ and ٌ ٌ [311], like ٌ ٌ [above], and then substituted ٌ for the ٍ (IY), because the regular form is ٌ ٌ ٌ ٌ, like ٌ ٌ from ٌ ٌ ٌ [304]: while the ٌ and ٍ 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 ٌ ٌ is orig. ٌ”; and adduces, as evidence thereof, its return to the o. f. in ٌ ٌ ٌ and ٌ ٌ (R): (c) some say that the ٌ is a subst. for the Hamza [below] in ٌ ٌ ٌ and ٌ ٌ (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 ٌ (IY, R, Jrb), since the ٌ is from the mouth, and the Hamza from the farthest [part] of the throat [732]; whereas the ٌ is akin to the ٍ (IY, Jrb), and is therefore substituted for it (IY): (d) they make the ٌ a subst. for the ٍ, 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 ٌ (Sn): (2) the J, [weakly (SH),] in ٌ (M, SH, A), for ٌ ٌ [537] (M, A); and ٌ ٌ ٌ ٌ No, but thou hast done such a thing, for ٌ ٌ [545] (A): (a) it is said [by some] that (R) the ٌ is a subst. for the J [the o. f.
being لَعَلْلَ (Jrb),] because لَعَلْلَ is [more (R)] frequently [and generally (IY)] used (IY, R, Jrb) : while the ن approximates to the J in outlet [732], for which reason (a) the ن is incorporated into the J [749, 751], as زَتَرَبُوتُ مِن لُدْنَةٍ أَجْرًا عَظِيمًا IV. 44. *And will bestow from Himself a great reward (IY, Jrb) ; and (b) the ن of protection is elided with the J in لَعَلْلَ, as with the ن in إِنَّيٍّ لَعَلَّلَ [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 ﷺفا يَا صَاحِبِيُ اللَّهِ [696. A]: (d) the reason why IH predicates “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 مُؤْنَةٍ أَيْنَ, [with Fath of their Hamza, and quiescence of their ی (Sn),] denoting serpent; and قَابِلٌ قَابِلٌ for قَبَانٌ [in this phrase] being a corrob. of قَابِلٌ قَابِلٌ (Sn); (4) the Hamza [above], جَنَّانُ being transmitted by Fr for جَنَّانَ [384], what is what is used as a dye (A). The ﷺلَعَلَّلَ in the
of نُعْلَيُّ is [said by S to be] a subst. for the Hamza [of نُعْلَيُّ], as the Hamza [in حَمْرَاء] is a subst. for the ؤ of حَمْرَاء [263, 683] (S). As for the saying of Khl and S that the ن of the فَعَّلَانُ whose fem. is نَعْلَيُّ, like the ن of سَكْرَانُ غَضِبَانُ [250], is a subst. for the Hamza of فَعَّلَانُ, 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 نُعْلَيُّ], as the ؤ of determination alternates with Tanwin [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 فَعَّلَانُ, and Hamza in فَعَّلَانُ,] is tropical, because alternating letters are in one word; whereas what is here is not so, since the fem. of سَكْرَانُ is سَكْرَانُ with abbreviation, not سَكْرَانُ with prolongation (Sn).

§ 689. The ؤ is substituted for [seven letters (A),] (1, 2) the ج and ج (M, SH, A), when [the ج or ج is] a ج [699] (M), in which case its substitution is (IY, SH) of two kinds, (a) regular (IY), obligatory (SH), in [نَفْعَّلُ and its variations (IY),] such as نَفْعَّلُ threatened [below] (M, SH) and يَفْعَلُ, and يَفْعَلُ, and يَفْعَلُ [278]
and ٰٔ، where they convert the ℹ، and incorporate it into the ℹ of ٰٔٔٔٔ. Similarly entered [below] (IY): and [such as (M)] divided into portions [below] (M, SH), from یسر [368], where they substitute a ℹ for the ℹ، as for the ℹ in ٰٔٔٔٔٔٔ. Similarly [above] (IY): (α) IH means every ℹ or ℹ that is a ℹ of ٰٔٔٔٔٔ. [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 ℹ or ℹ (Aud, A), not substituted for a Hamza (Tsr)], when a ℹ is [necessarily (IA, A)] changed into ℹ [according to the chasteest dial. (A, Tsr)],” in ٰٔٔٔٔٔٔ (IM) and its deriv. (IA, A); and incorporated into the ℹ of ٰٔٔٔٔٔٔ 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 ℹ, on account of the proximity of their outlets [732], and incompatibility of their qualities (A, Tsr), since the soft letter is vocal, and the ℹ surd [734] (A); as, [in the case of the ℹ (A), ℹ (IA, A), ٰٔٔٔٔٔٔ (IA, Aud, A), ℹ (IA, A), and ℹ (IA, A), and ℹ (IA, A), and ℹ (IA, A)] from (Aud), orig. [ٰٔٔٔٔ, (IA, A), ٰٔٔٔ (IA, A, Tsr), ٰٔٔٔٔٔ (IA, A), and
and [similarly] [above], from 
(Aud), orig. 
the, and incorporated into the, 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, account-
ing 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 
, the, being converted into 
and incorporated into the, from their anxiety for incorporation, because it makes two letters become like one (Tsr): the poet [Tarafa Ibn Al'Abd (MN, Tsr) al-Bakri (MN)] says

And verily the rhymes, by which he means odes, enter places of entrance, from which the entrance of needles has been excluded (MN), orig. 

وَلَوْنَجْ ُتُرْتِلْجَن ، َتُصَالِج َعَنْهَا أَنْ تُولِجُهَا أَلْبُر

فَكَانَ َتَرْفَعِيَ يَتَلَّبْجَن مَوَلَّجَا * تَصَالِج َعَنْهَا أَنْ تُولِجُهَا أَلْبُر

(IY, Aud), constructively

* and entrance
(1841)

(MN, Tsr): and the [other (IY)] poet [AlA’shâ Mai-
mûn Ibn Kâis (MN, Tsr), satirizing (MN), intimidating
(Tsr), 'Alkama Ibn 'Ulâtha (MN, Tsr),] says

فَأَنَّ تَتَّعَدَّنِي أَتَتَّعَدَّكَ بِبَيْتِهَا # وَسَوَفَ أَرَيدُ أَلْبَانِيَّاتَ الْقُوَّارِصَأ

(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. تَتَّعَدَّنِي and تَتَّعَدَّنِي (MN, Tsr): (γ) the reason why they change the في that [formation] into و 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 ى [rad. or converted from a، (Sn)] after Kasra [685], an ى [converted from a، or ى (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 و 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 و [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 و of أَفْتَعَالُ]: (δ) some GG
say that the substitution, [even] in the cat. of \( \text{إِتْصَلُ } \)
[where the \( \text{ف} \) is a \( \text{س} \)], is only for \( \text{ي} \), because the \( \text{س} \) is not retained with the Kasra in \( \text{إِتْصَلُ} \) and \( \text{إِتْصَلُ} \); while the \( \text{أَوْر.} \) and \( \text{اَكُر.} \) and \( \text{اَكَثَر.} \) parts. are made to accord with the \( \text{يَنْفُر.} \) \( \text{n.} \) and \( \text{يَرَت.} \) (A): but [the advocates of]
the first [theory] may say that the doctrine that \( \text{س} \) 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 \( \text{س} \) is retained, but then changed into \( \text{ت} \) (Sn): (ε) “soft [letter]” comprises the \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{ي} \), as above shown: but, as for the \( \text{ال} \) [697], it is not included in that, because it is not a \( \text{ف} \) [673]: nor [is it, when original (Sn),] an \( \text{ع} \) or a \( \text{ل} \) (A), which is not incompatible with its being an \( \text{ع} \) or a \( \text{ل} \), when it is a \( \text{آَكَثَر.} \) as in \( \text{قَلَّم} \) and \( \text{رَمَى} \) [684, 703, 719] (Sn): (ξ) some people of Al Hijāz leave this substitution, and pronounce the \( \text{ف} \) of the word according to the vowels before it, saying \( \text{إِتْصَلُ} \) [685], \( \text{أَوْر.} \) \[701\], \( \text{اَكُر.} \) part. \[701\]; and \( \text{أَوْر.} \) \[701\], \( \text{اَكُر.} \) part. \[701\]: and Jr transmits that some of the Arabs say \( \text{إِتْصَلُ} \) and \( \text{إِتْصَلُ} \), 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 \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{ي} \) by saying, as in the Tashil, “not substituted for a Hamza”, to guard
against such as [661, 702], inf. n. and إِيْتُرْزَرّ [699, 702] (Tsr): (b) irregular (IY), anomalous (SH), in such as أُنْخَجْة (M, SH), orig. أُنْخَجْة because from [above] (Jrb), as says the poet [Ímra alKais (IY)]

(1843)

(M, R) Many a marksman of the Banû Thu‘al, putting his two hands inside his lurking-places! (MAR), lest the wild animals [see them, and] flee away (IY); and فَرَّبَ رَأَي مِنْ بِنَيَّ ثَعَالِ # مُتَلْجِ كَفَى فِي فُقَرَةِ He smote him, so that he made him fall in a reclining posture (R), orig. أُوْكَى (MAR): (c) numerous expressions [illustrative] of that [irregular substitution of for the, when a. ف ] occur (IY): and hence (R): they say (IY, A) [408, 646, 671] (M, R, A) for وَجَاهُ (MAR), فُعَالَ from وَجَاهَ i. e., the location in. front of everything, as الْفُلْلُوْنُ نَجَاجٍ رَيْد Such an one is in front of Zaid, i. e., قَدَامَه قبلة before him (IY); and تَرَاطَ وَنَأْ كُلُّونِ آلَّا كَأَنَّا لِبَأِمْ LXXXIX. 20. And ye devour the inheritance with wholesale voracity, orig. فِرَائْة فِعَالَ (IY); and the like (A): and فِيِتْفَرُ (M, R), orig. فِيِتْفَرُ (Jh), فِيِتْفَرُ (IY) from شَرْف gravity, staidness (IY, R), as says the poet [Al‘Ajjāj (S, Jh)]

فَأَنَّ يَكُنْ أَمَّسَى الْعِيْلِيَّ تَيَقُورْ

145a
Then, if we have become the cause of my gravity (IX), meaning (S, Jh): and فُكَّلِتُ (M, R) incapacity and reliance upon another (Jh, KF), نُفِّلْتُ from I committed, deputed, delegated, aor. أُكِلْ (IV) and staff to lean upon [682] (M), the ُدَّ being orig. a, (Jh); and [307] (M, R), as ُكَّلِتُ for ُجَلَّة ُكَّلِتُ, i.e., a man incapable, committing his affair to another, whence ُكِلِبُ commissioner, deputy, delegate, as though he were ُكِلَّبُ commissioned, deputed, delegated, the root in them being one (IV); and ُتَكُّصْتُ [278, 646, 682] (M, R), a malady like cholera, from ُوْحَمُ or ُوْحَمَهُ, which is pestilence (IV); and ُهُمْ ُسَعْيَ (M, R), فُعِلْتُ from أُهُمْ I thought, the [first] ُدَّ being a subst. for the ُدَّ, because it is from رُهْمُ الْقَلْبِ the fancy of the mind (IV): and ُتَقْرِيرُ (M, MAR), ُقُرْرِي [331, 686] (M, R), and ُقَعْةُ (IY, R), respectively ُعِمْلَةُ, ُعِمْلَتُ, and ُعِمْلَتُ فُعِلْتُ I guarded, or was cautious (IV): and ُثْعَرْي consecutively, uninterruptedly, or at intervals (M, R), فُعِلْتُ (IY) from ُمُؤاَثِرَةُ (IY, R), i.e. making consecutive, uninterrupted; though Lh says “There is no ُتَقْرِيرَ but amongst it is an interval, as ُتَقْرِيرَ ُوْزَنُ ُوْزَنَا ُتَقْرِيرَ وُزَنَا XXIII. 46. Then We sent Our Apostles at intervals”; it has two dial. vars.
[282], Tanwin and omission thereof; and those who decline it is a diptote make its denotative of feminization; while, according to those who decline it as a triptote, the is co-ordinative (IY): and Pentateuch (M, R), one of the Revealed Scriptures (IY), from producing fire (R), orig. (IY), (IY, R) from The fire-stick produced fire [6 7] (IY), because [below] is extraordinary (R); and [similarly (R)] [693] (M, R), the covert of the wild animal, into which he enters (IY), (Jh, IY, Jrb on §. 693), says S (Jh, Jrb), because you hardly ever find as a n. [in the language (Jh)], whereas is frequent (Jh, Jrb), as says the Rajiz [Jarr (Jh on )], describing a bull [taking cover (Jh)] among thorn-trees,

Making for himself a covert among trees of the kind called : the Bdd say that is [above], and is [678]; but the correct [opinion] is the first, because is more frequent than among ns.: and, according to us, if the Arabs did not convert the [initial], [of into in , its conversion into Hamza would ensue, because of the combination of two , s , as in pl. of [683, 699, 730. A]; but, according to the Bdd,
that [conclusion] does not follow, because the ו, according to them, is an aug. [678], not a subst. [for a rad. serving as the ו, so that there is no initial ו, to be converted] (IX): and 253, 255 (R), the measure of (T) which is [construed, says Khl, to be (Jh, T); its o. f. being וurse above from entered (Jh); while its derivation is from agreement, as though the child 253, 255 (Jh, T): and 253 (M) old property, vid. what was born in thy possession, contrary of newly-acquired; and 253, 255, vid. who was born in the territories of foreigners, and then carried away while young, so that he grew up in the territories of AllIslam, from birth (IX): (b) a J (M), in (α) 277 (M, R), orig. 286 [234, 307]; but transferred from 286 to 286, like 646 (IX): and [similarly (IX)] 277 (M, R), being orig. 286 [234, 307, 667], on the measure of 286, like 286 pen; and then transferred to 286, like 646 (IX): (α) this final 286 in 286 also, is a rad. 286 [below], existing in continuity and pause [646] (D): [for the 286 is substituted for their J s (IX); and is not [really (D)] the sign of femininization [268, 277, 295] (D, IX), as is proved by the quiescence of the preceding letter (IX),
because the letter before the ٌ of feminization is [only (IY)] pronounced with Fath (D, IY), like the م in علیه
Fatima and the ٌ in مَكْرَةٌ [254] (D), the ٌ being equi-

va lent 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
حَضْرَاءٍ and بَعْلِبَةٍ [215] (IY); unless it be an ٌ, like the ٌ in مَكْرَةٍ [254] and قَنْسٌ [683]: and, since the letter before
the ٌ in مَنْهُ and مَنْهُت is quiescent, and is not an ٌ, this
proves that the ٌ in them is rad. (D): (٨) it is
objected against H 's saying "is a rad. ٌ" [above]
that the ٌ 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 ل of the word; or [that it is] quasi-rad., because it
is for co-ordination with such as جَذْعُ [or قَنْسٌ] (CD):
(٩) the sign of feminization in مَنْهُ and مَنْهُت is their
formation in these two shapes, and their transfer from
their first formation [307]; and, for that reason, the
shape and the ٌ of feminization are interchangeable in
مَنْهُ and مَنْهُت [667], where the shape of مَنْهُ corresponds
to the ٌ of feminization in بَنْةٌ (IY): (٨) the dial. var.
more often used is بَنْةٌ, with which the Kur speaks in
And Mary, the daughter of 'Imrân, and in Shu‘aib’s address to Moses

And Mary, the daughter of 'Imrân, and in Shu‘aib’s address to Moses

Verily I

wish to marry thee unto one of these my two daughters; and to which the saying of Abu-l’Amaithal conforms, vid.

I met Zainab, the daughter of the Sahmi—a rel. n. from Sahm, a clan of Kuraish, and in Bâhila 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) o; 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): (e) Sf hds the و in ونُت, and the like to be the sign of feminization, for which reason, says he, it is elided in the perf. pl. and the like [234, 307]; while the quiescence of the preceding letter is because the والك is meant to be co-ordinative (IV): (b) [263, 277, 307]
(M, R), where also the ﷲ is a subst. for ﷺ, because of the pl. ﷺ [234], as

I believe Ibn Nizár to have shunned me, and loathed me, on account of things whose course was uninterrupted [690]; and is meant for co-ordination with ﷺ فَعُلّ, like Bakr and ﷼ ﺃُمَرُ (IY): (c) كَلْنَا [263, 277] (M), which S [307] holds to be ﷺ ﻓُعِلّ, like ﷺ ﻓَذْرِي [272], orig. كَلْنِي, the, being changed into ﷺ [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 كُلَ (IY): (d) أَسْتَنْتَرا (M, R), i.e., They experienced drought (IY), from [the crude-form of (IY)] سَنَةٌ [234, 244, 260, 265, 275, 306] (IY, R), according to those who hold its ل to be a ﷺ, because of the sayings سَنَةٌ ﻣُسَنَوَاءَةٌ a hard year and ﻣُسَنَّاة I hired him by the year: the ﷺ is said to be a subst. for (α) the ﷺ, which is a ج: (β) a ﻭ, because the ﷺ, when it occurs fourth, is converted into ﻭ, as in [685, 727]; and then the ﷺ is substituted for the ﻭ, which [opinion] is more agreeable with analogy (IY): (e) ﻣُتَنَايِبٌ [263, 277, 313] (M, A), orig. ﻣُتَنَايِبٌ [spelt by YH with Fathas (Sn)], because it
is [فعل] I was a second to the one,
[of the conjug. of زمي (Sn),] inf. n. تاني (A); i.e., I became with him a second: so in the Msb (Sn): (α) the ت in it is a subst. for the ى, as is proved by its being from تاني I doubled, or folded, or bent [313]; because one of the two is doubled, or folded, or bent, upon the other: (β) its o. t. is تاني, like فيلم [above], as is proved by their making its pl. نانه [307], like انانه [307, 667] and أخته [260, 307]; but they transfer it from نسته to فعل, as they do in [above]: (γ), as for the في in زئان [307, 313, 667], it is like that in زئان [above]: whereas منتنبي is like منتنبي [above] (IY): (α) ديت كيبت [277] (M, A), orig. كبيدة and كبيدة [277, 277], because they say كان من الأمر كبيدة وكيبة and دية رديئة [227] (IY, A), transmitted from the Arabs by AU (IY), the ئ of feminization being elided; and a ت substituted for the [last (A)] ى, which is the ل (IY, A), of the word (A), by way of co-ordination, as in [above]: so that they say ديت كيبت and ديت كيبت: (α) these [forms] have three dial. vars., being uninfl. upon Fath, as and and Kasr, as and and and Damm, as and and: whereas كيده and كيده have only one form, which is uninfl. upon Fath: (β) if it be said.
"Why do you not say that the \( \text{و} \) is a subst. for \( \text{ه} \), the o. f. of \( \text{کی} \) being \( \text{کبیره} \), but the \( \text{و} \) being converted into \( \text{ی} \), as in [685, 716]?", we say that it is not allowable, because you would arrive at what has no counterpart in their language, which contains no word like \( \text{حیرة} \) [4, 685, 698], whose \( \text{ع} \) is a \( \text{ی} \), and \( \text{ج} \) \( \text{ای} \) (IY): (γ) [Jh, however, says in article 5 that possibly] the o. f. of \( \text{دیت} \) is upon [the measure of] \( \text{فعل} \), quiescent in the \( \text{ع} \); the \( \text{ی} \) being elided, so that \( \text{کی} \) remains bil.; and [its final] being therefore doubled, as [the final of] \( \text{کی} \) is doubled when you make it a name [275]; and the \( \text{و} \) being then put as a subst. for doubling: so that, if you elide the \( \text{و} \), and put the \( \text{ی} \), you must restore the doubling; [and thus] you say \( \text{دیت کاندیت} \) or \( \text{دیت} \): (3) if you form the rel. n. of \( \text{دیت} \), you say \( \text{بیروی} \), like \( \text{بیروی} \) rel. n. of \( \text{پنی} \) [307] (Jh): (3) the \( \text{س} \), in (a) \( \text{بسیت} \) basin [below] (M, SH, A), alone [below] (SH), orig. \( \text{طمس} \) (IY, Jrb), because [its dim. is \( \text{طمسیس} \), and (IY, Jrb)] its [broken (IY)] pl. is (IY, R, Jrb) \( \text{طمسوس} \) (IY) [and] \( \text{طمساس} \) (R, Jrb), not \( \text{طسوس} \) [below] (R): (a) Fr says "Tayyí say \( \text{طمس} \), and others \( \text{طمس} \): the former are those who say \( \text{لصف} \) [below]; and, according to them, the pl. is \( \text{لصف} \) [above] and \( \text{لصف} \) [below]" (Jk): (b) if it be said "Its pl. is \( \text{طسوس} \) also: then why do you decide that the
is original, and the \textit{t} a subst., and not the converse?”, we say “Because it is established that the \textit{t} is a letter of substitution, whereas such is not established in respect of the \textit{s} [682, 696. A]” (Jrb): (a) IH says “alone” [above], notwithstanding \textit{昱} [below], because the substitution in the latter is for incorporation [682] (R): (b) the num. (A) \textit{昱} [307, 316, 671, 682, 758] (M, R, A): (a) its o. f. is \textit{سیدس} (IY, A), because it is (IY) from [the crude-form of (R)] \textit{تکسیدیس} making six (IY, R), since they say [in its dim. (Jh, IY)] \textit{سعیدیسَة} [282] (IY, A), and in the pl. \textit{آسداس} (Jh): but they convert the last \textit{s} into \textit{پ}, in order that it may approximate [in outlet] to the \textit{د} [732] before it; while [they choose the \textit{ت} because], together with that [proximity to the \textit{د} ], it is surd, like the \textit{s} [734]: so that \textit{سیدس} becomes constructively \textit{سیدت} (IY); and then, [since the \textit{د} and \textit{ت} are combined, and they approximate in outlet (IY),] the \textit{د} is changed into \textit{ت}, [because of their agreement in surdity (IY),] and incorporated (IY, A) into the \textit{ت}, so that they say \textit{昱} (IY): (c) the saying of the poet

\begin{quote}
\textbf{بَا قَاتِلُ اللَّهُ بَنِي آلسَّفَالَّةِ} # عَمَّوَرَ بَنَ مَسْعُونٍ شَرَارَ آنَابِ
\textbf{غَيْرُ أَعْفَاءٍ وَلَا أَكْبَابِ}
\end{quote}

(M, R), meaning \textit{النَّاسِ} (IY), \textit{O}, or \textit{O (my}}
people) [59, 551], God fight against, meaning slay, the sons of she-devils, 'Amr Ibn Mas'ùd, the worst of men, incontinent and not sharp-witted! (Jsh), where he substitutes a ب for the س (IY; Jsh), because of their agreement in being surd [734], aug. [671] letters, adjacent in outlet [734]; for extension of the vocabulary (IY), in order that the الناس may rhyme with the السولب (Jsh); which is extraordinary (R): (4) the ص is, in [below] (M, SH, A) and لُصَت (IY), for لَصَت (IY, R, A) and لَص [682] (IY), the ب being a subst. for the ص, as is proved by their saying تَلَصَتْ عَلَيْهِم He committed robbery upon them and هُوَ بَيْنَ الْلُصْصِيَّةَ It is plain robbery (IY, Jrb), with Damm and Fath of the ج (Jrb), and أَرْضٌ مُّلَصْصَةٌ land infested by robbers (IY): (a) the pl. is لُصُصَت [above], as

(IV, R) Then they let Nahd—a clan of AIYaman—with its children destitute, and the Banû Kinâna like insolent robbers (MAR); and those who say that make لُصَت a dial. var. [682], because the ب is substituted for the ص [in its variations also]: (b) its derivation is from لَصَصُ, 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)] لَصَتْ, with Fath of the ل, is i. q. لَصَتْ in the dial. of Tayyi, who say لَصَتْ [above] for لَصَتْ; and that the pl. is لَصُتْ: (d) it is mentioned in the CHd that لَصَتْ is said with all three vowels of the ل, Kasr being the chastest; and لَصَتْ with Fath of the ل [682]. pl. لَصُتْ, like بِيَتْ, pl. لَصُتْ [242, 256] (Jrb): (5) the ب in دَعَالْبِ (M, SH, A) and دَعَالْبِ (IY), for دَعَالْبِ (M, A) and دَعَالْبِ (IY), as

[The bargain of the poor needy purchaser, wearer of worn-out rags is, in irrevocability and conclusiveness, like a sale by a man that is not desirous of rescinding (MAR)], i. e., دَعَالْبِ (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 دَعَالْبِ ] is orig. ب, because دَعَالْبِ is more often used, i. q. دَعَالْبِ [below], which are bits of worn-out rags (R): (b) دَعَالْبِ
[and دَعَالِيبُ (A)] are [bits of rags, and of (IY)] worn-out clothes (M, A), as

メントسِحًا عَنْهُ دَعَالِيبُ الْعَمَّرِ

With the bits of rags stripped off him [below] (IY): (c) the sing. is دَعَلَبُ (IY, R, A), like مُعْطَرَ [253, 396] (Sn): (d) Jh mentions in the Sahâh that (Jrb) دَعَالِيبُ are bits of rags, as ْمُنْتَسِحًا عَنْهُ آلِحَ [above]: and [that (Jrb)] IAl says “And the ends of garments are called دَعَالِبُ, sing. دَعَلَبُ” ; and cites by Jarîr

وَقَدْ أَكُونَ عَلَى الْكَاحِلِ ذَا لَبَثٍ ۛ

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 Sahâh: (e) hence one knows that دَعَالِبُ [above] by conversion of its [sing.'s s] letter of prolongation into ی, as is the rule, like تَرَاطِیسُ [253, 685] (Jrb): (f) the substitution in لِصَتْ [above] is weak (SH): (6) the ط , in فُسُکَاطُ [with ذَامِم of the ف , the tent (Sn),] orig. فُسُکَاطُ [885] (R, A), because they say in the pl. فَسَاتِیطُ [390], not فُسَاتِیطُ كَرِبَوتُ a tractable she-camel, orig. كَرِبَوتُ , i. e., broken in,
because it is fromi (A) 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 ℰ is seldom substituted for the s. The ex. of it is the interpretation put by some upon the saying [of Abū Wajza asSa'dī, praising the family of AzZubair Ibn Al'Awwām (AKB),]

ٱلْعَاطِفُونَةُ حَيْينَ مَا مِنْ عَاطِفٍ ° ٱلْمُطْعِمُونَ رَمَانَ أَيْنَ أَلْمُطْعِمُ

[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 ٱلْعَاطِفُونَة with the s of silence; and afterwards changes it into ℰ, 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 [١٩٩َّْ and جَنَّتٌ and نَعْبَتٌ [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. (IY), as in (a) [١٩٩َّْ (M, Jrb) ١٩٩َّْ I poured out [658, 679, 682] (M, SH) the wat.
(M, Jrb), i. e., أرَثَتْ (IY, Jrb): (α) in أَهْرُقْتُ [349, 382, 671, 679] the s is aug., a quasi-compensation for the departure of the vowel from theع, as theس is aug. inَجَرَحْتُ [آلدابه] [671, 680, 682] (IY): (b) أَرْحَتْهَا [M, R, Jrb] أَرْحَتْهَا [658, 682] (M, SH), i. e., أرَحَتْهَا (IY, R, Jrb), meaning I brought the beast back to the nightly resting-place (Jrb): (c) أَهَرِبْتُ أَلْثَوْبُ I put a woo to the cloth, or an ornamental border to the garment (M, R), i. e., أرَثَتْ (IY, R), أرَثَتْ from أَنْعَلْتَ (IY): (α) I wanted the thing [682], transmitted by Lh (M, R), i. e., أرَثَتْ (IY, R), aor. أَهْرِبْتُ with Fath of the s, like أُهْرُقْتُ, aor. أُهْرِقْتُ [349] (R): (α) those [four exs.] are all transmitted by ISk (IY): (b) when rad. (IY), as in (a) أَهْيَاَنَ (658, 682) (M, SH), for أَهْيَاَنَ (IY, Jrb), whence أَهْيَاَنَ [60] (IY, R), thus cited by Akh; and the reading أَهْيَاَنَ نَعْبُدُ رَهْيَانَ نَسْعَيْنُ I. 4. [Part I, p. 39A] (IY): the s being a subst., because أَهْيَاَنَ is more frequent (R): (α, it is transmitted from Ktb that some say أَهْيَاَنَ, [which is read in I. 4. (K, B;,) with Fath of the Hamza; and then substitute the s for it, saying أَهْيَاَنَ (IY): (α) لاَعْبِكَ [521, 682] (M, SH), orig. لاَعْبِكَ (IY, Jrb), whence أَهْيَاَنَ [521] (IY): (α) when the ل of inception is prefixed, they alter the Hamza into s, because the ل is not combined with ...
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) لَقَدْ كَانَ كَذَا Now, by God (M, R), assuredly such a thing did indeed happen! (M), meaning ﷺ ﷺ (551) (IY, R): (d) If thou do (M, SH), I will do (M, Jrb), meaning ﴿ إِن ﴾ (IY, Jrb), in [the dial. of (M, Jrb)] Tayyi (M, SH), who convert the Hamza of the cond. ﴿ هُدَى ﴾ (SH): the poet says (R, Jrb)

وَأَتَى صَٰمِحَهَا فَقُلْنَ هَذَا أَلْدِى ﴿ مَنْعَ الْمُرْدَةَ غَيِّرًا وَجَفَاً ﴾ (M, R, Jrb), cited by Akh M, R), And he came to her (his beloved’s) companions; and they said “Is this he that bestowed affection on others than us, and forsook us? (Jsh), i. e., ﴿ أَدَا أَلْدِى ﴾ (M, SH), the Hamza in ﴿ أَدَا ﴾ being interrog. (Jrb); while Ktb transmits ﴿ أَدَّرَجَ مُسْتَلِقٍ ﴾ Is Zaid departing? in interrogation: (f) ﴿ كَيِّبَ ﴾ for the voc. [p.] [554] (R): (α) they [justly (IY)] change the Hamza into ﴿ ﴾ [in these cases (Jrb), by way of alleviation (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 حَمْدَة ْنَحْبِّيْنَم for إِبْرَاهِيم، nor ُinementْ for Abraha, nor َائْتِرَة ْنَحْبِّيْنَم for a citron; but you follow what they say, and stop where they end (IY): (2) the َأَنَّ in [648] (M, SH, A), where the s may be (IY, R, A), (a) as is said [here] (R), a subst. for the َأَنَّ in pause [upon أَنْ; which is most likely (IY)], because [أَنْ with (IY)] the َأَنَّ is more often used [in pause (R)] than [أَنْ 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 َأَنَّ and َرُ [615, 644, 671, 679] (R), affixed (A) in pause (Sn), like the َأَنَّ [161, 497, 647] (IY), to make the vowel [of the َأَنَّ (IY, Sn) in أَنْ (IY)] plain (IY, A); and not a subst. for the َأَنَّ (IY, Sn): (b) حَبْهَلْة (M, SH, A): (a) the َأَنَّ in حَبْهَلْة is to make the vowel plain: and (IY) the [last (A)] َأَنَّ حَبْهَلْة is a subst. for the َأَنَّ (IY, A) in حَبْهَلْة [615; 648] (A); or may be [affixed, like the َأَنَّ َأَنَّ] to make the vowel plain, as is allowable in َأَنْ [above] (Sn): (c) َأَنَّ in interrogation 147 a
(SH), and هتنا (Jsh), as in (R) the poet's saying قَدْ رَدَّتْ نَجَّاهُ آللَّهُ [175, 181, 646] (M, R, A), where he substitutes 3 for the 1 (A), meaning مِنْ هُنَا (IV): while [مَتَأَمَّث] may be an instance of that [substitution of s for ! (Sn)], i. e., نَمَا أَصْنَعْ Then what (shall I do)? [below], or نَمَا آتِطَابِي لَهَا Then what (is the good of my waiting for them)?; or may be i. q. أَكُفُ [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): (a) نَمَا أَصْنَعْ admits of two alternatives:—(α) that he means نَمَا أَصْنَعْ Then what?; but that, pause upon the 1 being disliked, on account of its faintness, he substitutes the s for it, because of their proximity in outlet [732]; what is meant being نَمَا أَصْنَعْ [above], or the like [181]: (β) that نَمَا is a chiding, i. e., Then hold! (O man), as though he addressed, and chid, himself (IV): (b) [on the supposition that مَتَأَمَّث here means ما] the better [opinion] is that the s is a subst. for the 1: but it may be said that the 1 is elided from the interrog. ما not governed in the gen., as it is elided from the one governed in the gen., as in ْإِلَٰهُ ْفِيْمَ [181, 615, 648]; and that the م is then strengthened with the s of silence, as [the ر and ق are] in ْرَفَتْ رَأْبِيِّ الَّذِي [above] (R): (d) ْيَا هَٰتَئَّشْ (SH), [as] [Part I.
p. 15A], where the ́ש is substituted for the ́ל converted from the , [appearing] in ־חֵלֶת [234] (M), according to one opinion (SH): (α) there is a dispute about its [last (IY)] ́ש (IY, R):—— (α) according to the BB (W, R), the ́ש [in ־חֵלֶת (W)] is a subst. for the , [below] (W, IY, R), which is the ́ל of the word (IY), in [ יָפָן and (W, IY)] ־חֵלֶת [16, 234] (W, IY, R), [as] in ־חֵלֶת [689] (IY); its o. f., [according to them (R),] being ־חֵלֶת (IY, R), [as] in ־חֵלֶת [14]; but the , being then changed into ́ל (IY); so that the ́ש , being a subst. for the ́ל of the word, may, for that reason, be pronounced with ־חֵלֶת [48]: while AZ says on ־חֵלֶת [616] that the poet assimilates [the ́ש in] it to the letter of inflection, [i. e., the final of the ́ל.] and therefore pronounces it with ־חֵלֶת (W): (β) it is indicated by Z [and IH] that the , being final after an aug. ́ל, is converted into ́ל [below], the ́ש being a subst. for that ́ל (IY): (γ) according to AZ, Akh, and the KK, it is the ́ש of silence [615, 616] (R): [for] AZ holds that the ́ש is affixed after the ́ל, for pause, on account of the faintness of the ́ל, as it is affixed in lamentation, as in ־שֵׁדַע [55, 615]; and that it is mobilized by assimilation to the ́ל: ́ש, [as he says on ־חֵלֶת above]: and this saying is transmitted from Akh also: while, according to them, the ́ל [not the ́ש ] is a subst. for the , which is the ́ל 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 AlMutanaabbi

[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): (3) some hold that the s [in هُنَا (IY)] is original, [not a subst., but only the l of the word, as in عَصْة calumniated and شَفَة consumed (IY),] which is [a (IY)] weak [saying (IY)], because the cat. of سَلِّس and قَلِق is rare [674, 685, 690] (IY, R): (b) the substitution of the s for the l is anomalous (SH): (3) the ج [671], in زُنُدُ رَأَبَنِي أَلْحَمْ [above]: (a) that is disputed, the majority holding that the s is substituted for the ج [above], the o. f. being : while IJ says "If the s were said to be a subst. for the l converted from the s occurring after the [aug.] l, it would be a strong saying, since the s is nearer [in outlet] to the l than to the ج [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 ُكَسَّاء [688] and غُطَّا covering (Sn): (4) the ُي (M, SH, A), in (a) هُدِئة [648, 671] (IY, SH, A), with quiescence of the ُلَا (Sn), for ُهَذِئَي [174] (IY, A), [as] in هُدِئة أَمَّة ُالْلّهِ [648] (M): (a) the ُس of هُدِيئة is a subst. for the ُي in pause, according to the Banu Tamim (R), who say ُهَذِئَي with quiescence of the ُس, which is sub-
stituted because, in pause after the Kasra, the ُي is faint, the ُس being more apparent than it; while the ُس is approximate [in outlet] to the sister of the ُي [697], i.e., the ُل [732]: but these [Arabs], when they continue, restore the ُي, saying ُهَذِئَي ُهَذِئُ This is Hind, because the ُي is made plain by what follows it: (b) Kays and the people of AlHijaz make pause and continuity alike, [saying ُهَذِئَي ] with the ُس, as Tayyi make pause and con-
tinuity alike in ُأَنْعَي [686] (R on Pause): (c) this [sub-
stitution] is not regular in every ُي, [as conversion into ُي is regular, according to Tayyi, from every ُل (R on 
Pause)];] so that ُأَلْذِئَي [176] (R): (d) this ُي is mostly converted into ُس, in order that it may be assimilated to the ُس of the masc. [pron.] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in ُبَيَّي and ُبَلَامِهي [161, 648], and be therefore conjoined [with ُي ]: (e) the [conj.] ُي is elided in pause: (f) ُهُدِئة with quies-
cence is allowable in continuity and pause, but is rare
[in the former] (R on Pause): [for] some of the Arabs make this ُ in quiescent, like the َ in continuity and pause: while some assimilate it to the ُ of the pron., because it is attached to a vague indecl. n.; so that they pronounce it with Kasr in continuity, saying This is Hind [and ُ هُذَى أُمَّةٌ اللَّهِ (IY on § 648)], as you say [as ُ هُذَى أُمَّةٌ اللَّهِ] and terminate it by َ in [648]; and make the Kasr of the ُ plain; but [even] those who say this pause upon the ُ quiescent: (g) one proof that the َ is [affixed] to make the vowel plain, and that the ُ is not for feminization [648], is that, if you named a man ُ ذَه , you would inflect, and pronounce with Tanwim, as ُ هُذَى ذَه This is Dhih, رَأَيْتُ ذِه I saw Dhih, and ُ مَرَّتُ يِذِه I passed by Dhih, eliding the َ because rendered unnecessary by the vowels and triptote declension; whereas, if the ُ were for feminization, you would not decline it as a triptote, as you do not decline حُمْرَةٌ ُ طَلْحَةٌ [18] as triptotes (IY): (b) for ُ هُنْيَةٌ [277] (A), which is the trifling thing (Sn): (5) the ت (M, SH, A), in (a) the cat. of رَحْمَةٌ [682] (SH), i.e., the n. containing the ُ of feminization [646] (MASH), [e.g.] in [such as (IY, A)] ُ طَلْحَةٌ (M, A) and حُمْرَةٌ (M), in pause (M, SH, A), according to the opinion of the BB (A): (a) some treat
continuity like pause, saying [647, 663]; and some treat pause like continuity, saying [183, 640, 646] (IY): (b) \( \text{كيف} \) and \( \text{كيف} \) \( \text{البَلُّونَ} \) \( \text{وَالبَتَنَةُ} \) [646], transmitted by Ktb from Tayyi (M, A), which are anomalous: (c) \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) for chest (IY, A), which also is anomalous; “but,” says IJ, “is read” [in II. 249].

Verily the sign of his kingship is that the ark should come to you, where Ubayy and Zaid Ibn Thabit read \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) with the \( s \) (K), meaning “among the anomalous [readings]” (A): (a) [many hold that] \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) [with the \( s \) (Jh, K, IY)] is [a dial. var. (IY),] the dial. of the Anṣār (Jh, K, IY, KF); and \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) the dial. of Kuraish: KIM says that [the dials. of (Jh)] the Anṣār and Kuraish do not differ about anything in the \( \text{كُرَ} \) except \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) (Jh, IY): (b) the measure of \( \text{رَحْمُوت} \) \( \text{فَعَلْوَت} \) (K, IY, B), like \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) [678] (IY), from \( \text{رَحْمُوت} \) 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 \( \text{فَعَلْوَت} \) (K, B), because such [formations] as \( \text{sِلْسَ} \) and \( \text{قِلْقَ} \) [above] are rare; and because \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \) is an unrecognized crude-form, for which the recognized [crude-form \( \text{ثَابَوْت} \)] may not be abandoned
it is like devil (IY), which is exceeded in wickedness (KF); formed by transposition, because it is from طَغَّى (Jh); [orig.] فَغُرُّ [686], its ع and ل being transposed (B): (d) its o. f. is ْتَوْنُوتَ, the [first] and of which they convert into أ [684] (IY): (e) as for those who read [the tashbīḥah] with the ١ (K, B), it is فَغُرُّ, according to them, except among those who make its ١ a subst. for the َّ (K); [and] perhaps they [may all] substitute the ١ for the َّ (B), because these two letters participate in surdity [734] and augmentativeness [671], for which reason the ١ is substituted for the ١ of feminization [above] (K, B): (d) أَلْلَّةٌ أَلْلَّة (I) said by some, who pause upon ١٠ أَلْلَةٌ. AlLūt with the ١ (IY): (e) عُلِى عَلَى أَفْرَاهُ [646], which some one was heard to say, meaning عُلِى أَفْرَاهُ: (6) the ج, in (a) طُكَّرَ الْشَّيْءُ, i. e., مَتَّعَهُ مَتَّعَهُ أَنْذَرُ: (b) أَبْعَدَهُ drew out the bucket, i. q. مَتَّعَهُ مَتَّعَهُ أَنْذَرُ (A), which is said in the Msb to mean (Sn): (c) مُذَّهَّبَةٌ praised him, i. q. مَذَّهَّبَةٌ: (α) some distinguish between ج and مَذَّحَبَةٌ مَذَّحَبَةٌ to be [praise] in absence, and مَذَّحَبَةٌ to be [praise] to one’s face; but the correct [opinion] is that they are synonymous, except that مَذَّحَبَةٌ is the o. f. (A).
§. 691. The J is substituted for [two letters, as before mentioned (A),] (1) the ن (S, M, SH, A) in ُأَصِلَّانَ (A), which [substitution] is [very (S)] rare, as ُأَصِلَّانَ (S, SH), which is [orig. (R) only (S)] (S, R), whence

 waktu فِيهَا أُصِيَّلاً لَا عَسَأَّلُهَا عِنْدَ جَواْئِبِها وَمَا يُنْتَقِعُ مِنْ أَحَدِهِ [682] (M), by An Nábigha 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 ُأَصِيَّلاً (ABk), meaning ُأَصِيَّلاً (IY), an irregular dim. of ُأَصِيلٌ [285, 286] (IY, MN); the [second (Sn)] J being a subst. for the ن (ABk, IY, MN, Sn): (a) I asked Khl about your saying ُأَتَيْكَ أُصِيَّلاً I will come to thee for a short time at evening: and he said “It is only ُأَصِيَّلاً, for [the ن of] which they substitute the J; and that is verified by the saying of the Arabs ُأَتَيْكَ أُصِيَّلاً” (S): (b) [R says that ] ُأُصِيَّلاً is dim. of ُأَصِلَّانٍ: and [that], if ُأُصِيَّلاً be pl. of ُأَصِيلٍ, like رَغْفَانُ pl. of ُأَصِيلٍ [246], which is apparently the case, then ُأُصِيَّلاً is anomalous in two respects, the substitution of the J for the ن, and the formation of a homomorphous dim. from the pl. of multitude [285, 286]; but if ُأُصِيَّلاً be a sing., like ُرَمَّانَ.
[677] and サリバ olation, notwithstanding that it is not used, then オスィラ is anomalous in one respect, vid. the conversion of the ن into ﷲ (R): (c) [according to ﺟ،] whoever fancies that オスィلا is dim. of ﺟ، is anomalous in one respect, vid. the pl. of オスィل، makes a mistake, because it is a pl. of multitude, which does not form a dim. [285] (ABk); and [IY holds that] オスィلا is only a sing. n., peculiar to the dim., like ﻤُعْشَيْشَة [or ﻤُعْشَيْشَة (KF) and [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 オスィلا as a name, it would be declined as a diptote, because the ﷲ is quasi-retained, being indicated by the retention of the ﷲ in the dim., as in ﺟ،١ [274]; and similarly ﻢِرْأَى [690], when you use it as a name, is diptote, because the Hamza is virtually retained (R): (2) the ض (M, SH, A) in ﻫِلّ ﺟُبْطَحَع (A), as is ﻫِلّ ﺟُبْطَحَع, which is corrupt (SH), whence

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

§. 692. The ل is substituted for [two letters (A),] 
(1) the ﴸ (M, SH, A), (a) regularly (IY), necessarily (SH), in ﴺ after the letters of covering (A), [i. e.,] when the ﴸ of ﴺ is one of the [elevated (R)] letters of covering, which are [four (IY),] the ﴸ, the ﴸ, the ﴸ, and the ل [734] (IY, R), as in ﴺ had patience [671, 682, 756] (M, SH), ﴺ collided, ﴺ was regular, and ﴺ put up with wrong (IY), as [will be] mentioned [756] (A): (a) that [substitution] is because the ﴸ 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 ﴸ, vid. the ل; and put it in place of the ﴸ, because it is akin to the ﴸ in outlet, and to the ﴸ, the ﴸ, and the ل 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 ﴺ [below] (SH), ﴺ I waded, ﴺ I surrounded, and ﴺ 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 ج of the word is a ۙس or ۖس, and similarly after the ۔س and ۖس, as in حُضُطَ عَيْنَتَةٍ I sealed its eye [above] (R), and حُضُطَ برْجَلَيۣ I scraped a hollow with my foot [693] (M, R), and حُضُطَ أَخْتُ [above] (R): (b) if the ج of the v. be ۔س, it is incorporated [into the ۔س 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 ۔س 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 ۔س, [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 ۔س [above] (R): (2) the ن: Ya’kūb transmits from As مَّلَا لَكْرَبُ He prolonged the letter, for مَدَّة إِبْعَاطُ removing to a distance for إِبْعَاعُ (A).

§. 693. The ۔س is substituted for [three letters (A):] (1) the ۔س (M, SH, A), (a) إِنْتَعَالُ after the ۔س, the ۔س, the ژ, and the ج, as [will be] mentioned [756] (A), (a) regularly (IY), necessarily (SH), in [such as (SH)].
checked (M, SH) and was adorned; and remembered, when subjected to incorporation, according to what IAAl 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 ، [a د，or a ن (R),] the ت of امْفُتَعَل is converted into د (IY, R), as إِدْكَرَ and إِدْكَرَ [above], orig. and إِدْكَرَ (IY): and the د and ن are incorporated into it, as incurred a debt and إِدْكَرَ [above]; but it is allowable for the د not to be incorporated, as إِدْكَرَ [above]: (β) the three letters being vocal, and the ت surd [734], the ت is converted into د, because the د, being akin to the د and ز in vocality, and to the ت in outlet [782], is intermediate between the ت and them; while the د, but not the ز, is incorporated into the د because the outlet of the د is near to, and the outlet of the ز far from, the outlet of the د: (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 إِدْكَرَ [above] or إِدْكَرَ [671, 682], and إِدْكَرَ sifted, winnowed, those are not instances of what we are considering, but only of incorporative substitution (IY): (δ) conversion of the ت into د after the د 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 َّ 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 َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َّ َ
Then, if thou chide me, O Ibn 'Affān, 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 اٍِدْوَرِا is not said [for اٍِدْوَرِا venturing (IY, MAR)], nor اٍِدْوَرِا (IY, R) for اٍِدْوَرِا earned (IY, MAR): (b) anomalously (SH), in (a) [such as (SH)] (α) I succeeded, prospered (M, SH), like فَرَّط [692] (R), the o. f. being فَرَّت from فَرَّت فَرَّت [331], where they substitute ا for the because of the influence of the (IY); (β) I was liberal for جُدْت , where its conversion after the ا is likewise anomalous (R): (b) دُلْج (M, SH), for دُلْج [689] (IY, Jrb), from دُلْج (R, Jrb), the [first] ا being converted into ا, and the ا then converted into ا (R), as though, seeing the ا to be surd, and the ا vocal [734], they substituted the ا for the ا, because it is the sister of the ا in outlet [732], and of the ا in vocality; so that homogeneity of sound is attained (IY): (α) that [theory] is [advanced] because دُلْج is more used than دُلْج (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 ا into ا in is from affinity of sound, as in صَوَيْق [695] (R) for صَوَيْق meal,
gruel (MAR); contrary to دَوْلَجَ (R): (2) the ل: they say مَرْطَفٍ مَرَّدًا [248, 272], which is where the hair is plucked out round the navel (A); but, in the KF, a kind of running: while مَرْطَفَةٌ 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 مَرْطَفَةٌ with Kasr; and the arm-pit: and مَرْطَفٍ, with abbreviation, is the uvula (Sn): (3) the د in ذَكْرَةٌ ذَكَرْ pl. of ذَكْرَةٌ ذَكَرْ remembrance (A), like ذَبْرَةٌ ذَبَرْ pl. of ذَبْرَةٌ ذَبَرْ admonition, as SBd says: (a) the author of the KF transmits from Lth that the د is changed into د in ذَكْرَةٌ ذَكَرْ pl. of ذَكْرَةٌ ذَكَرْ when synarthrous; but that, when anarthrous, ذَكَرْ with the د is said (Sn).

§. 694. The ج is substituted for the ي (S, M, SH, A), as before mentioned [643, 682] (A), when (1) double, (a) in pause (S, M, SH), as فَقُرَّ [643] (SH), for فقْرٍ [311], a rel. n. (MASH): (a) the ج is substituted for the ي and nothing else (IY), because they are partners in vocality [734] (IY, R, Jrb) and outlet [732] (IY, Jrb), except that the ج is hard (IY, R), and, but for its hardness, would be a ي [643] (IY); while the ي, when doubled, becomes [extremely near to (R)] a ج (IY, R): Ya'kūb says "Some of the Arabs,
when they double the َی، make it become َج، as َکَانَ َی [below], meaning َالْبَعْثِ َلِهِنَّ َالْحَمْ [682]" (IY); while both are from the middle of the tongue [732] (R, Jrb): but the َی is plainer [below] in pause, where plainness is desirable since the letter paused upon becomes faint, for which reason َی and َی with the َی and with the ، are said [643, 685, 686] (R): (b) this substitution is orig. [employed] in pause upon the َی, because of its faintness and resemblance to the vowel (IY), as َعۡوَنۡیَ َعَلَی َعَلِی َعَلِی َعَلِی "Ali and َعۡوَنۡیَ َعَلِی َعَلِی "Auji (S): IAl says "I said to a man of the Banu Ḥanzala ‘Of whom art thou?’, and he said َنَقَّیَسْیِمْ", [i. e., َنَقَّیَسْیِمْ Fuḥāmi (IY); ] then I said ‘Of which of them?’, and he said َمَرَحْ (M, Jrb), i. e., َمَرَحْ 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 Rājiz (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
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 Abu ‘Ali, 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 

(1376)

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),]

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., حَجْتَيْنِي 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 Tamٌm 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

حَتَى إِذَا أَمْسَكْتْ رَأْمِسْكًا
(M, SH) Until, whenever she entered, and he entered, أَمْسَكْتْ أَمْسَكْتْ (R), orig. أَمْسَكْتْ (ΙY, Jrb, Jsh) and [أَمْسَكْتْ, which, with the letter of unbinding, becomes] أَمْسَكْتْ (Jrb, Jsh): (a) since the ي is converted into ج, it is not converted into ٌ [684, 719], nor elided because of the two quiescents [607, 663], like the ي in أَمْسَكْتْ and أَمْسَكْتْ respectively (R); [or] the ج [of أَمْسَكْتْ] 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 (ΙY, 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 أَمْسَكْتْ [and أَمْسَكْتْ] is not paused upon (R); [and] because they treat the supplied
The ٰ is sometimes said to be a subl. for the ٰ of ٰ, and although the ٰ is not [ordinarily] substituted for the ٰ that is permissible [here (IY)], because the ٰ is substituted for the ٰ [684, 719] (IY, Jrb). This [substitution of ٰ for ٰ (Sn)] is named the ٰ of ٰ (A), who transmute ٰ into ٰ [when it occurs] with ٰ [immediately before it], saying ٰ. This is a herdsman that has come out with me, i.e., ٰ (Jh).

§. 695. The ٰ is [allowably (M, SH)] substituted for the ٰ (M, SH, A) before (1) a ٰ (M, SH, Sn), as ٰ ٰ. XXXI. 19. And hath fully bestowed His benefits upon you (M, SH), orig. ٰ (Jrb), read with the ٰ and ٰ (K); and ٰ (M), for ٰ (K) shedding the tooth that is behind the ٰ سدیس ٰ, which takes place in the sixth year (Jrb): (2) a ٰ (M, SH, Sn), as ٰ stripped off (M, SH), for ٰ (K, Jrb); and ٰ subjected (M), ٰ being i. q. ٰ (KF): (3) a ٰ (M, SH, Sn), as ٰ مس ٰ LIV. 48. The touch, or feel, of Hell (M, SH), for ٰ (K on XXXI. 19., Jrb), a proper name of Hell [18], from ٰ The fire scorched him or ٰ, i.e., ٰ (K on LIV. 48., B);
VIII. 6. [516] and I drove; I outstripped; [below] (M): (4) a ط (M, SH, Sn), as صرُّاط [693]; and [below] (M): (4) radiating; and مُسِيطُر (M), for سِيطرَ عَلَيْنا 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 مَسِيطُر with Fath of the ط in the dial. of Tamīm, on the ground that سِيطرَ 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, R) 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 صُكْبَب for مَسْغَبَة hunger, صُكْبَب for climeur, صَيْقَل for سِيَقُل, صَيْقَل for سِرَاط and بَسْط for 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 قَصِتْ for قَصَت I measured (IY, R, Jrb), nor يَخْصِرْ for يَخْصَر البَنَاغ He loses the commodity (IY), nor يَخْصِرْ for يَخْصَ بَحْص 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 صَقَر [above]; or separated [from it] by one letter, as in صَلَح [above]; or two, as in صَلَق [for سلَق level plain (MAR)]; and صَراط [above]; or three, as in مَسْلاَق (R) for مَسْلاَق pl. of eloquent (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 زُرَاط [682], which is [allowable] because the ز resembles the
(1381)

But the س is changed into ز exclusively in the dial. of Kalb [696], who say مَس زَقَر LIV. 48. [above] (M).

§. 696. The [pure (M on §§. 695, 696)] ز is substituted for [two letters (A),] the ص and ص, [allowably (Jrb on the ص, 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 ع, as in يَرَدُّل (M, SH, A) for [ثَوْبَة (M, Jrb) يَسْتَلِل (M, Jrb, A) loosens (IV, Sn) his garment (IV); and for [يَسْتَلِل (M, A) The camel (A) becomes dazed (IV, A) from the intensity of the heat (A): (a) سَدَل with the ج is of the conjugs. of ضَرَب, and سَدَر with the ز is of the conjug. of فَرَح: so in the KF (Sn): (b) the cause of this [substitution] is that (IV, Jrb), the ص being a surd, and the ع a vocal [734], letter, they dislike the transition from one letter to another incompatible with it (IV, 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 (IV): and therefore they approximate (IV, R, Jrb) one of them to the other (IV, Jrb), [vid.] the س to the ع (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 _district in vocality; so that the two sounds become consonant (IY, R, Jrb): (c) S says that simulation, i.e. (M), imbuing [the س (IY, R)] with the sound of the ـ, is not allowable (M, R) here (R), as it is in the ص (IY, R), as "مَصُدَّر" 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) يَصِدِّق يَبْرَدُّت (O) for "speaks truth"; لَمْ يَخْرُجْ قَضْدَهُ قَرْنُ (أَلْبَنَدَة) مَنْ قُرْنَ لَهُ (A) [with a ق (Sn)] for "course" (A); 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 فُصِدَّ , the ص being made quiescent (IY, A), for alleviation, as in ضْرُب for ضرُّب was struck, and قُبْل for قُبْل accepted [368, 402] (IY), and [afterwards (IY)] changed into ز (IY, A); the saying of هَسْتِم [below] (M, R) اِتْتَاْي (R) "هَكَذَا قَرْنَتْ أَنَّهُ" Thus is etc. [648] (M, SH); and مُؤَدُّر for أُصَدَّرت for I issued [trans.] (IY): the poet says

"وَرَّدَ ذَٰلِكَ الْقُوَّةُ قَبْلَ الْعَلَائِقَةِ تُرُكَّ ذِٰلِكَ الْقُوَّةَ مَتَنِينَ الْقُوَّةِ خَيْبَةً مِنَ الْصَّرْمِ مُؤَدَّرًا"
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 rup-
ture (M). The ص, when occurring quiescent before the
ش, may be pronounced [in three ways (IY, Jrb)], (1) as
a pure ز [above] (IY, R, Jrb), as in هَلْهَا فَرْزَنِي أَنَا [648],
said by Ḥātim [above] when he had slaughtered a she-
camel [for a guest (IY)], and it was said to him “Where-
fore didst thou not bleed her?” (IY, Jrb): (a) that
[change (IY, R) of the ص into a pure ز (IY)] is because
the ص is covered, surd, lax [734]; and [without any
intervening vowel or other barrier (R)] is in the vicinity
of the ش, which is open, vocal, rigid (IY, R, Jrb); so
that, from this incompatibility between their sounds, the
ش recoils somewhat from the ص; 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 ش, like the ت in إِسْتَعْلَى, as
in إِصْطَبَر [692], because it is not ang., 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 ص], because of its weakness, in conse-
quence of the quiescence, by approximating it to the ش
(R); and therefore they change the ص into a pure ز,
whereupon the sounds become consonant, because the ز
is from the same outlet as the ص [732], and is like it in
sibilance, while it is akin to the ⟨⟩ in vocality (IY, R, Jrb), and openness \[734\] (R); so that the ⟨⟩ and ⟨⟩ coalesce (IY, Jrb), and that recoil ceases: S says “We have heard the chaste-speaking Arabs make it a pure ⟨⟩” (IY): (2) as a ⟨⟩ simulating, i.e., imbued with [somewhat of (IY, Jrb)], the sound of the ⟨⟩ (IY, R, Jrb); so that it becomes betwixt and between, i.e., becomes a letter whose outlet is between the outlets of the ⟨⟩ and ⟨⟩ (IY, Jrb); inclining towards the ⟨⟩, but not changed into a [pure (R)] ⟨⟩, [as in the preceding way (IY),] for preservation of the [excellence of (R)] covering (IY, R), in order that the sound of the ⟨⟩ may not be altogether gone, and so the covering in it be gone (IY, Jrb), the covering in the ⟨⟩ being an excellence, the removal of which would be a mutilation of this letter: whereas the ⟨⟩ in ⟨⟩ [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 ⟨⟩ is sometimes simulated by the ⟨⟩” (M, SH), meaning that the ⟨⟩ is made to simulate the ⟨⟩, vid. through the ⟨⟩’s being inclined towards the ⟨⟩ (R); “not by it” [below] (SH), i.e., by the ⟨⟩, which is not made to smack of the sound of the ⟨⟩, but is converted into a pure ⟨⟩ (R), this simulation not being allowable in the ⟨⟩, (a) because the ⟨⟩ and ⟨⟩
are from one outlet, and both are sibilant letters; so that, with such closeness of proximity, intermixture [of sound] is difficult; contrary to the م، which the covering makes it possible to imbue with the sound of the ز; whereas there is no covering in the س (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: (α) thus

is said, with the م made to smack of the ز; but not بِلْ زَسَمُتْ، with the س made to smack of the ز: (b) the pron. in IH's saying "not by it" [above] relates to the س: but some commentators fancy that it relates to the ز, the sense being that the ز is simulated by the quiescent ص, but not the ص by the ز; 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): (a) if the م [before the د (R)] be mobile, (α) it is not changed (M, R, Jrb) into a [pure (R)] ز (R, Jrb), (α) because a barrier, vid. the vowel, occurs between the ص and د (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): (β) 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 م plain], except simulation because of [the م's] vicinity [to the ڭ in outlet] (R); [and accordingly they sometimes make it simulate the ڭ (M), [so that] the ڭ 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 م (IY, Jrb), and therefore does not act like incorporation (IY), as ڭ صَدَّر issued, emanated, and ڭ صَدَّق spoke truth (M, SH), where that simulation is regular, constant, [because nothing but the vowel of the م intervenes between the م and ڭ] (IY): (α) [such] intermixture [of sound] is rarer in the mobile than in the quiescent [م], 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 ڭ is not allowable, except in what has been heard from the Arabs (IY): (γ) if the م and ڭ 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 [similarly] صادر (733) (M, R), because the ط is like the د (IY, R): (d) such as مَسْتَقَرَّ LIV. 48.[695] is Kalb (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 ص [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 ص in simulation are the ج and ش, as

He is more worthy and wide in the corner of the mouth (M), for and أَشْدَقَ (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 ص [734]; so that the ج may be simulated by it, as by the ص, because it is from a position near the ج; and similarly the ج, 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 ُ and ُ occurring before the ُ (R)] are rare (SH): but this is contrary to what is stated by S, who says, about imbuing the like of this ُ with the sound of the ُ, 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 ُ by the ُ, and of the ُ by the ُ, there being no real difference between them, since the pronunciation [of the ُ and ُ] in ُ and ُ [733], when simulation is employed in them, is one (Jrb): (d) the ُ and ُ may not be made a pure ُ, like the ُ and ُ above, because they are not from the outlet of the two latter, [which have the same outlet as the ُ] (R): (f) the sum of the matter is that this substitution and approximation are [found in letters] of three kinds, (α) a letter wherein substitution and simulation are allowable, vid. where two causes are combined, as in the ُ, which they (α) make to simulate the ُ, but do not change into [pure] ُ, in order to preserve the covering; (β) change into [pure] ُ, from the strength of the affinity between the ُ and ُ, 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 ز, because of the distance between it and the outlet of the ز; and similarly the ج (IY): (3) as a pure س, which is the v. 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 س" (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 س, occurring before the د (R): (b) by "sounding plain" he means (R, Jrb) pronouncing the س or س pure, without conversion or intermixture of sound (R), [i. e.,] leaving it in its first state (Jrb): (c) in the quiescent س before the د, sounding plain is most frequent, then simulation, and then conversion into ز (R): (d) in the quiescent س also, sounding plain, as يَسْتَدَلْ, is more frequent than substitution, as يَبْتَرَدْ (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 1 [684]: (3) the s [690]: (4) the e is substituted for two letters, (a) the ح, as ضبْحُ أَلْفَرْسُ (A): (a) one says ضبْحُ أَلْفَرْسُ The horse snorted, like مَنَعُ, i.e., uttered a sound not a neigh, nor a whinny (Sn): (b) the Hamza, as عَنْ زِيْدٍ (527, 580, 682), i. q. آنَ، which is the عَنْعَنَةُ of Tammī: (5) the غ is substituted for two letters, (a) the غ, as عُطْرُ بَيْدُحَيْ: خ He swung his arms up and down, aor. غَطَّرَ [682], aor. غَطَّرَ, transmitted by IJ: (b) the غ, in لَعْنَ لَعْنَ (A), a dial. var. of لَعْنَ [537, 688] (Sn): AlFarazdak says تِفا يَا صَاحِبِي بِنًا لَفَنَا # نَرى أَلْفَرْسَأَو أَثَرَ أَلْجِيَايِمِ

[688] Tarry, O my two companions, with us: may-be we shall see the courts, or the trace of the booths (Jh): (6) the ح is substituted for the ع, as رَبْحُ for رْبَحُ [682]; which is rare: (7) the خ is substituted for the غ, as اغْسِنْ خَحْيَ for اغْسِنْ [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 ع is substituted for the ل, as رَكَّتَةُ for رَكَّتَةُ [682]; transmitted by Khl: (9) the ع is substituted for two
letters, (a) the ت for كُتُبٍ [682]: (a) reciprocity therefore occurs between them; but substitution of the ك for the ت is more frequent than its converse: (b) the ب in يَا أَباَمَ للَّهِ أَلْمَيْنِ [129, 169, 682]: (10) the ج [694]: (11) the ش is substituted for three letters, (a) the ك denoting the fem., as أَكْرَمْتُكَ I honored thee for كَشَفَتُكُهُ which is the كَشَفَتُهُ of Tamim [617, 680, 682]: (b) the ج., in the saying

إِذْ ذَكَّ إِذْ حَبَّلُ أَلْوَاصُ مَدْمَشُ

At that time, when the bond of union was strong, i. e., مُدْمَشٍ: (a) IU says "But no other [ex.] has been preserved; and that is facilitated by the agreement of the جعْصُوش, which is despicable, mean; and forms its pl. جعْصُوشُ (Jh)] with س, not ش, by which the substitution is known [682]: (12) the ي [685]: (13) the ض is substituted for the ج, in رُجُلٍ حَضَدِ [682] (A): (a) some MSS have "the ص is substituted for two letters, the س in صَرَاطُ, and the ل in صَرَاطُ جَلَدٍ i. e., جَلَدٍ"; and, according to this version, A’s saying below "the ص is substituted for the ج, as صَرَاطُ [695] is a repetition: but other MSS have "the ص", i. e., the dotted, "is substituted for the ج, etc." [above]; and,
according to this version, there is no repetition: [and moreover the prescribed "order in outlets" necessitates the placing of the \( \text{ص} \) here, and the \( \text{ص} \) below, because in order of outlets the \( \text{ص} \) is the 13th letter, and the \( \text{ص} \) the 20th:] (b) the two versions are opposed in \( \text{رَجَلُ} \text{ضَضُّ} \), which the first requires to be with the undotted \( \text{ص} \), and the second with the dotted \( \text{ص} \); 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 [\( \text{رَجَلُ} \text{ضَضُّ} \) i. q., \( \text{جَلْدُ} \text{ضَضُّ} \), where they change the \( \text{ل} \) into \( \text{ص} \) (KF), distinguishing] it with the red color indicating that it is one of his additions to the \( \text{صَلَّى} \); while his Glossator objects that it is found in the \( \text{صَلَّى} \), i. e., where Jh says, in the crude-form \( \text{جَلَدُ} \), "And sometimes they say \( \text{رَجَلُ} \text{ضَضُّ} \), making the \( \text{ل} \), with the \( \text{ص} \), a \( \text{ص} \), when it is quiescent"; and I have seen that the author of the Mr, in the 32nd chapter, on [the Recognition of (Mr)] substitution, transcribes from the DAd [by Frb (HKh)] the like of what is in the \( \text{صَلَّى} \): and God is the guide! (Note by Naṣr alHūrī on the margin of the Sn): (14) the \( \text{ل} \) [691]: (15) the \( \text{ر} \) is substituted for the \( \text{ل} \) in \( \text{تَّنْبَأُ} \) [632], and \( \text{رَعَكَ} \) i. q. \( \text{لَعَل} \) [537]: (16) the \( \text{ن} \) [688]: (17) the \( \text{ط} \) [692]: (18) the \( \text{د} \) [693]: (19) the \( \text{بَ} \) [689]: (20) the \( \text{ص} \) [695]: (21) the \( \text{ز} \)
(1393)

[696] (A): (22) the س [below] is substituted, [say they (R),] for three letters (A),] (a) the س in [671, 682, 759] (R, A), according to one of the two accounts [759] (A), its o. j. being دـ١٢٣ (R, A), from دـ١٢٣ [702] (R), i. q. دـ١٢٣ (MAR): (a) its o. f. is also said to be دـ١٢٣ [759]; but in that case it contains no proof [of substitution of the س ]: (b) it is the like of دـ١٢٣ that Z lays hold of [as evidence that the س is a letter of substitution]; not دـ١٢٣، as IH says [682] (R): (b) the ش in دـ١٢٣ a man (R)] bound fast for دـ١٢٣ (R, A), and دـ١٢٣ for دـ١٢٣ [337], where the ش is original, because it is more often employed (R): (c) the د in دـ١٢٣ picked it up, for دـ١٢٣, which [substitution of the س for the د (Sn)] is extremely anomalous: (23) the ط [below]: (a) I have not seen any instance of its [unincorporative] substitution: (24) the د is substituted for two letters, (a) the د, in the reading دـ١٢٣، فـ١٢٣، فـ١٢٣ VIII. 59. [682]: (b) the ط, in the reading كـ١٢٣ كـ١٢٣ for meaning The man was slow, or backward, in answering [682] (A): (a) IH does not reckon the س [above] of such as دـ١٢٣، nor the د and ط [above] in دـ١٢٣ and دـ١٢٣ [682], among the letters of substitution, because the substitution in these things is not intended for itself; but, since the س، د، and ط are
approximate to the \( \text{ث} \) in outlet [732], they intend incorporation, which is not possible in two approximate letters until they are made alike [735]; so that the \( \text{ث} \) is converted into س, د, and ظ respectively; and, since the substitution is for the sake of incorporation, he does not take it into account (R): (25) the \( \text{ث} \) is substituted for two letters, (a) the ف, in مَفٌّتَرُ, مَفٌّتَرُ [676]; (b) the د, in جِدْرَةٌ مِنَ النَّارِ a brand from the fire: (26) the ف is substituted for two letters, (a) the قَامُ, قَامُ [540, 682], transmitted by Ya'kūb: (b) فُومُ, [which is wheat (K, B on II. 58); and is said for bread (B), whence قُرِمْا لَنَا Make bread for us (K, B), i.e., إِخْيِزْوا (K); and is said to be (K, B)] i.e. فُوم garlic (A), which is indicated by the reading of ['Abd Allāh (Jh)] Ibn Mas′ūd وَتُفْمُهَا رَعْدَسْيَةً رَبْصُلَهَا II. 58. And its garlic, and its lentils, and its onions, being more congruous with the "lentils" and "onions" (K): (b) the ب, in خَذْتُهُ بِأَلْفَانِه Take it in its time, i.e., بِأَلْفَانِه [meaning قَتَّةٌ (Sn)]: (27) the ب is substituted for two letters, (a) the م in بَا آَسْكُ [682], meaning مَا آَسْكُ: (b) the ف in بِسْكُلَ meaning بِسْكُلَ (A), like فُنْذُ, male hedge-hog and زِيْرُجُ [392], the horse that
comes in last in the race; whence جَلَّلُ فَسْكَلْ, like هُزَجْ, a low man (Sn), for which the vulgar say Fسَكَلْ with ذَامِم (Jh): (28) the ٍм [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 \([703]\) \((IV)\). Transformation [in their conventional language \((R)\)] is [peculiar to \((R)\)] alteration of the unsound letter, [i.e., the \(\text{i, w, or y}\), 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 \(\text{*أصِيلَلَl} [691]\), are excluded; and, when he says "for alleviation", then such [a substitution] as [in \(\text{غَلَم} [683]\) for \(\text{غَلِم} \) 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 \(\text{قَالِ} [684, 703]\); while transformation without substitution is found in \( \text{يَفرُر} [\text{below}]\), and substitution without transformation in \( \text{أصِيلَلَ} [\text{above}] \) \((Jrb)\). Alteration of the Hamza by one
of the three [modes], as in مَرْأَةٍ رُآسِ, مُسَلَّةٍ, and مَرْأَةٍ, 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 هِيَأَلٍ [690] and جُرْحٍ [694] for بِيَأَنٍّ and عِلِيٍّ عِلِيٍّ; nor their elision, as in جُرْحٍ [275]; nor their quiescence, as in بِيَلٍّ for بِيَلٍّ [368]. IH's saying "for alleviation" is to exclude the alteration of the unsound letters in the six ns., as أَبْرَكٍ [16], أَبْيَكٍ, and أَبْيَكٍ أَبْيَكٍ; and in the du. and perf. pl. masc. مُسْلِمَيْن, مُسْلِمَيْن, and مُسْلِمَيْن [16, 228, 234]: that being for inflection, not alleviation (R). Transformation includes [three things (Jrb),] conversion, [as فَتَّالٍ (Jrb);] quiescence, [as يُقُولُ (Jrb);] and elision (SH), as فَتَّلَتْ [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 أُنْعِلَ, in which case the Hamza is elided [347, 428, 661, 699] in the paradigms of its *aor.* and *act.* and *pass.* parts., as مَكْرُومً, تَكْرُومً, يَكْرُومً, نَكْرُومً, أَكْرَمً; while the saying [of Abû Hayyân alFak‘āsī (Tsr)]

For verily he is worthy to be honored is anomalous (Aud): (a) this Hamza may not be retained, according to the o. f., except in poetic license, as فَانَّهُ أَهْلَ الْعَالَمْ [above]; or in a word deemed extraordinary, as أَرْضٌ مَوْرَنَبْةٌ with Kasr [or Fath, as in the KF (Sn),] of the ن, i. e., *land abounding in hares*, and كَسْأَةٌ مُوْرَنَبُ i. e., *wrapper whose wool is mixed with fur of hares*, according to the saying that the Hamza of أَرْنَبَ is *aug.* [672], which is the more obvious [hypothesis]: (b) if the Hamza of أُنْعِلَ be changed into s, as عَرَقَ [690], or عٌ, as مُنْهَلَ and watered the camels for أَنْهَلَ, it is not elided, because the motive for elision is lacking: so that you say يُهْرِقُ [with Fath of the s (Sn)], and [similarly (Sn)] يُعْتَهِلهُ and مَهْرِقَ; and مَهْرِقَ, act. part. مَعْتَهِلْ, pass. part. مَعْتَهِلَةٌ (A): (2) what appertains to the ف (Aud, Sn) of the v. [699] (Aud): (3) what appertains to the ع
(Auld, Sn) or J, according to different opinions (Sn), of the v. [759] (Auld). "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 l of عصا and the ي of قام [16, 643]; and "curtailing elision", or ['"arbitrary elision"], i.e., "elision for no cause", to denote irregular elision, like the elision of the l of يين and كم [719], though it also is an elision for alleviation (R). Transfer of the vowel [667] of the unsound [mobile (Auld)] 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 (Auld, Sn) conversely (Sn), in its augment, but not in its measure [712] (Auld): (3) [an inf. n. commensurable with (Auld)] or لسن (Auld, Sn), as تقول or استفعال (Auld) and مفعول [338, 703] (Auld): (4) [the form (Auld)] [703, 709, 714] (Auld, 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 يقول [above] and يبيع [703, 704, 721], orig. and يبْيِعُ and يَبْيِعُ [482]; (2) convert it into a letter akin to that vowel, if it be not homogeneous therewith, as يَبِعْ [703, 704, 721] and يَفْخُفُ [aor. of frighten] (Tsr), orig. 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 ٌ, ٌ, and ى [2:3, 643, 663] (M, `SH), which are so named because of the regular alterations 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 qats., 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 دامم, كسر, or فاث being really to put, immediately after it, part of the ،
or $t$, 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 Fathâ and Kasra, which is the one before the $t$ pronounced with Imâla [626]; (5) a vowel between Fathâ and Damma, which is the one before the broad $t$ in Warsh's reading of such as مَلَك [783], رَكَّة, and حَيَاة; (6) a vowel between Kasra and Damma, which is the vowel of Ishmâm [436, 668, 706] in such as قَبّل and غِيِّف in XI. 46. [436], according to the reading of Ka” (Sn on the Pro-Agent) and Hishâm (MKh). All three [letters (IY)] occur in the three kinds [625], [ns. (IY)], as حَرْض [703], [Tâb] مَال and سَوْط [674], and [Tîth] سَوْط and [IY] تَبٌّ ثَتَ تَبٌّ ثَت tent and eggs; [vs., as (IY)] مَال [703] حَارَّل, and tried to get,
and [683, 698]; and [ps., as م and (IY)] ل [546, 547], ل [585], and كي [595] (M). The ل, 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)] ل or ك (M, SH), because, (a) in the decl. v., (a) when tril., it is impossible to begin with ل [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 ل, [since the ل is quiescent]: (b) when quad., the first, second, and fourth [cannot be ل], 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 ل], because of what has been mentioned [about the corresponding 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 ل in حاَقِيَتْ [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 ل of م or ل [above] is not
said to be \textit{aug.}, for lack of a derivation wherein its \textit{i} is missing; nor to be a \textit{subst.}, because substitution is a kind of plasticity, and is not recognized for \textit{ps.} (Jrb): (a) similarly, [for lack of derivation (Jrb),] in (a) \textit{uninfl. ns.} [673, 686] (IY, Jrb), which go far in resemblance to \textit{ps.} [147, 159]; (b) imitative \textit{ejs.} [200] (IY); (c) foreign names [673, 676] (IY, Jrb), which follow the course of \textit{ps.} in that their \textit{l}s are \textit{rad.}, not \textit{aug.}, nor converted, because we decide that, in the case of \textit{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 \textit{rad.} letters (Jrb). The \textit{quad. n.} or \textit{v.} is not unsound, nor reduplicated [below], nor formed with Hamza [below] in the \textit{ف} [672]. Nor is the \textit{quin} reduplicated: but, in the \textit{ف} alone, it is sometimes unsound, as \textit{زَرْتَل} [671, 675]; or formed with Hamza, as \textit{مَصْطَبُ} [283, 672]. The \textit{quad.}, however, is reduplicated, on condition that a \textit{rad.} letter be interposed between the two likes, as \textit{زَرْرَل} [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 \textit{ف}, \textit{ع}, or \textit{ج}, [this clause being added by R] in order that the definition may not [appear to] be infringed by such as \textit{ضَرَّر} and \textit{مَيْطَر} [482, 483] and \textit{ضَرَّر} [404, 674]. By the
"unsound letter" ИУ means the ٌ, 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 أَمْرَ comanded, سَأَلَ asked, and تَرَا read; and sometimes unsound, as رَأَى and رَأَيْ [357]: and similarly the latter, as وَشَبَ [482, 671] and وَعَدَ [699]: (2) reduplicated and unreduplicated, the former being either sound, as مَدَى extension [731]; or unsound, as اِعْلَى affection, ا٥ُّ حَيّ living [698, 728], and ثُقَ [685 (case 1, a, a)]: and similarly the latter, as وَبَ [331] and وَعَدَ [698, 699]. But ИУ omits these two divisions. And similarly the reduplicated is either formed with Hamza, like ا٥ُّ [rousing and inciting (MAR)]; or not so, like سَمَى [above]. The "formed with Hamza" is what has a Hamza for one of its rād. letters, like سَأَلَ, أَمْرَ, and تَرَا [above]. And the "reduplicated" is what has its ع and ٣ alike, which is the frequent [formation, like مَدَى above]; or its ف and ع, like جَفَّ [357], which is extremely rare [672, 674, 683]: or has
two rad. letters repeated after two rad. letters, as زَرُّلْ [332, 674]. As for what has its ب and ل alike, as قَلَقَ [674, 685, 690, 698], it is not named "reduplicated" (R).

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, (a) conjoined in the (α) ف and ع, as يُلْيَلَ وَوَعَى and يُلْيَلَ دَأَنَ [698], from which [division] no v. is formed [41]; (β) ع and ل, as ذَرَى [728]: (b) separated, [as ذَرِى and ذَرَى below]: (b) more than two, as ذَرُّ [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 يُسْتَرَ [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 بُعْتُ and قُلْتُ [703], بُعْتُ and قُلْتُ [663, 703], لَمْ يَعْلُ and لَمْ يَعْلَ [703] (R): (b) tril. [below] (SH), from
regard to the first of the pret. forms, since the etymologists, when they conjugate the pret. and aor., mostly begin with the 1st pers., as \( I \) struck, because the person of the speaker is the nearest to him; while the 1st pers. of the hollow is of three letters, as \( \text{تَلَكَ} \) and \( \text{بُعْتُ} \) [above] (R): (3) in the J, is [named (R, Jrb)] (a) defective (SH), from regard to the reason for its being named “defective” in the chapter on Inflection [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 imp., as \( لا \) تَغَرْبُ, إِخْشَدُ, اَمْرُ, وَأَخْشَدُ, [428, 431, 719], and apoc., as \( لا \) تَقْصُدُ (R): (b) quad. [below] (SH), because, though it contains an unsound letter, it does not become tril. in the first of the pret. forms, as the hollow does (R), since its pret. is of four letters when you predicate of yourself, [as \( I \) raided and \( I \) shot] (Jrb): (a) their being named “tril.” and “quad.” [above] is from regard to the v., not the n. (R): (4) in the ف and ع, [as \( \\text{يَمَّر} \) and \( \\text{يَمَّح} \) mercy (R),] or in the ع and ج, [as \( \\text{نَوْي} \) purposed, \\text{حَبَّي} \) lived, and \( \\text{قَرْو} \) (R),] is [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 J, its matter has been mentioned; and that it is not rad. in decl. ns., nor in vs. [697]. But, as for the $ and ﷧, they are sometimes rad.; and occur as ف، ع, or ﷧ (IY). The [unaug. (M)] $ and ﷧ agree [in their positions (M),] in that (1) both occur as (a) ف s, as ـَعَد [683, 697, 699] and ـَصَدَلَّ (IY): (b) ع $ and ـَبَعَ [663, 689] (M, SH), قَأَرَمَ ـَيْبَسَ was dry (IY): (c) ﷧ s, as ـَتَوَلَّ [663] (M, SH), بَانَعَ ـَوَثَلَّ withheld [713] and ـَبَيْنَ [683, 697] (IY): (e) ﷧ ـَمَيْتَ [697, 719] (IY): (d) ع and ﷧ (M, R), together, as ـَتَرَة [697] and ـَتَرَةُ serpentine (M); [and] as ـَتَرَةٌ [729] and ـَتَرَةٌ [a she-camel's young one (MAR)], ﷧ ـَحَيَّي [697, 730. A] and ـَحَيَّي incapable: (a) both [double $ and double ﷧] are as rare as a double guttural for ع and ﷧, like ـَجَحْيَّ [stuck together (MAR), ـَجَحَت (MAR)], ـَجَحَت [vomited (MAR)], and ـَجَحَت [200]: (b) double Hamza is not used for ع and ﷧; and double $ for them is extraordinary, as ـَفَتَ [failed, broke down, in his speech (MAR)] and ـَفَتَ ( ) he (the drunken man) 153 a
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 ژیل and پوم [697] (M, SH): (a) precedence of the ع is more frequent; as though they disliked the transition from the ع to what is heavier than it, vid. the ژیل (IY): (b) the ف as a ی and the ع as a ى have not been heard [together], except in پوم and پوج [a name of The sun (Jh on پوج, KF)]; nor the converse, except in ژیل , ژیل , ژیل, ریس , ژیل وoe or mercy [41, 200] (R). And they differ in that (1) the ع precedes the ی (M, SH) as [ ف or] ع and ج respectively (SH), as [ دوقَت ] I guarded and (M)] كریت I folded (M, R, Jrb), where they put the ع before the ی (IY), which is frequent, as [ دوقَت ] I was governor and كریت I fulfilled, [I perished (MAR)] and كریت (R) I erred (MAR): whereas [the converse (SH)] precedence [of the ی before the ع (M, Jrb)] does not occur (M, SH), with the ع as [ ف or] ع , and the ع 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) ع and ی for ع and ج respectively, as in كریت [above], are more frequent than double ع , as in گر [above]; so that, when the ی is obscure, conformity with the first is more proper, for which
reason the *dem. ْنْا* is said to be *orig. ُنْا* [293] (R): (b) the *حَيْوان* [and *حِيْوان* (M)] is a subst. for *ع* (M, SH), according to S and his school (R), like the *جَبَارة* [686] (M), *orig. ُجَبَارة* (IY), the *o. f. being ُحِيْيان* [730. A] (M, Jrb) and *حَيْبة* [Part I, Note on p. 8, l. 1] (M), where they substitute *ا* for the second *ع* from dislike of the reduplication: this is the opinion of S and Khl (IY): (a) by analogy ُحِيْيان should be ُحَيْيان, because the [first] *ع* is mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 703]; but they let [the *ع* in] it remain mobile, in order that the word may correspond with what it signifies, [vid. *animal,*] in mobility, like ُجِرْكَن [331, 684 (condition 11, a), 703] and ُحَفْقَان fluttering; while in *مَوْتَان* inanimate object [703] they make opp. conform to opp.: (b) for the same reason they do not incorporate [the two *ع* s] in *حَيْبان* *o. f. of* *حِيْبيان*; but, since they dislike the combination of two similar letters, they convert the second into ُع; 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 ُع of ُحِيْبان is [not substituted, but (IY)] original (IY, R); nor is there in ُحَبْيت I lived [728, 730. A] any proof that the second [unsound letter] is [orig.] *ع* , because it may have been converted into ُع on account of the preceding letter’s being pronounced with Kasr
[685 (case 1, a), 744]: but S arrives at his decision because, if the were made original, would have no counterpart in their language (R); and the [correct] opinion is that of S: (d) there is no word, says S, like [4, 685 (case 7, c, b, y), 689, 716] in their language, i.e., none whose is a, and a, while [itself] is orig. [above], because it is from [697, 728]: (e) the substitute a, for the last ى, 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 ى occurs as (a) ف and ع[together (M)] in 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 (IY, R), known to me (R), among ns.: (a) this is like and [674, 697] in the sound (IY): (b) ف and ل[together (M)] in [لّ, orig. ] with quiescence of the ى, its being proved to be a ى by their saying (IY)] (M, SH), i.e., [I hit on the hand, or (R)] I bestowed a favor (IY, R, Jrb): the poet [of the Banû Asad (T)] says

يَكُونُ َعَلَى أَبِي حَسَّاَكَ ْبِنِ َرَحْبٍ

بَلَّأَفْلِذِ ذَٰلِكَ َأَلْجَاذَا َيَدُ ْأَلْكَرْبِيم
[I bestowed upon the son of Hashās, or in one version Hassās, Ibn Wahb, in the lowest part of Dhu-l-Jidhāt, the favor of the generous (T)]: and in the du. they say يَدْيَكِي يَبْسَارَةٍ آهَمِي يَدْيَكِي, 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 ﻃ and ﺚ are ﺹ : (a) the truth is that the ﺚ and ﺚ agree here in being, each of them, ﻃ and ﺚ together; but each in one word only: (b) in the sound letters also homogeneity of the ﻃ and ﺚ, as in بَبَرُ [with two ب s, which I think to be exotic, not of the speech of the Arabs, a kind of wild beast, which the Persians name بَبَرُ tiger (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 كَرْكَبُ [373]; or by the existence of a cause necessitating incorporation, as in ﺛَوْرُ [above] (R): (b) ﺟُوُرُ [683 (case 1, c, a), 697, 723], according to one account (SH): (a) F holds that its o. f. is ﺟُوُرُ, from dislike to forming the word of [three] ﺹ, which [sort of formation] does not occur [even] in the sound letter, except in the single word بَبَرُ.
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 ٍٍّ, because the َّي does not precede the م and ل respectively [above] (R): (b) if we say that ُّۚ ُّۚ is composed of ُّۚ ُّۚ , َّي, and َّي, because the cat. of سَّلَسَ [below] is more numerous than that of بَّبَّ [above], then the م is like the َّي in occurring as ف and ل [above]; but, if we say that it is composed of ُّۚ ُّۚ , َّي, and َّي, then the م is like the َّي in occurring as ف, َّي, and ل [below]: (c) the reasons for saying the latter are (α) that, in the dim. of ُّۚ ُّۚ , they say أَّتِيَة, by converting the ف into Hamza, because it is the first of two initial م [683, 699]; whereas, if its م were a َّي, then أَّتِيَة would be said; (β) that the م is a و, as in ُّۚ ُّۚ shifted, was transmuted, more often than a َّي, as in بَّجَّ sold [684, 703]; while conformity with the more numerous [cat.] is better (Jrb): (d) you say, according to the opinion of F, I wrote a و, converting the last م into م [685 (case 4), 727], as in أَّكْتَبَ and I elevated, exalted: but according to the opinion of Akh, أَّكْتَبَ; while Th says أَّكْتَبَ, which is rightly rejected by IJ, because the heaviness in أَّكْتَبَ is more than in أَكْتَبَ [683, 699], on account of the combination of [three] م s (R); (e) they say that in Arabic there is no word whose م and ل are َّي, except ُّۚ ُّۚ [above]; and
for that reason they prefer the fray to be written with ي (M), lest the ف and ل become : (f) similarly we decide that the آ in آخت.ت is substituted for the Hamza in آخت.ت, not that they are two dial. vars., because, the ل in آخ.ز [16] being a و, as is proved by the du. آخ.ز [231], the decision that the ف is a ج would lead to the establishment of a paradigm whose counterpart is rare in the language (IY): (g) similarity of the ف and ل, even if they be sound, is rare in the tril., as قل. and سلس [674, 685, 690, 697] (R):

(3) the ي occurs as ف, ع, and ل [together] in I wrote ا ِ (Jrb), contrary to the, except in قر [above], according to one account (SH): (a) the opinion of F is that the o. f. of ي و [697] is يوي, so that he says يويت يآ حسنعة I wrote a beautiful ي; but, according to others, its o. f. is يوي: (b) there is a similar dispute between them about all the names of the alphabet whose second [letter] is an ٰ, as ٰ, ۱, and ٰ: so that the others say I wrote ا ِ, ِثیبت, ِبیت, ِبیت, ِبیت, etc.; but F says ِثیبت, ِبیت, ِبیت, etc.: while their pl. [234], according to F, is اثبة and اثبة; but, according to others, اثبة and اثبة: (c) the reason why the others decide that [the ٰs here are orig. ي] is the occurrence of Imála [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 ّs are original, like the ّ of ما and ن [697]: while their ّs are judged to be converted only when another ّ is added at their end, and made into Hamza, by analogy to such as كـسآ [683 (case 1), 723], vid. when they occur constructed, infl., in which case their ّs are co-ordinated with the ّs 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 ّs are orig. ی: (d) the reason why F decides their ّs to be [orig.] ّ, and their ل to be ی, is that the cat. of طریبّت [above] and تروّیت [697] is numerous, and more prevalent than the cat. of ّبیبّت and ّبیتت [697, 728]; while the ّ of حبّران is [orig.] ی, according to the sounder [opinion], as before mentioned: (e) as for those names [of letters] which have an ّ for their second, followed by a sound letter, like گاّ، صدّ، ٓضّ، ّالّ، ّالّ، and ّم، their ّ, before their construction and inflection, is original, because they are orig. indecl., as before mentioned; and, after their inflection, should be regarded as orig. ّ، rather than a ی, because the cat. of ّبّر is more numerous than that of ّبّب [684, 703, 711]: so that we
say. I wrote a ل, and I wrote a د, while the pl. is أَكْرَافِ, أُصْرَائُ, and دَرَائِلِ. I wrote a د, while the pl. is أَكْرَافِ, أُصْرَائُ, and دَرَائِلِ. (f) as for عَيْنٍ, سِبْنَ, جَيْحُ, their عَيْنٍ is a عَيْنٍ, like that of بَيْتٍ [674, 697], since the عَيْنٍ is present, and there is no proof of its being [converted] from ٰ; and, according to S, جَيْحُ may be orig. فُعَلَ with دَامَم or كَسَر of the ف, contrary to the opinion of أَكْرَمْ [710] (R).
§. 699. The  and  (1) remains sound in such as  and  begot; and  and  [683, 697, 698] and [below] (M), pl. of  child (KF): (a) the  in all of that is sound, because nothing to necessitate alteration or elision is found in it: (b) hence  and  is ample, where the o. f. is Kasr, the Fath being on account of the guttural letter (M): (a) the o. f. of  and  weighs is  [333, 482] and  (M) and  (SH): (b) the  is elided [from such as  begets and  (SH)] because of its occurrence [quiescent] between a  [pronounced with Fath (R)] and [an original (SH)] Kasra [below] (IY, SH), expressed, as in [  and]  and  [below] and  (R): (α) the  is then elided (IY, R), from desire of alleviation (IY), because combined with the  in such a way that incorporation of one into the
other, as in [685 (case 7, a, b)], is not possible: and especially [is elision necessary] when the \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \) is followed by Kasra, which is part of \( \mathord{\text{i}} \) [697]; and preceded by a vowel not congruous with it, as in \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}\text{\textasciitilde}} \) [below], aor. of \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}\text{\textasciitilde}} \) threatened (R); for the \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \) is homogeneous with Damma, being considered as equivalent to two Damma; while the Kasra after it is homogeneous with the \( \mathord{\text{i}} \) before it; and the occurrence of a thing between two things opposed to it is deemed heavy, and must therefore be avoided (Jrb): (\( \beta \)) the \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \), and not the \( \mathord{\text{i}} \), is elided, because the \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \) is the heavier of the two, while the \( \mathord{\text{i}} \) is the sign of the aor.; and because the heaviness arises from the \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \), since it is second (R): (\( \gamma \)) 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 \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \), which is therefore elided: and its elision is most effective in alleviation, because it is heavier than the \( \mathord{\text{i}} \) or the Kasra; while it is quiescent, [and consequently] weak, so that the cause of its elision is strong (IY): (\( \delta \)) the \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \) is not elided from such as \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}\text{\textasciitilde}} \) [above], because it is orig. not between a \( \mathord{\text{i}} \) and Kasra, but between a Hamza and Kasra since the \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \) is [428, 661, 697] (Jrb): (\( \epsilon \)) the KK say that the \( \mathord{\text{\textasciitilde}} \) is elided only to distinguish the trans. [of this cat. (IY)] from the intrans., because you say, 'in the trans.
promised it, aor. √食品药品√ , and √食品药品√ weighed it, aor.√食品药品√ , and (IV) [fell into the mud, aor. (IV) [√食品药品√ , and (IV) [√食品药品√ feared, aor. (IV) [√食品药品√ [333, 700] (IV, R): but that [theory] is vicious, because the √食品药品√ is sometimes elided in the intrans. of this cat., as √食品药品√. The tent, or house, dripped with rain-water, aor. √食品药品√ , and √食品药品√. The fly dropped excrement, aor. √食品药品√ , and √食品药品√. The camel went along, throwing his legs out like an ostrich, aor. √食品药品√ ; so that what we have said is thereby established (IV); whereas what they say is of no account, since, if the case were so, the √食品药品√ would not be elided from √食品药品√ aor. of i. q. √食品药品√. 

grieved (R): and one proof thereof is that there are some √食品药品√ whose aor. occurs on [the measure of] √食品药品√ with Kasr and Fath, in which case the √食品药品√ is elided from √食品药品√ , and retained in √食品药品√. His breast was filled with rage, aor. √食品药品√ [482]; which proves the truth of our reason, and the falsity of theirs: (5) if the letter after the √食品药品√ be pronounced with Fath in the aor., as in √食品药品√ and √食品药品√ [above], the √食品药品√ remains, and is not elided, because one qualification [for elision], vid. Kasr, is removed, as in the pass. √食品药品√ is promised and √食品药品√ is weighed, whence CXII. 3. [404], where the √食品药品√
is elided from ١٠٠٠٠, because the letter after it is pronounced with Kasr; but remains in ٠٠٠٠٠٠, on account of the Fatḥa (IY): (η) IH's saying “an original Kasra” [above] comprises such as ٠٠٠٠٠ [above] and ٠٠٠٠٠ [362, 482], orig. ٠٠٠٠٠ (R): (θ) as for ٠٠٠٠٠ [above] and ٠٠٠٠٠ [482], the reason why the ٠ is elided from them is that the o. f. is ٠٠٠٠٠ and ٠٠٠٠٠, since the aor. of ٠٠٠ in this [cat., whose ٠ is a ٠, ] occurs [orig.] only on [the measure of] ٠٠٠٠٠ with Kasr [482, 671], being pronounced with Fath in ٠٠٠٠٠ and ٠٠٠٠٠ through the influence of the guttural letter; so that the Fatḥa is then adventitious; and, the adventitious not being taken into account, because it is like the non-existent, the ٠ is elided in them, because the Kasra is virtually pronounced (IY): and, as for ٠٠٠٠ [above] and ٠٠٠٠٠ [482, 671, 700], [whose prets. are on the measure of ٠٠٠٠٠, ] it is plain to us, by the elision of the ٠, that their ٠ [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 ٠٠٠٠٠ [and ٠٠٠٠٠], because the Kasra is [actually] pronounced, and the constructive in ٠٠٠٠٠ and ٠٠٠٠٠, because the ٠ is virtually pronounced with Kasr
though literally with Fath (IY): (c) the  is elided in leaves [482] for conformity with  [above], because it is syn. therewith: (κ)  finds with Damm, according to the Banū ‘Āmir [482], is anomalous, the  being elided from it either because it is orig.  with Kasr; or because  is deemed heavy between the  pronounced with Fath and the Damma in a conjug. other than that of  aor.  with Damm of the  in both (R): (c) the remaining variations of the aor. (IY, R), [being] the congeneres of  (SH), are made to accord with it [in elision of the  (MASH)], as  ,  , and  [Note on p. 246, l. 19] (IY, SH), the  being elided, although it does not occur between a  and Kasra (IY),] in order that the conjug. [of the aor. (IY)] may [not vary, but (IY)] be uniform (IY, R), and because of the alleviation that is [found] in elision (IY); and [similarly] its imp. mood [428, 482, 667, 668] (SH), because derived from the aor. whose  is elided, as  (R): (b) such inf. ns. as  [482] and  (M): (α) the o. f. of  [and  (IY)] is  (IY, Jrb, Tsr) and  (IY), with Kasr of the , and quiescence of the  , as they distinctly declare (Tsr): (α) 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، is transferred to the ع، and the و، then elided [below] (Jrb): (β) 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 v. is transformed, as in ویع and ورخ [above], the inf. n. being transformed by reason of the transformation, and sound by reason of the soundness, of the v.، as ویع inf. n. of ود and ولاد inf. n. of ولاد [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 ورخ [above] and "وکن، where, since the و، is pronounced with Fath، and Kasra is removed, elision does not ensue, although the v. is transformed in ویع and ورخ; and as ولاد inf. n. of ولاد I loved him in return for his loving me and "ولاد inf. n. of ولاد I held close intercourse with him، where the و، although pronounced with Kasr، remains [sound], because the v. is not transformed: (δ) when the simple substantive، not the inf. n.، is meant، as in ولاد [above]، the و، is not elided: (ε) the transformation of such as وعک and ورخ is only by transfer of the Kasra of the ف، which is the و، to the ع: 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 *َ* into *ى* [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 َِ ٌٍ، with a *ى* 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: (ṣ) it is said [by some] that, since transformation of َِْ أَلَّا and َِْ أَلَّا is necessary, the intention is to elide the *َ* as in the v. ; so that they transfer the Kasra of the *َ* to the أَلَّا, in order that a mobile *َ* may not be elided in the *ىَلَل* n.; in which case the n. would exceed the v. in elision, [since the *َ* elided in the v. is quiescent]: whereas the n. is subordinate to the v. in that [liability to transformation]; so that, when not inferior to the v. in degree [of elision], it is equal, but not superior, to it (IY): and [similarly] we say "the Kasra of the *َ* is transferred to the أَلَّا, and the *َ* then elided" [above]; the *َ* not being elided mobile, lest the transformation of the n. exceed the transformation of the v., in which the *َ* is elided quiescent, not mobile (Jrb): (b) [some say that] the o. f. of َِْ أَلَّا (MASH) is َِْ أَلَّا (A, MASH) and َِْ أَلَّا (MASH), on the measure of َِْ أَلَّا [without a *ِ*] (A);
and [this description of the o. f. seems to be more consistent with the statement that] the َُ of feminization is inseparable [from such inf. ns.], like a compensation for the elided [265 (reason 11, a)] (IX, Jrb): (α) its ع is elided for conformity with the aor.; and its ع mobilized with the vowel of the ت, vid. Kasra, in order that the Kasra may remain as an indication of the [elided] ت; while the َُ of feminization is put as a compensation for the ت, for which reason the two are not combined (A): (β) if it be said that the ت 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 َُجَهْب is not an inf. n. conformable to the v. [331], but a simple substantive denoting the direction turned to; while the ت remains in the simple substantive, like دَلَِّ [above], pl. of دَلِّم meaning boy and slave: and secondly that it is an inf. n.; but remains sound for a notification of the o. f., like إِسْتَحْمَرُدُه and قُرُود [685 (case 6, c), 703]; and this is the saying of Mz (Jrb): (γ) the َُ 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 َُ (Sn),] relying upon رَأْخَلْفِرَكْ آتِم [331, 338], which is the
opinion of Fr.; whereas some explain عّدّة here as عّدّة pl. of عّدّة i. q. 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 عّدّة to be عّدّة, 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 عّدّة [above]; or [when] it corresponds to the v. in initial augment, like عّدّة and عّدّة [703, 714]: and, for this reason, the عّدّة in the inf. n. of عّدّة may be elided, as عّدّة; or retained, as عّدّة; 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 عّدّة of femininization is put at the end as a compensation for it, as in عّدّة and عّدّة [265 (reason 11, a, b), 338]. 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 عّدّة in عّدّة, which is orig. عّدّة, 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 عّدّة 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 ا in the aor. is pronounced with Fath because of a guttural letter, it may be pronounced with Fath in the inf. n. also, as يَسَع [above], inf. n. سَعَ [306]; or not, as يَهَب [806] with Damm for junction, union, is anomalous: (8) when the J is guttural, the inf. n. of نَفُّل, aor. يَنْفِلُ, with Damm of their ا, is sometimes treated like the inf. n. of يَسَع [above], as وَدَعَ was tranquil, aor. يَرْدَعُ, inf. n. دَعَ [806]; and وَقَرَ was level, aor. يَوْقَرُ, inf. n. طَقَأٌ and طَقَأٌ: this being to notify that the ا of its aor. ought to be elided, because its occurrence between a ى 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 نَفُّل denotes inseparable natures [432, 484], continuing in one state: and likewise [to notify] that the ا of its aor. ought to be pronounced with Fath, because the J is guttural: (6) لَدَأَ born at the same time as another [234] is orig. an inf. n.; but is made a simple substantive to denote the مَرْجَب born, as ضَرَبَ the امیری struck, or coined, by the sovereign means مَصْرُوتَةٌ; (5) as for چَهَة direction and گَر coined silver [234], they are anomalous, because they are
not inf. ns.; so that their ی is not a compensation for the ی (η) the ی is not elided in such as یَمَرَدْ [a fictitious word (MAR)], on the model of یَقَطُينَ an acaulous plant, from یَعُدْ, because the reason for elision is weak (R):

(3) converted [below] in what has been mentioned under substitution [683, 685, 689] (M), as [یَمِرَانَ, یَوَارَسْلُ, تَعَکُّه] [below], and the like (IY). The ی is like the ی except in elision (M). The ی remains where the ی is elided (IY); [so that,] when ی occurs in the aor. between a ی pronounced with Fath and a Kasra, it is not elided, like ی, because the combination of two یs is not so heavy as the combination of ی and ی (R). You say یَنْعَرْ, aor. یَسَرُ [played at hazard with unfeathered and headless arrows (IY)], aor. یَسَرُ [482], retaining it, [because of its lightness (IY),] where you drop ی, (M) in یَعُدْ, etc. (IY). The ی is not elided from such as یَسَرُ because it is homogeneous with the Kasra: nor from such as یَبَشَ also, for the same reason; though here elision of the ی does occur, because two یs are deemed heavy with Hamza (Jrb). S relates that (IY) some of them say یَبْيَسْ [482, 684], aor. یَبْيَسْ, ke یَبَقَ, aor. یَسَرُ [above] (M); and یَسَرُ, aor. یَسَرُ [82], [like یَعُدْ, aor. یَعُدْ; ] eliding the ی, as they ide the ی, since ی, though lighter than ی, is deemed
heavy in comparison with [643, 671], for which reason they elide it (IY), treating it like the SharedPointer<: but this is rare (M). S transmits elision of the SharedPointer< in [only] two words, SharedPointer< [divided the limbs of the camel (MAR)], SharedPointer<, and both are anomalous (R). Its conversion [686, 689] is in such as SharedPointer< and] SharedPointer< [below] (M). The SharedPointer< is converted into Hamza [683], (1) necessarily in such as SharedPointer< and SharedPointer<, and SharedPointer<, [i. e. (Jrb).] when [two SharedPointer< s 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 [SharedPointer< s] heavy (Jrb); contrary to SharedPointer< (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 SharedPointer< and SharedPointer< [697, 698] are rare: so that, if two SharedPointer< s occur at the beginning, then, the SharedPointer< 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 SharedPointer< from SharedPointer< [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 \( \text{":} \), and because the prolongation relieves some of the heaviness: (b) conversion of the first into Hamza is [therefore] necessary, if the second be (a) not a letter of prolongation, whether it be converted from an auxg. letter, as in \( \text{أَرَّعَدُ} \) and \( \text{أَرَّسُلُ} \) [above]; or unconverted, as in \( \text{أَرَّعَدُ} \) [683]: (b) a letter of prolongation, but [either] not converted from anything [below], as in \( \text{أَرَّعَدُ} \) 683]; or converted from a rad. letter, as Khl says \( \text{وَيْلُ} \) for \( \text{نَقُولُ} \) from \( \text{مُؤْجَيْتُ} \) [716], when [its Hamza is] alleviated [by conversion into \( \text{ـ} \)]: (a) hence the opinion of the KK on \( \text{أَرَّوَلُ} \) 3857], which, according to them, is orig. \( \text{وَرَوْلُ} \), then \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \), then \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \) [683]: (b) Mz refutes Khl with [the argument] that the [second] , in the like [of \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \) alleviated from \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \) o. f. of \( \text{أَرَّوَلُ} \) ] is adventitious, not inseparable, since alleviation of the Hamza in such a case is unnecessary [658]; and he says that \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \) for \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \) is allowable because of the Damma of the \( \text{و} \), like \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \) for \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \) [below], not because of the combination of two \( \text{س} : \) (c) original, not converted from anything [above], whether it be \( \text{ـ} \) letter of prolongation, as in \( \text{أَرَّوَلُ} \) [357, 633], according to the BB, orig. \( \text{وَرُوْلُ} \); or not a letter of prolongation, as in \( \text{أَرَّوَلُ} \) [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 و s are combined, the first of them is changed into Hamza, as in "; and then says "and hence their saying لـ for the fem. of " and afterwards says "but, if the second be not inseparable, it is not necessary to change the first of them into Hamza, as " [above]: and S says "When you form a [ن] like from و you say " [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 [above] is unnecessary; and that the [first], [in , o. f.] of 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 , because of the excessive affinity between the , and , whereas the Hamza is more remote; for, if the were converted into , that combination of two و s, which is deemed heavy, would be, as it were, remaining (R): (2) allowably, [with unbroken regularity (R),] in such as [683] and [for the mentioned (MASH)]; and, says Mz, in such as [683] (SH), for [above], and , because in Kasra also there is heaviness, though less than in Damma (R): (3) invariably in و،
[notwithstanding the quiescence of the second (Jrb, MASH),] for conformity with [its pl. (MASH)] [\(\text{\textdegree}\) [above]: (4) irregularly, [by common consent (R, MASH),] in [\(\text{\textdegree}\) and for [\(\text{\textdegree}\) (R) morose, looking down from intensity of grief (MAR), and (SH), because a single, pronounced with Fath is not heavy at the beginning of the word (MASH): (a) S says that is orig. [683', meaning beauty of face, diptote because of the of feminization [18]; while Mb says that it is pl. of [667], its measure being , diptote because of the quality of proper name and id. feminization: but the first is more obvious, because 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 took is orig. on the evidence of [702], like [689]. No word, whose initial is pronounced with Kasr, occurs in the language of the Arabs, like words whose initial is pronounced with Damm, except a dial. var. of left hand [701] and pl. of awake [and (248)]. Sometimes they escape the combination of two , at the beginning of the word, by converting the first of them into , as in and
which is rare; as a single \(\text{-}\text{a single}\), at the beginning of
the word is escaped by conversion into \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), as in \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) and
\(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\). The \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) occurs as a subst. for the
frequently, as \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) and \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) [above], \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) and
\(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), and \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), and \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), the last, according to the
BB, being from \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), since the Book of
God is a Light; but not regularly, except in the conjug.
of \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) (R). The \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) and \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) are [necessarily, regu-
larly (R),] converted into \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), [and incorporated (Jrb),]
in such as \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) and \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) [played at hazard (Jrb,
MASH), where the unsound letter is not converted
from a Hamza (Jrb)]; contrary to \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) [SH],
orig. \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), where the second Hamza, being quiescent,
and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is con-
verted into \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), which is not converted into \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\),
because it is accidental, being removed in continuity, as
\(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) and \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) and wore a waist-wrapper (Jrb). The [quiescent
(Jrb)] \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) is converted into \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), when the letter before
it is pronounced with Kasr, as \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) [above] and \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\);
and the [quiescent (Jrb)] \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) into \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\), when the letter
before it is pronounced with Damm, as \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) awakening
and \(\text{\text{-}b\text{-}b}\) (SH).
§. 700. What differentiates َوَجَعُ aor. of َيَوَجَعُ had a pain and َيَسَعُ aor. of َوَجَعُ [699] from َيَسَعُ aor. of َوَجَعُ and َيَسَعُ aor. of َوَجَعُ [482, 699], so that the َيَسَعُ remains in one of the two classes, and drops off in the other, though both classes contain a guttural letter, is that in َيَوَجَعُ the Fatha [of the َع] is original, like that in َيَرَجَعُ [333, 699] (M), where the Fatha is original, because َيَوَجَعُ, aor. َيَرَجَعُ, belongs to the conjug. of َفَعَلُ, aor. َيَفَعَلُ, with Kasr of the َع in the pret., and Fath in the aor., like َعَلِمَ, aor. َيَعِلَمُ [482], and َشَرَبَ, aor. َيَشَرَبُ (IY): whereas is َيَسَعُ it is adventitious, imported on account of the guttural letter (M), because َيَسَعُ, aor. َيَسَعُ. and َوَطَأ, aor. َيَبَطَأُ [482, 671, 699], belong to the conjug. of َفَعَلُ, aor. َيَفَعَلُ, like َحَسِبَ, aor. َيَحَسِبُ accounted, aor. َيَحَسِبُ, and َكَسِبَ, aor. َيَكَسِبُ was pleasant, aor. َيَكَسِبُ [482]; and similarly, in the unsound, as َأَرَبَ aor. َيَأَرَبُ [482, 682], and َأَرَبَى [697], aor. َيَأَرَبُى [482] (IY). The antagonism of the two [Fatḥas mentioned] is therefore [like] that of the two Kasra of the ُسِمْسِمْ and ُسِمْسِمْ (M). The Fatha in َيَسَعُ [and َيَسَعُ (IY)] is likened to the Kasra in rivalry, competition, where the Kasra is adventitious, the o. f. being ُسِمْسِمْ [332]. For they convert the Damma into Kasra [724] (IY,
Jrb), because of its occurrence before a final ی (Jrb), in order that the ی may be sounded true, since, if ֻDamma occurred before the final ی, the latter would be converted into ֻ; and you would arrive at a paradigm unprecedented among [decl.] Arabic ns., in which there is none whose final is ُ, preceded by ֻDamma [721]. And, since the Kasra تَجَّرَبُ is adventitious, the paradigm is not accounted a preventive of triptote declension [18], because it is [not تَفَاعَلُ, but] virtually تَفَاعَلُ with ֻDamma of the غ [256] (IV). And the فَاتِرُ is likened to the Kasra in تَجَّرَبُ trials, where the Kasra is original, because تَجَّرَبُ [339] is pl. of تَجَّرَبَةُ [332] (Jrb).

§ 701. Some Arabs [of the Hījāz are induced, by desire for alleviation, to (IY)] convert the [unsound letter, whether (IY)] ُ or ی, in the aor. of یَنَتِعَلُ, into َُ (M), notwithstanding that it is quiescent [684, 703] (IY), saying یَنَتِعَلُ and یَنَتِعَلُ [below] (M), because the combination of ی with َُ is lighter, according to them, than its combination with ُ, for which reason they say یَنَتِعَلُ, substituting an َُ for the quiescent ُ, as they substitute it for the ی in یَنَتِعَلُ (IY). Some inhabitants of the Hījāz do not regard the difference between ُ and ی in the formations of the v., saying [pret.,] یَنَتِعَدَّ and
and not [above]; not pronounced with Fatha in the aor. [above] and Kasr [689], because the, and أ, are deemed heavy between the أ pronounced with Fatha and the [next] Fatha, as in and يأبُس [below]: act. part., مُوَتَّعَد and مُوَتَّعَد [below]: imp. and مُوَتَّعَد [689]. This, according to them, is an universal rule (R). And, agreeably with it, and مُوَتَّعَد and مُوَتَّعَد occur in the dial. of [the Imam (Jrb)] Shf (SH), who used to pronounce so in speaking (Jrb). Some convert the أ occurring [in the aor.] between the أ pronounced with Fatha and the [next] Fatha, as in 333, 699, 700, into أ, as يأجل [below], because there is heaviness in this أ, though not so much as to cause it to be elided [699]; and others convert it into أ, [as يَيِّبَجُل, ] because أ is lighter than أ; while some, disapproving conversion of أ into أ for no apparent cause, pronounce the أ of the aor. with Kasr, [as يَيِّبَجُل, ] in order that the conversion of the أ into أ may be because of its occurrence after Kasra [685 (case 5), 699] (R). There are [thus] four dial. vars. in the aor. of [أور. يَفْعَل, aor. يَفْعَل, whose is أ, as (IY)] [أور. يَوْجَل, aor. ْيِوْجَل, aor. ْيِوْجَل (IY)]: ْيِوْجَل ْيِوْجَل and the one used in the Qur, as قَالَوْا لَا تَوَجَّل XV. 53. They said, Fear thou not, because the أ 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 یِبِجُلُ, یِبِجُلُ, یِبِجُلُ, [which is the most outrageous of them (Jrb),] are anomalous in the aor. of یِبِجُلُ [below] (SH), the chaste [form] being یِبِجُلُ [above], according to analogy (Jrb). This Kasra is not like the Kasra in [the dial. of those who say (M, Jrb)] تَعْلُمُ (M, R, Jrb) and نَعْلُمُ (R), since they [who pronounce the aoristic letter there with Kasr (IY, R)] do not pronounce the ی with Kasr (IY, R, Jrb), as [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 یِسَار [699] (IY): whereas here the ی is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the ی may be converted into ی [above]. Jh says in the سَاهِح (Jrb), یِبِجُلُ with Kasr of the ی is according to the dial. of the Banū Asad, who say أَنَا یِبِجُلُ I fear, نَخَنْ یِبِجُلُ We fear, and أَنْتَ یِبِجُلُ Thou fearest, all with Kasr; and, while not pronouncing the ی with Kasr in یِعْلُمُ, because they deem Kasr upon the [initial] ی to be heavy, pronounce [it] with Kasr in یِبِجُلُ, in order that one of the two یs may be strengthened by the other (Jh,
Jrb). And its *imp.* is یِیَکَجْلُ, the یَ زَجَلُ becoming یَ زَجَلُ from the Kasra of the letter before it (Jh). The language of Sf and F appears to indicate that conversion of the یَ زَجَلُ [above] and یُیَخَلُ [699, 700] into یَ زَجَلُ or یَ زَجَلُ is regular [713], even though it be rare. Sf says "They convert the یَ زَجَلُ into یَ زَجَلُ and یُیَخَلُ and what resembles them, saying یَ زَجَلُ and یَ زَجَلُ " and F says "As for [the aor. of] یَ زَجَلُ, یَ زَجَلُ, as یَ زَجَلُ, یَ زَجَلُ, and یَ زَجَلُ, it has four *dial. vars.*"; [while the language of Jh and IH 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 یَ زَجَلُ" [above], which imports that the forms mentioned are peculiar to [the aor. of] this word (R). And some of the Arabs say یَیَبَسُ [above] and یَیَبَسُ [684] (M, R), for یَیَبَسُ and یَیَبَسُ [482] (M), converting the یَ that occurs in the aor. between the یَ that pronounced with Fatḥ and the [next] Fatḥa [into یَ], for conformity with the یَ [above]. This [conversion], like [that in] such as یَیَاحِلُ and یَیَاحِلُ [above], is [found] only in the [aor.] pronounced with Fatḥ of the یَ; and, says S, is not regular. The [initial] یَ is not pronounced with Kasr here, as in یِیَکَجْلُ [above], because that is [done], in the aor. whose یَ is a یَ, with the intent that the cause
for conversion of the , may appear, as before explained (R).

§. 702. When َفَاعَلَ is formed from [a v. whose اِِمْمُنَ is Hamza, as (IY) ] َأَكْلَ اَمْرَ commanded, [and َأَمَنَ was safe (IY),] in which case ِإِيِتَّكَلَ َإِيِتَّمْرَ was eaten away, corroded, ِإِيِتَّمْرَ obeyed, [and ِإِيِتَّمْرَ trusted (IY),] are said (M), َيُ being substituted for the Hamza, because quiescent and preceded by the conj. Hamza pronounced with Kasr [661], on the principle of its conversion in َذِيبَ َيُ َيُ and َبِيمَ [658, 685] (IY), the َيُ is not incorporated into the ُبَ , َبَ as [as and ِإِتَّمْرَ (IY),] as it is in [639, 699], because here it is not permanent (M). As for the َفَ ِإِيِتَّمْرَ whose َفِ is Hamza, as ِإِيِتَّمْرَ put on, or wore, a waist-wrapp[r [below] and ِإِيِتَّمْرَ [above]: its َيُ is not converted into َبَ, because, though: conversion of its Hamza into َيُ 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 [738], still, since the conj. Hamza is not inseparable, as when you say [َقَالَ أَنْتَيْرُ pronounced] َقَالَ أَنْتَيْرُ He said “Put on a waist-wrapp[r”, in which case the Hamza returns to its َبَ َأَمْرَ, the general rule of
Hamza [738] is observed (R). In منْ تَعْلَكَ from یَأْرَبُ یَؤْنَ یَؤْنَ you say یَأْرَبُ [above] (Aud), by changing its Hamza into یَأْرَبُ (Tsr); but change of the یَأْرَبُ into یَأْرَبُ, and incorporation of the latter into the یَأْرَبُ, are not allowable, because this یَأْرَبُ is a subst. for a Hamza, and is not original (Aud). The saying یَأْرَبُ [from یَأْرَبُ (Tsr)] is wrong (M, Tsr): so says سد (Tsr). And یَأْرَبُ [661] from یَأْرَبُ is anomalous (Aud), which IM indicates by his saying [in continuation of the passage quoted in §. 689] (Tsr) "But this [change of the یَأْرَبُ of یَأْرَبُ (A)], in the case of Hamza, as in [یَأْرَبُ and یَأْرَبُ (A)] [یَأْرَبُ], with the یَأْرَبُ changed into یَأْرَبُ, and then incorporated into the یَأْرَبُ, and similarly in [یَأْرَبُ (661, 689), with the یَأْرَبُ changed into یَأْرَبُ (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 یَأْرَبُ is the saying of some یَأْرَبُ, and in the یَأْرَبُ is the saying of some یَأْرَبُ" (Tsr). The chaste dial., in all of that, makes no change [of the یَأْرَبُ or یَأْرَبُ into یَأْرَبُ], otherwise two transformations would occur consecutively (A). And the saying of Jh that یَأْرَبُ took for himself [699] یَأْرَبُ is a mistake (Aud,
A), because, if it were from أَحْدَدُ without [change and (Sn)] incorporation would necessarily be said' so says Sd (Tsr, Sn), as [is stated] in the Tsr (Sn). Its [first (Sn)] is original; [not a subst. for a ى substituted for a Hamza, as Jh asserts (Sn);] being from تَحَدَّد [took for himself (Tsr)], like from تَّبَعَ followed (Aud. A): so says F (Tsr). Zj contests the existence of the crude-form تَحَدَّد, asserting that تَحَدَّد, as Jh asserts; or from أَحْدَدَ, as A transmits below (Sn); but is cut down (A), the conj. Hamza and the ٰ of إِنْفَعَال being elided from it; and, the ٰ, which is the ٰ of the word, being pronounced with Fath, and the ٰ with Kasr (Sn). But F's opinion is verified by their saying, transmitted by AZ, ٠ور, تَحَدَّد, inf. n. تَحَدَّد [696A] (A), of the conj. of تَعَبُ; though the ٰ of the inf. n. is sometimes made quiescent: so says Fm in the Msb (Sn). Some [of the moderns (A)] hold إِنْفَعَال to be an instance of the إِنْفَعَال whose ٰ is changed into ب (A, Tsr), according to the chastest dial. [689] (A), because أَحْدَدُ has a dial. var. ٰ with [699] (A, Tsr), in which case the ٰ is not original; and, according to this, إِنْفَعَال is said, like [689, 699] (Tsr). And, though this dial.
var. is rare, still the formation of َنْفَٰذُ in accordance with it, [i. e., as َنْفَٰذُ (Sn),] is better [than making it َنْفَٰذُ (Sn)], because they unequivocally lay down that َنْفَٰذُ [661] is a corrupt dial. var. (A). But [some of (R)] the Bdd [are reported to (Tsr)] allow conversion [of the َل into َب (R)] in the case of Hamza, [transmitting certain words (Tsr)] as [instances of that, vid. (Tsr) إِنْفَٰذُ (R, Tsr), إِنْفَٰذُ (Tsr); and َنْفَٰذُ took example (R), whence the tradition َنْفَٰذُ [661]: so in all the versions of the Mūwatta (Tsr) on Tradition, by the Imām MIAn (HKh). And َنْفَٰذُ تَأْتِهُ َتَأْتِهُ أُمَّةً أَمَّةً II. 283.] Then let him that hath been entrusted repay his trust [658] is [reported to be (K)] anomalously read (R) by 'Āsim (K), with incorporation of the َل [in َلْدِينْ] into the َب (K, B), by analogy to إِنْفَٰذُ (K); but it is wrong, because the [َل (K)] converted from the Hamza is in the predicament of Hamza (K, B), and is therefore not incorporated [738] (B). And إِنْفَٰذُ [above] is vulgar; and so is َرِبِّا [685, 716] for َرِبِّا [272, 658] (K).
§. 703. They are transformed, elided, or preserved (M). Transformation is alteration [697] of form (IY). The transformation occurring in the ḫ is by conversion, by transfer of the vowel and quiescence, or by elision. As for the first [mode], it has three divisions, conversion of ḫ and ʿ into ʾ [684]; conversion of both into Hamza [683]; and conversion of one into the other, i. e., of ḫ into ʿ [685], or the converse [686] (Jrb). The ḫ and ʿ are converted into ʾ 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 ضم light and ش ʿ [658], when alleviated; and "permanently", to exclude such as بضاب جرأ and بضاب [240], according to the Banū Tamīm (R), or rather Hudhail (MAR). They are then converted into ʾ 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 ḫ or ʿ into ʾ, in order that it may be homogeneous with the vowel of the preceding letter:
(2) that the , and ی, when mobile, are, each of them, equivalent to a letter of prolongation, and part of one [697], or to two letters of prolongation; the , pronounced with Fath, Kasr, and Damm being like a , and ٌ, a , and ی, and two, s, respectively; while the predicament of the ی is similar: and, the combination of unsound letters being deemed heavy, they convert the , or ی into ٌ, because this is a letter with which one is safe from any vowel [711] (Jrb). The cause for conversion of the mobile , and ی, preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, into ٌ is not very substantial, since they are converted into ٌ because deemed heavy; whereas, when the letter before them is pronounced with Fath, their heaviness is lightened, even if they also be mobile; while Fath ی does not require ٌ to occur after it, as Damma requires , and Kasra ی, since such as قرِلُ and پَبَعُ [below] are frequent, while such as قِنْلُ and پَبَعُ with Damm, and قرِلُ and پَبَعُ with Kasr, of the ی are not to be found [713]: but, nevertheless, they, though lighter than all the sound letters, are converted into ٌ 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. ٌ; and especially when they are heavy, by reason of the vowel; and when a cause for alleviating them, by conversion into ٌ, is ready at hand, through
the preceding letter's being pronounced with Fath, since Fathā is akin to [697]. And, from the infirmity of this cause, (1) they are converted into ۳ only when they are at the end, i.e., when جās [719, 723, 728]; or near the end, i.e., when عās; not when فās, as in ۹ and ۶ [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 ۹۹ drew water, related and ۹۹ twisted, would be worthier of conversion; so that, [since the ج is not converted into ۳] when the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr, [as in ۹۹ طویل hungry and ۹۹ حیی lived (MAR),] the ع [also] is not converted into ۳ [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 \( v. [667, 684 \text{ (condition 11, a), 711, 712}] \), to which, because of its heavi-
ness, alleviation is more suitable. And in the \( v. \) this
transformation is of two kinds, (1) original, vid. where
the \( \circ \) or \( \) is mobile, and preceded by a letter pro-
nounced with Fath, as \( بنز \) and \( نز [684] \): (2) conform-
able to the original, vid. where the \( \circ \) or \( \) is pronounced
with Fath after a letter pronounced with Fath in the
\( tril. \ pret. \), which occurs in (a) the \( aor. \), (a) \( act. \), like
\( يكاف تءر \) \( [697, 704] \) and \( يهاب يركر \) \( [704] \); (b) \( pass. \), like \( is feared and \( يهاب يركر \) \( is reverence \). 
(b) the \( pret. \) of two conjugs. in the augmented \( tril. \),
as \( تقلت \) set upright and \( بمانه \) separated; and \( استقلت \), as
\( استقبان \) appraised and \( \) made plain: and their
\( pass. \) aors., as \( is set upright and \( فبمانه \) is separated,
\( يسقتام \) is appraised and \( دبابان \) is made plain. Only
the \( aor. \) whose \( \circ \) or \( \) is \( [orig.] \) pronounced with Fath,
\( [as \) \( يكاف فبمانه ] \) not the one whose \( \circ \) or \( \) is \( [orig.] 
pronounced with \( ذاءم \), as \( يقوم فبمانه \), or \( كسر \), as \( يبعع 
\) \( يسقيم \), is conformable to the \( tril. \ pret. \) in this conversion,
because the inducement to transfer \( [697] \), in the whole of
that, whether the \( \) be pronounced with Fath, \( ذاءم \),
or \( كسر \), is imitation of the original by the \( deriv. \) in
quiescence of the \( \) \( \), together with indication of the
mode of formation, which \( [indication] \) is not possible
with conversion of the whole into ı [below]. The ns. subjected to this transformation are only four sorts [714], (1, 2) two resembling the v., that being regarded because of what we have mentioned, vid. that transformation is principally in the v.; and that this cause [of conversion into ı], not being strong, is more suitable to the v. :—(a) that [tril. n.] which is commensurable with the v., as (a) ناپ and باب [278, 684], orig. and باب رجل مال (b) a wealthy man [278, 682, 683] and نِوُلِمُental, orig. and مِوُلْ with Kasr of the ع; and similarly كُبْش صاف a woolly ram [278, 708]: (α) by its commensurability with the v. we mean here its equality with the v. in number of letters, and in special vowels, though it differ from the v. in the special augments and their places: so that منعل [712, 714] is on the measure of يفعل, though its augment is not that of يفعل; and ناعم [708] is commensurable with يفعل [343, 712, 714], though its augment is not that of يفعل, nor is the place of its augment that of the augment of يفعل : (β) the tril. n. is either unaugmented [711], or augmented [712]: (γ) as for the quad. and quin., they are not commensurable with their v., except the cat. of جفَر [392], as جَهَر [374], where the ج, being co-ordinative [712], because the and ی with three
rods. are only aug. [674, 675], is not transformed, in order that the formation of co-ordination may be preserved: (b) the n. containing 
 or 
is 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 
and 
[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 
to the preceding letter, and converting them into I: (3, 4) two sorts of ultimate pl. [256], vid. the cat. of 
[715], and the cat. of 
[246, 683 (case 3), 717], which, though they do not resemble the v., are subjected to the transformation mentioned, because of the I of the pl. in one of them, and the intention to distinguish in the other [708] (R). That [conversion into I] is [found] (Jrb) in (1) a tril. n., as (a) 
and 
[above] (SH): (b) 
(R) and 
[above], and (M) cowardly, which is like 
[348, 368], from was cowardly, aor. 
; though ISk transmits 
I was cowardly, aor. 
(1Y): (2) a v., (a) tril., as 
and 
[684]: (b) conformable to the tril., as 
[above] and 
offered for sale (SH), and 
[above] (R): (a) hence 
[was humble.
submissive (H)], contrary to the opinion of most (SH); because it is ِعَسَّافُهُ from كان was (Jrb), meaning *came to have a being contrary to his being*, like ِعَسَّافُهُ altered from state to state, except that ِعَسَّافُهُ is general, applicable to every state, while ِعَسَّافُهُ is peculiar to alteration from a particular being, vid. the contrary of humility and submission; or from ُكِيْن clitoris, because it is in a most low and humble position, meaning *became like it in contemptibleness* (H): not ِعَسَّافُهُ from َسُكْنَة quiescence (Jrb), with * added for impletion of the Fatha (H), because [such] addition [of the letter of prolongation, as in َمَتنَّرَح (Jrb), whence

(َمَتنَّرَح) by Ibrāhīm 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., َمَتنَّرَح (H), is improbable; and because they say ِعَسَّافُهُ (SH) for its inf. n. (Jrb); and, says F, ُمُسْتَكِيمٌ for its act. part, as in the saying of Ibn Aḥmar

 فلا تَضْعِفْ بَطْرَكَ إِذَا مَا سَرِى فِي الْقُرُوْبِ أَصْحَبُ ُمُسْتَكِيمًا

Then put not up with a flabby man, who, whenever he journeys by night among the folk, is humble in the
morning; and also ُيُسْتَكِينُ [for its aor.] (H): (b) the
istry [above], ُيُقَالُ is said, and ُيُهَبُ [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 ُقَامَةٍ and ُقَامَةٍ [338,
697] (SH), conformable to ُقَامَةٍ and ُقَامَةٍ respectively
(Jrb); and ُمَقَامٍ and ُمَقَامٍ [712] (SH), conformable to
ُقَامَةٍ رَأْيًا respectively (Jrb): contrary to (1) ُقُولُ (663,
684 (condition 1), 698] (SH), where the ُيَ and
ى are quiescent (R, Jrb); ُطَلَّبَى [298, 311, 684] and
ُيَتَجَلَّى [333, 674] being anomalous (SH): (a) we have
mentioned that such as ُيَتَجَلَّى is regular, though
weak [684, 701]: (b) similarly some of the Hijāzīs
regularly convert the quiescent ُيَ and ى in the
aor. of such as ُقُسُرُ إِنْتَعَدَ into َ. [701]: (c) some
of the Banū Tamīm regularly convert the [quiescent],
in such as ُأُلَدُ أَوْلَدُ children, i. e. the pl. of that [n.] whose
ف is a ُ, into َ, as ُأَلَدُ: (d) when ى is mobilized with
an uninflectional Fāṭha, and is final, and preceded by
a letter pronounced with Kasr, Tayyī [regularly] pro-
nounce the letter before the ى with Fāṭh, in order that
the ى may be converted into َ, [as ُبَقِى and ُبَقِى for ُبَقِى.
and لَغْي (349, 482, 724) (T, M.A.R.),] because the final
is the seat of alteration and alleviation; (a) Fatha of
the ی is stipulated [above], in order that it may be
transferred to the preceding letter; and its being
uninflectional, 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 [آئام] [above]: (b) a
poet [of the Banu Baulan, of Tayyi (T),] says

(1449)

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 حَرْب
war [in the preceding verse] was doing that (T):
(c) if the ی be intermediate, because of the inseparable
د [266], as in [349, 482] for نَاصِية, [and ِبادِة for
Badía] desert (T),] such conversion is rare, not regular
(R): (2) قال (683 (case 1, n)), convers:.
together and trafficked, one with another, showed that was established and explained, was plain (SH), i.e., the augmented tril. [v.] (R), where the letter before the [mobile] \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{s} \) is quiescent (R, Jrb), but that quiescent is not a letter pronounced with Fath in the [unaugmented] tril. (R): (a) \( \text{قَتَالُ} \) and \( \text{قَتَالَ} \), etc., are not made to conform to the tril., as are \( \text{عَامِمُ} \) and \( \text{عَامَمَ} \), \( \text{عَسْتَبِينُ} \) and \( \text{عَسْتَبِينِ} \), because we stipulated [above] that the quiescent before the mobile \( \text{s} \) or \( \text{s} \) should be pronounced with Fath in the tril. pret.: (b) if you say "Do you not transform the act. part. in \( \text{قَتَالُ} \) and \( \text{قَتَالَ} \) by converting the \( \text{s} \) or \( \text{s} \) into \( \text{l} \) [683, 708, 712], notwithstanding that it is preceded by \( \text{n} \), and is in the \( \text{n} \), where transformation is contrary to the general rule, it being generally in the v.?", I say "The case is so, except that \( \text{بَيْعُ} \) \( \text{قَتَالُ} \) and \( \text{بَيْعَ} \) \( \text{قَتَالَ} \) have the sense, and government, of the v., and belong to the conjug. of the [unaugmented] tril. [343], contrary to \( \text{قَتَالُ} \) and \( \text{قَتَالَ} \) \( \text{بَيْعُ} \) \( \text{بَيْعَ} \): (c) if you then say "But \( \text{أَقْرَمُ} \) and \( \text{إِسْتَقْرَمُ} \) 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
conjg. 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 trans-
formation of and تَبَعَ and تَقَوَّمَ, بَيْنَ تَقَوَّمَ تَبَعَ, it would be
more strange than transformation of تَقَوَّمَ and تَبَعَ, because incorporation of the أَلْتَبَعَ in the [first]
two conjugs. is necessary (R). Such as قُوَّدَ أَفْضِيٍّ (684), and [wept, waited, ُحَرَّدَ (R),] أَعْمَرَ أَعْمَرَ [It (the sky) became rainy (R)]. It
became cloudy, and أَغْيَبَتْ [She suckled notwithstanding
pregnancy (R)], are anomalous [711, 707] (SH); and
similarly إِسْتَحْرَدَ إِسْتَحْرَدَ smelt the
odour, and إِسْتَحْرَدَ إِسْتَحْرَدَ [707]. AZ allows the conjugs. of
إِسْتَحْرَدَ إِسْتَحْرَدَ to be treated as sound unrestrictedly,
regularly, when they have no tril. v., like إِسْتُنْبَرَ [became a she-camel (MAR)]: but, according to S, such
as إِسْتَنْبَرَ also is anomalous, analogy requiring it to be
transformed, for uniformity of the conjg., as the rel. ns.
ُجُلْدُ [312] and ُجُلْدُ [from سَيْف sword and ُجُلْدُ horses
are transformed, although no transformed $v.$ comes from them, for uniformity of the cat. of $\text{تَعْدُ، تَعْدُ، تَعْدُ}$ [683, 708]; and, since $\text{تَعْدُ}$, $\text{تَعْدُ}$, and $\text{تَعْدُ}$ are made uniform [with $\text{تَعْدُ}$], this [opinion] is more probable. $S$ says that the whole of the anomalies mentioned have been heard transformed also, according to rule, except $\text{سُتْحُورُ}$, $\text{عَفْلَتْ}$, and $\text{عَسْتُرْحُ}$; 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 $v.s.$ is to indicate that the transformation in their like is not original, but for conformity with what is transformed (R). The $\text{س}$ and $\text{س}$ are made quiescent, their vowel being transferred to the preceding quiescent letter, in such as $\text{يَقُولُ}$ says and $\text{يَبْيِعُ}$ sells [697, 704, 721], because of their liability to confusion with the conj. of $\text{يَحَافُ}$ [below] and $\text{يَهَابُ}$ (SH), if they were made to accord with the pret. in conversion of their unsound letter into $\text{ة}$ (MASH). When the $\text{س}$ and $\text{س}$ 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 o. $f.$ is transformed by quiescence of the $\text{ع}$ [through conversion of $\text{س}$ or $\text{س}$ into $\text{ة}$], or in a $n.$ conformable to such a $v.$, the $\text{ع}$ of that $v.$ or $n.$ is made quiescent in imitation of its
and, after the quiescence, the vowel [of the ُ] is transferred to that preceding quiescent, to notify the mode of formation [below], [i.e., the measure,] because the measures of the ُ vary only through the vowels of the ُ [482, 704]. This quiescence is principally in the ُ, not the ِ, because the ُ is heavier (R). When the ُ of the ُ [712] is a, or ُ preceded by a sound quiescent, the vowel of the ُ, being deemed heavy on the unsound letter, must be transferred to the sound quiescent, as ُ stands and ُ is plain, orig. ُ and ُ with ُ of the ُ, and Kasr of the ُ, the vowel of the ُ and ُ being transferred to the preceding quiescent, vid. the ُ of ُ and the ُ of ُ; so that the ُ and ُ become quiescent (A). In the augmented conjugs. [also] of these tril. vs. unsound [in the ُ], when the letter before the unsound letter is orig. quiescent, and is not an ُ, ُ, or ُ, you make the unsound [letter] quiescent, transferring its vowel to the quiescent; and that is regular in their speech, as أُبَانَ [below] and اسْتَعَادَ deemed tardy and اسْتَرَاتَ [697] أَحَافَ sought protection: but, when the letter before the unsound [letter] is mobile, it is not altered, as َخَتَارَ [706, 707], َحَتَانَ became accustomed, and َفَاتَ was measureable (S). And, when the vowels are transferred to the letter before the ُ and ُ, then, (1) if the vowel be Fatha, the
and ی are converted into ٰ, as یَهَلْبٰ and یَكَلْبٰ [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 Damma, their conversion into ی is not possible, because it follows only 

atha: so that they remain unaltered, as یَبُيِعٰ and یَقُومٰ [above]; except the , pronounced with Kasr, which is converted into ی, as یَطَيِعٰ [below] and یَقُومٰ [above]; orig. یَطَيِعٰ and یَقُومٰ, 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 Damma, or a ی when the vowel is Kasra (Sn),] is not altered by more than quiescence after the transfer, as above exemplified [in یَقُومٰ and یَيِبِسْ (Sn)]: (2) if not homogeneous with the vowel, is changed into a letter homogeneous with it, as (a) َأَبَانَ [above], orig. اَبِيّنَ and اَبِيّنَ, where the ی, when the Fatha is transferred to the quiescent, remains not homogeneous with it; and is therefore converted into ی, because orig. مُكِلٰ دة, and [now (Sn)] preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684]: (b) یَقُومٰ [above], orig. یَقُومٰ, 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.*, and

\( \text{يَبِيعُ} \) \( \text{يَقُومُ} \) and are not transformed in the same way as their *pret.*, on

the plea that the \( \text{,} \) and \( \text{ٰ} \), being mobile, and preceded by a letter constructively pronounced with Fath from

regard to the *o. f.*, vid. the *pret.*, should be converted into \( \text{ً} \), as \( \text{يَقَامُ} \) and \( \text{يَبِاعُ} \), because, if so treated, they

would be confounded with the *conjug.* of \( \text{يَخافُ} \) [above]

(R). And \( \text{مَعْوَلُ} \) and \( \text{مَفْعُولُ} \) are similar (SH), as \( \text{مَعْوَلٌ} \) and \( \text{مَيِّضُ} \) [333] (Jrb); and so is \( \text{مَفْعُولٌ} \) [697, 714], as

\( \text{مَيِّضُ} \) and \( \text{مَيِّضُ} \) [347, 709] (SH). The *n.* conformable to

the *v.* in this transfer is of two sorts, (1) the augmented * nihil.* commensurable with the *v.* in the manner above

mentioned under conversion of the \( \text{,} \) and \( \text{ٰ} \) into \( \text{ً} \), while
differing from the *v.* in an *aug.* letter [either] not used as an *aug.* in the *v.*, like the \( \text{م} \) of \( \text{مَقَامٌ} \) [712]; or

used as an *aug.* in the *v.*, [but] mobilized with a vowel not used as its vowel in the *v.*, like [the *v.* of] \( \text{يَبِيعُ} \) [712]:

(a) \( \text{مَفْعُولٌ} \) [above] is *orig.* \( \text{مُفْعَلٌ} \) [347, 712], which is commensurable with \( \text{يَفْعَلُ} \) [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 \( \text{م} \) [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
and the preceding letter is quiescent, [but] mobile in the o. f., [vid. the tril. pret.,] the vowel of the 

even if it be Fatha, is transferred to the preceding letter for observance of the mode of formation [above] in the v., or n. connected with the v., [not for distinction between the cats. of and ] because, in such [words], regard for the mode of formation is possible in those pronounced with Fatha of the 

as in those pronounced with Damm or Kasr; contrary to [those words which have] the [ ] pronounced with Fatha and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha, as قال and بَنَأ [705].

For here the ف is quiescent; so that, when it is mobilized with Fatha, and the إ is made quiescent, that [Fatha on the ف] is known to be the vowel of the 

and here the distinction between the cats. of and 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 تَسْبِيح [above], which, according to Khl, is orig. مَقَامُ تَسْبِيح [704]? And you say مَقَامُ and مَقَامُ and مُقَامُ and مُعْوَنُ and مُقَيِّمُ and يَبْنَأُ and يَتْهَبُ [above], sleeps at midday and
and ـَّـَل sleeping at midday and مَـقِيل [333]. Thus you see how, when they are obliged to transform the أ, because the words mentioned are conformable to their o. f's, 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 Fathā to the preceding letter; and do not mind confusion of the cat. of ۡو with that of ۡي (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 ۡقُوَّي hindered and ۡبَيِّنَ (above), or (b) a Hamza, as in يَأَيِّس aor. of ۡأَيِّسَ despairs, because it is liable to transformation by conversion into ۡيَأَيِّسَا for alleviation; so that it is, as it were, an ۡل, while ۡل does not receive a vowel (Sn)]: (a) that is categorically declared in the Tashih 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 ۡمَا أَقُوْمَةُ أَلْشَيۦ How plain the thing is! and ۡمَا أَقُوْمَةُ أَلْشَيۦ How upright it is!, and ۡأَقُومُ يِهِ and ۡأَقُومُ يِهِ, because they make it conform to the n. corresponding to it in measure and indication of excellence, vid. the أَقُومُ 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 \( \text{فَعْلُ} \) of superiority is only \( \text{مَا فَعْلَةُ} \), not \( \text{مَا فَعْلَةُ} \); but the latter is made to accord with \( \text{مَا فَعْلَةُ} \).

(b) Frd says “AH transmits from Ks that transfer is allowable in [the v. of] wonder, such as \( \text{أَقْصِمُ يَهُ} \), where you say \( \text{أَقْصِمُ يَهُ} \); but it is weak” (Sn): (b) reduplicated in the \( \mathfrak{L} \), as in \( 
\text{إِبْيَضَ} \text{was white and إِسْوَدَ} \text{was black [707]},
\)

which sort they do not transform, lest one paradigm be mistaken for another, because, if \( 
\text{إِبْيَضَ} \) were subjected to the transformation mentioned, \( 
\text{بَاهُ} \) would be said, which one might suppose to be \( 
\text{فَاعُلُ} \) [with Fath of the \( \text{ع} \) (Sn)] from \( 
\text{بِضَامَة} \) delicacy of complexion: (c) unsound in the \( \mathfrak{L} \), as in \( 
\text{أَخَرَى} \text{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 \( 
\text{فَاعُلُ} \) [by indicating constitution or color (Sn)], as in \( 
\text{يُصِيدُ} \text{and يُعْرُرُ} \text{aor. of حَرُرُ} \text{and صَيِّدَة} \text{[707]; and similarly their variations, as ٌأَعْرَةُ} \text{التَّلَاهُ} \text{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 \( 
\text{ع} \) of \( 
\text{فَعْلُ} \) and \( 
\text{نَفَعُ} \), when possessed of \( 
\text{أَفْعَلُ} \) ..... 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 اَنْعَلَ (Sn). The و and ی are elided (SH), (1) necessarily, in two positions, (а) where quiescence of the final happens to be necessitated by (а) attachment of the pron. (Jrb) in such as I said and پَعْتُ I sold [403, 697], They [fem.] said and پَعْتِ They [fem.] sold: (α) the initial is pronounced with Kasr, if the ع be [either] a ی , [as in پَعْتُ (Jrb);] or [ا و (Jrb)] pronounced with Kasr, [as in حْفَتْ (Jrb);] and with Damm in other cases (SH), as in قُلْتُ [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 اَنْعَلَ with Kasr of the ع (456, 707), does not have the J 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 لَسْتُ becomes like لَسْتُ [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 لَمْ يَفْعَلَ did not sell [697]; or quasi-apocopeation, as (Jrb) in فَلْ say and بَعِيَ sell [663, 697], because they are [deriv. (Jrb)] from قَبَعَ and قَبِعَ [428, 431] (SH), and therefore do not differ from them in Damma or Kasra [of the ف ] (Jrb): (b) in [such as (Jrb)] إِسْتِقَامَةٍ [above] (SH), orig. إِقْتَامٌ and إِسْتِقَامَةٍ [697], where they convert the ا into ل for conformity with إِقْتَامٍ and إِسْتِقَامَةٍ [above]; and, since two ل, the ل that is [converted from] the ا, and the aug. ل, then concur, the first is elided (Jrb) : (a) what IH mentions as to elision of the ل converted from the ا, or ل is the opinion of Akh [338]; while, according to Kh1 and S, the elided is the aug., as they say on the مَفْعُولُ [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 إِسْتِقَامَةٍ and إِسْتِقَامَةٍ is a repetition; but the answer is that they are mentioned above because of the conversion of the ا into ل, and here because of the lision (Jrb): (2) allowably, in such as (a) سَيْلٌ and مَيْتٌ [251, 635 (case 7, a, a)] (SH), which then remain سَيْلٌ and مَيْتٌ, with a single و (MASH); the second و being elided from them for alleviation, because of the combination of two و and a Kasra (Jrb): the poet ['Adi Ibn
ArRa'ila al-Ghassani (Jsh) says, [combining ميت and ميت in one verse (Jh).]

(1461)


(Jh, IY) 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) كينونة [331] and كينونة (Jsh) sleeping at midday (SH), with Fath of the ع (MASH): (a) this requires consideration (R, Jrb), because elision is allowable in such as كينونة, necessary in such as كينونة [below] (R); since ns. like كينونة and كينونة 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! كينونة being in the acc. as a sp. (Jsh): (b) there is no dispute that كينونة is altered from its of., because there is no فعلولة [331] in their language, except extraordinarily, like صفرة swerving, deflection, [an inf. n. of صفرة The arrow swerved, or deflected, from the butt, aor. يصف (Jh, KF)]: but the BB say that it is altered from كينونة [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 (Jrb): (e) according to S, such as َسِدَة and َمَيِّت are with Kasr of the غ [251, 373, 685, 716]; while َقِيَلَة and َكُونَة are َقِيَلَة and َكُونَة, with Fath of the غ, on the measure of [old woman (KF)], except that the ل is repeated, and the س inseparable: (d) since neither َقِيَلَة with Kasr of the غ, nor the inf. n. َقِيَلَة [331], is found in any formation other than the hollow, some judge and َمَيِّت to be orig. َقِيَلَة with Fath of the غ, like َصِرَف [373]; but pronounced with Kasr irregularly, like َبِصْرُي َغ ف with Kasr of the غ, and َدُحْرُي with Damm [311]: (α) S, however, says that, if they were [orig.] pronounced with Fath of the غ, they would not be altered; [but would be] like َنُبُوْيَان َهَيْبَان [390]: and the use of َقِيَلَة would be commonly allowable, whereas no َقِيَلَة has been heard from the hollow, except َعِيْشَاء, as َعِيْشَاء [251]: (e) Fr, also endeavouring to avoid the formation َقِيَلَة with Kasr of the غ, says that [251] is
orig. like طویل جریض; but that, the و [pronounced with Kasr] being transferred to the position of the ی, and the [quiescent] ی to the position of the ۸, [as چِوپن, ] the ۸ is converted into ی, and [has the quiescent ی ] incorporated [into it]: (α) he says that گویل 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 ی be not an ep., like گویل a wailing, it is not subjected to this transformation: (f) he says that گویل and the like are

orig. [above], like ۸ُهمول [252, 390]

and یُندُری chest, coffer: but that, since most of these
inf. ns. are scions of ی, as صار became, inf. n. صیروة [331], and یُارد سار journeyed, inf. n. یُارد, they pronounce the ف with Fath, so that the ی may be preserved, because the cat. belongs to ی [below]; and then make the scions of ۸ conform to those of ی, converting the [first]

[ینسیرر] into ی in گویل, for conformity with یُارد: (α) this is as he says that یُارد [247] is orig. یُارد, like یُارد [247]; but that, deeming the double ۸ heavy, they make it single, and put the ۸ 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 قَيِّعَلُ with كَسْر of the ع to the hollow, and of قَيِّعَلُ with فَاتُحَ of the ع to the ن. other than the hollow; and since, according to Fr, putting the ی [of the ا] before the ع, and, according to those others, transfer of قَيِّعَلُ with فَاتُحَ to قَيِّعَلُ with كَسْر, may be peculiar to the hollow, there is nothing to prevent the formation قَيِّعَلُ from being peculiar to it: and similarly there is nothing objectionable in peculiarity of قَيِّعَلُ [331] to the inf. n. of the hollow, or قَيِّعَلُ [247] with دَامَم of the ن to the pl. of the defective; while the saying of Fr that they make ی predominate over ع, because the cat. belongs to ین [above], is of no account, since inf. ns. of this measure are rare, and, in those which occur, the scions of ع, like كَيْنُونَةُ [above], قَيْدُونَةُ leading, and حَيْلُونَةُ intervenning, are near, or equal, in number to the scions of ی: (h) the reason why elision is necessary in such as Ки́нота and سِيلورَة كَي́نوتة, contrary to سِيد and مَيَت سِيد, is that the extreme number of letters reached by a ن. through augmentation is seven [368], while these contain six, to which the ی of feminization is invariably attached; so that, since alleviation is allowable in what has fewer letters, like سِيد, it is necessary in what has many, like Ки́نота: (3) rarely, in رَيْجَكَانُ قَيِّعَلَانُ, as sweet basil for رَيْجَكَانُ, orig.
from ِّ (R). The ِّ and ى are preserved in other cases, vid. where the causes of transformation and elision are (1) absent (M), as in قرَلَّ and بَيْعَ [above], and what resembles them (IY): (2) present, except that something intervenes, which prevents the execution of their behest, as in صَرْرَى [684 (condition 11, d), 711] and حَيْكَانُ [331, 684 (condition 11, a), 698, 711] and حَيْيَخَانُ [inf. n. of حَيْيَكَانُ, َيَعْيَعُكَ] ِّ قَرْبَاهُ [273] (M). Such as حَيْيَكَانُ and حَيْيَكِنِ [above], حَيْيَراَنَ [684 (condition 10, a, b), 698] and حَيْيَراَنَ [and حَيْيَكَانُ], are [treated as] sound, (1) to notify, by their mobility, the mobility of what they signify; while مَرْتَانُ is [conformable to حَيْيَراَنَ (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 ى 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 إِسْتِقَامَةٌ and. إِسْتِقَامَةٌ [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
Moreover جولان and علیان and دروازه [711] (R). Moreover جولان and علیان and دروازه [331, 719], in which the unsound letter is [treated as] sound, though it is a ج, which is weak, susceptible of alteration; so that the ع, which is stronger than the ج, because protected [by the subsequent letters of the word], should a fortiori be [treated as] sound. Similarly حیکاء and قوریاء are of the same formation as عثبة and جل سولتة, in which the unsound letter is [treated as] sound, though it is a ج, which is weak, susceptible of alteration; so that the ع, which is stronger than the ج, because protected [by the subsequent letters of the word], should a fortiori be [treated as] sound. Similarly حیکاء and قوریاء are not transformed, because of their remoteness from the formations of the ع, by reason of the two جs of feminization at their end; and, even if no ج of feminization occurred at their end, their formation would still necessitate their being treated as sound, like جل سولتة [711] and جل سولتة an inquisitive man, because of its remoteness from the formations of the ع. (IX).

§. 704. The tril. vs. unsound in the ع, (1) if the ع be ج, are of three kinds رفع ج and نعس ج, and not جد [482], like the sound: (2) if the ع be ج, are of two kinds, نعس ج and نعس ج, as though they discarded this formation in this cat. [of the hollow], because of that conversion of the ج into ج [686 (case 1)] which would ensue in the aor. (IX). One word of this conjug., however, does occur in the ج cat. of the hollow, vid. ج میا ج* جل which meaning The man became possessed of goodly appearance [705, 707], the ج of which is not converted into ج in the pret., because, if it were, then transformation of the aor., by
transfer of the vowel of the ِ to the letter before it and conversion of the ِ into ِ, would be necessary, because the aor. follows the pret. in [undergoing] transformation; so that you would say ُبَيَّنَ ِiating ِ, 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] ِ, are on [the measure of] (a) ِ، aor. ُيَفْعَلُ، as ِ، aor. ِيَقُولُ [697, 703] (M); not ِ، with Kasr, as [sometimes] occurs in the sound [482], lest the ِ, becoming ِ [685 (case 5)], the scions of be confounded with those of ِ (IY): (b) ِ، aor. ُيَفْعَلُ، as ِ، aor. ِيَكَانُ [697, 703] (M); not ِ، with Kasr, except in two words, ِ، aor. ِيَطْيَحُ، and ِ، aor. ِيَفْعَلُ، [below] (IY): (c) ِ، aor. ُيَفْعَلُ، as ِ، aor. ِيَكَانُ ِ، aor. ِيَجْرُدُ، i. e., became tall, and bountiful: (2) in the [cat. of] ِ, are on [the measure of] (a) ِ، aor. ُيَفْعَلُ، as ِ، aor. ِيَبْيِعُ [697, 703]: (b) ِ، aor. ُيَفْعَلُ، as ِ، aor. ِيَهْبُ [708]. And ِ، aor. ُيَفْعَلُ with Kasr does not occur in the [cat. of] ِ، nor ِ، in the [cat. of] ِ [below]. But Khl asserts that ِ، aor. ِيَطْيَحُ [703], and ِ، lost the way, aor. ِيَتَيَّشَاءُ، are ِ، aor. ِيَفْعَلُ [above], like ِ، aor. ِيَصْبُحُ [482, 700]; both being from ِ، 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 [above] with Kasr of the , (1) because you say I perished and I lost the way, with Kasr of their ن; whereas, if their pret. were , then would be said, with Damm; and, since that is not said, they are proved to be of the class of [below] 403, 484] : (2) because the aor. of , in the cat. of , is only [above] with Damm; so that, since they say , and , what we have said is proved. The o. f. of and is [703] and , 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 [685 (case 5)] (IY). But, according to him that says and , they are [from (below), being , aor. (IY).] like , aor. [above] (M). IH says that (R) طَلَّاح , aor. , and , aor. , according to those who say and , and , and [above], are anomalous (SH), on the ground that the pret. is [above] with
Fatḥ of the ʿ, the aor. of which, in the hollow belonging to the cat. of ʿ, is pronounced only with Damm of the ʿ (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 طَلَحُ, aor. يَطَلُحُ, is said, takes the pret. from طَلَحُ, aor. يَطَلُحُ, belonging to the cat. of ʿ, and the aor. from طَلَحُ, aor. يَطَلُحُ, belonging to the cat. of ʿ [above]. But the mentioned by Jh has not been heard: and, if it were authentic, طَلَحُ, aor. يَطَلُحُ, would not be compounded [of two dial. vars.]; but طَلَحُ, aor. يَطَلُحُ, would be like تَالُ, aor. يَقُولُ; and طَلَحُ, aor. يَطَلُحُ, like بَنَغُ, aor. يَبْيِغُ [above]. Nor is what IH says about anomalousness of any account, since, if طَلَحُ were like تَالُ [above], like ُطَلَحُ [403, 703, 705], would be said, with Damm of the ن, 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 [Inserted with] Damma on the [ع when a] ى occurs in ُيَهَيْرُ aor. of ُيَهَيْرُ [above] (R on the Preterite).

§ 705. Upon attachment of the [mobile] pron. of the ʿ, [vid. the َ of the 1st or 2nd pers., and the like
(IY),] they transmute \( \text{فعل} \), [when it is] from [the cat. of (IY)] \( \text{فعل} \), into \( \text{فعل} \); and, [when it is] from [the cat. of (IY)] \( \text{فعل} \), into \( \text{فعل} \): and then the Damma and Kasra are transferred to the ف, [after removal of the vowel orig. belonging to it (IY)];] so that \( \text{فعل} \), \( \text{فعل} \), and \( \text{فعل} \) [403, 703] are said (M). If you say “Why do you not assert that the o. f. of \( \text{فعل} \) \( \text{فعل} \) \( \text{فعل} \) is with Damm of the ﺪ, and dispense with the trouble of altering [the conjug.]?” one says [in reply] “That would not be correct, because \( \text{فعل} \) occurs only intrans. [432, 484]; whereas you say ﺪ ﺪ ﺪ I visited the sick and ﺪ ﺪ ﺪ I visited the friend, so that you find ﺪ to be [sometimes] trans.” (IY). IH’s saying about “the conjug. of ﺪ ﺪ ﺪ” [484] is an answer to the objection that ﺪ ﺪ ﺪ I ruled him and ﺪ ﺪ ﺪ I said it are orig. ﺪ ﺪ ﺪ, with Damm of the ﺪ, as is the opinion of Ks [below]; the Damma of the ﺪ being transferred to the ف, and the ﺪ [then] elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that ﺪ does occur trans.: and the answer is a denial that they are orig. pronounced with Damm of the ﺪ, because the unsound, when its case is dubious, is made to accord with the sound; while no ﺪ with Damm occurs trans. in the sound, so that they are orig. with Fath of the ﺪ.
The learned differ about the manner of the transition [from $\text{فعلت}$] to that [form $\text{فعلت}$]. Some say that $\text{فعلت}$ and $\text{فعلت}$ are orig. $\text{فعلت}$ and $\text{فعلت}$, with Fath of the $\text{ع}$; but that, since it is known that the $\text{ع}$ would be elided, because of the concurrence of two quiescents [663], upon its conversion into | [684, 703], and the cat. of $\text{ع}$, would [then] not be distinguishable from that of $\text{ع}$, [ $\text{فعلت}$ being, in either cat., reduced to $\text{فعلت}$, ] they transmute the former into $\text{فعلت}$ with Damm, and the latter into $\text{فعلت}$ with Kasr; and then the vowel of the unsound letter is transferred to the $\text{ب}$, and the $\text{ع}$ elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that $\text{فعلت}$ and $\text{فعلت}$ are said (Jrb on the Preterite). This is the opinion of many [described by R in §. 484 as "S and the majority of the GG,"] and among them KS [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 $\text{ع}$, 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. [ $\text{فعلت}$, $\text{فعلت}$, and $\text{فعلت}$]: and he points out that the Damm and Kasr are "for explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of the $\text{ع}$," [484] and $\text{ع}$, 161 a
respectively (Jrb). What is meant by “scions of [or 
(Jrb)]” is (Jrb, Sn) its deriv. (Sn), [i.e.,] the 
unsound [words] belonging to the cat. of, or 
(Jrb), [here] meaning the words whose ع is, [or ع] (Sn). 
His argument is that the ج and ع, being mobile, and 
preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, are con-
verted into [684, 703] and elided [663]; and afterwards 
the ن is pronounced with Damm in the cat. of, and 
Kasr in that of ع, 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 خفت and خفت 
[403, 703], between the ج and ع, they say that, if the 
vowel were for explanation [of the v. as one] of the 
scions of، دامم would be necessary in خفت: but, in 
reply to that, IH says that they pronounce [the ن] 
with Kasr in خفت for “explanation of the mode of 
formation” [484]. His argument is that indication of 
the mode of formation is more important than explana-
tion [of the v. as one] of the scions of، or ع, because 
the first pertains to the sense, and the second to the 
form: but that, since indication of the mode of forma-
tion is not possible for them in خفت and خفت، from fear 
of missing the object altogether, because, if they pro-
nounced the ن here with Fath, this would not indicate
the vowel of the ع, and moreover they would also omit the explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of ی; contrary to حَفْطُ and یِّبِتُ, which the Kasra shows to be orig. pronounced with Kasr of the ع, so that here they observe the explanation of the mode of formation (Jrb). And [what] we say [is this]:—The ـُ in قول, طُولٍ, حَوَبٍ and یِبِتُ, being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is converted into ۱ [684, 703]; so that they become طَالِ, حَاتِ, and ۱ُبَأَعَ and ۱ُجَّلَ: and, while the ۱ remains, it is impossible to notify the mode of formation in these conjugs., and that they are orig. [on the measure of] فعل [704], فعل, فَعَلٍ; because the ۱ must be preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; but, when the mobile nom. prons. are attached to them, the ۱ must be made quiescent, for the reason known [20, 403, 607, 692]; and, the ۱ being then elided in all of them, because of the two quiescents [663], what prevented the notification of the measure, i. e., the ۱, 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 ب with a vowel like what was on the ع in the o. f., because the variation in the measures of the tril. v. is only through the vowels of the ع [482, 704]: but,
this notification not being possible in 

\( \text{ناً} \) with Fāṭh of the 

\( \text{ع} \), as \( \text{بِعَ} \) and \( \text{بِعَ} \), where the vowels of the \( \text{ف} \) and 

\( \text{ع} \) are alike, they omit it; and notify the mode of forma-

tion in 

\( \text{نَعُ} \) and 

\( \text{نَعُ} \) only: so that in 

\( \text{حَنَّاكَ} \) and 

\( \text{حَنَّاكَ} \) they say 

\( \text{هَبْتُ} \) and 

\( \text{هَبْتُ} \), equalizing the cats. 

\( \text{فُرْ} \) and 

\( \text{ي} \) [in Kasr of the \( \text{ف} \)], because the important 

[object] is to notify the mode of formation; and in 

\( \text{فُرْ} \), as \( \text{مَالَ} \), they say 

\( \text{لَدْنَتْ} \) [721], the Damma being 

for explanation of the mode of formation, not for 

explanation of the [v. as a scion of], because of what 

we have [just] mentioned, and [because] in this 

conjug. 

no hollow [v.] belonging to the cat. of 

occurs, which they might equalize with the cat. of, in Damm [of the 

\( \text{ف} \)], as they equalize the two [cats. in Kasr] in [the 

conjug. of] 

\( \text{فُرْ} \) and 

\( \text{فُرْ} \) [above], except 

\( \text{هَيَرُ} \) [704], the \( \text{ي} \) of which is not converted into \( \text{l} \), as we 

mentioned: and, since they have finished notifying the 

mode of formation in the conjug. of 

\( \text{فُرْ} \) and 

\( \text{فُرْ} \), while 

the like of that [notification] is not possible in 

\( \text{فُرْ} \), they intend in its case to notify the cats. of \( \text{ف} \) and 

\( \text{ي} \), and the distinction between them, as the saying goes 

\( \text{إِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ حَلْلُ ٓخَلْصُرُّ} \). If there be not any vinegar, then 

wine; so that, after elision of the \( \text{l} \) because of the two 

quiescents, they import Damma into 

\( \text{قَالَ} \), putting it in 

place of the Fāṭh [on the \( \text{ف} \)], and similarly Kasra
into ٌبَعَ, in order that the first may indicate the ٌء, and the second the ى (R on the Preterite). Mž asserts that they transmute ٌبَعْ and َقَامَ into َvenient, and َقَاتَ and َمْبَعَا [above] (IY). And Akh told us that some of the Arabs say ٌرِبَى ٌيَفْعَلُ Zaid was near doing and َمَا ٌرِبَى ٌيَفْعَلُ َذَاٌكَ Zaid has not ceased doing that, meaning َرَأَى and َكَانَ (S). But [Z says that] they do not transmute without the [mobile] pron. [of the ag.] (M), because َقُرِلَ َبِعْ and would be mistaken for the pass. in َبِعَ ٌرِبَى Zaid was sold and َقُرِلَ َتَقْوَ The saying was said, in the dial. of those who say that [436, 706] (IY); except in the say- َمَا ٌرِبَى ٌيَفْعَلُ َذَاٌكَ and َكَيدَ ٌيَفْعَلُ َكَذَا [above] trans- mitted from some of the Arabs (M), whence

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 is َفَعَلَ [463, 626], and so is َرَأَى, that being proved by the aor. ٌيَكَانَ [482] and ٌيَرَى [447]: but they transfer the Kasra from the ٌع to the ٌب, after eliding the vowel of the ٌب, so that the word becomes ٌكِيَبَ and ٌرَأى; and
they do not fear its being mistaken for جعل، because
both [vs.] are intrans. (IY).

§. 706. When the ع of the pret., [either] tril., like
قُدِ [in the cat. of ج. (Tsr)] and باع [in that of ی (Tsr)],
or on [the measure of (Tsr)] یُنفَعُل or ی又被ع، like
choose [in the cat. of ی (Tsr)] and نقاد ی انفعَل.submitted [in that
of ج. (Tsr)], is unsound, then [in the pass.] you may
pronounce the preceding letter with (1) Kasr, (a) pure,
[which is the dial. of كِرِاش and their neighbours
(Tsr)]; (b) smacking of ذَمَم، [which is the dial. of
many of كِرِاش and most of the بَنِى أَسَد (Tsr) : (a)
the ج is then, in either case, converted into ی: (2) pure
ذَمَم، the ج being then converted into ی، as جَلَف جَلَف
[436], which [dial. (Tsr)]
is rare; but [is found in the speech of Hudhail; and
(Tsr)] is attributed to [all of (Tsr)] فاكَّاس and Dubair
(Aud on the Pro-agent), who are among the chaste
speakers of the بَنِى أَسَد; and is said by IUK in his
commentary on the Tashfil, and by RShit, to be trans­
mitted from the بَنِى ذَبَّابا; and by IHSh to be
transmitted from some of تَمَّم [Notes on pp. 122,
123] (Tsr): (a) it is asserted by Ibn ‘Udhra [and a band
of the modern Westerns (Tsr)] to be disallowed in انفَعَل
and انفَعَل (Aud), like جُنَفَل and انفعَل، which exceed
three [letters]; so that اخْتَوَرَ and أَنْفُرَ 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 يَقِيلَ and بَيْعَ, [i. e., the tril. pret. pass. (Jrb),] has three dial. vars., (1) [pure (MASH)] ي (SH), which is the chastest of them (MASH): (a) يَبِيعُ is orig. يَبِيعُ: then they make the ي quiescent, from dislike to Kasra upon it after ؤamma; so that, a quiescent ي preceded by ؤamma being produced, the ف is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the ي may be sounded true: (b) then يَقِيلَ is made to conform to يَبِيعُ: (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) Ishnâm (SH), i. e., making the ف smack of ؤamma, for notification of the o. f.: (a) this dial. var. is chaste (Jrb): (3) [pure] قُرْوُل (SH): (a) قُرْوُل is orig. قُرْوُل: but, disliking Kasra upon the , after ؤamma, they elide it, so that قُرْوُل becomes قُرْوُل: (b) then they make قُرْوُل 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. قُرْوُل 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, َّطَلَعْ and َّطَّعَ remaining, (a) some convert the quiescent ى into ِ, because of the Damma of the preceding letter, saying َّرَعْ and َّرَعَ [436], which is the rarest of the dial. vars.: (b) the better [course] is to convert the Damma into Kasra in the cat. of ى, so that َّطَّعَ remains, because alteration of a vowel is less [disturbing] than alteration of a consonant [above], and also because َّطَّعَ is lighter than َّرَعَ; and then to make َّرَلُل conform to َّطَّعَ, because, like the latter, unsound in the ُع; so that, its ُع being pronounced with Kasr, the quiescent ى is converted into ى: (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, َّطَّعَ and َّرَلُل remaining, the quiescent ى is converted into ى, because of the Kasra of the preceding letter, as in مَيَّزَن [685 (case 5)]: (b)
some of them, says he, make the ğ equiescent, but do not transfer the Kasra to the preceding letter: so that the ıremains in its [original] state; while the ğ is converted into ı, because of [its quiescence and] the Đamma of the preceding letter [636 (case 1)]: but this is the rarest of the *dial. vars.*, because Đamma and ı are heavy; and the first is better, because Kasra and ğ 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) RSht says "There are three ways, vide compressing the lips (a) while pronouncing the ğ, so that its vowel is between the vowels of Đamm and Kasr, which is the well-known, notorious [way], used in reading [the Kur]; (b) while making the Kasra of the ț pure; (c) a little before pronouncing the Kasra of the ț, 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
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 ی 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 ی becomes clear" [436] (Tsām). The essence of this Ishmām [436, 668, 697] is your directing the Kasra of the ی of the v. towards Damma, so that the subsequent quiescent ی may incline a little towards ی, 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 ی; 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 ی; 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] (IH). IH says "The object of Ishmām is to announce that the initials of these words are
origin. pronounced with َدِسمَ " (R on IH). But, if that [mobile nom. pron. (Jrb)] which makes the ُنَوَمَ quiescent [403] be attached to the cat. of لَيْلَ and بَيْعَ, as بَيْعَةَ ٍبَا عُبْدُ Thou wast sold, O slave and بَيْعَةَ ٍبَا قُرْلَ Thou wast said, O saying [below], then [also three dial. vars. are allowable (Jrb),] Kasr [of the ف (Jrb)], Ishmām, and َدِسمَ (SH). The ُعَ 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 َدِسمَ; (3) pure َدِسمَ (R). IM asserts that what is ambiguous, whether Kasr, as in جُفْتُ and بَيْعَةَ جُفْتُ, or َدِسمَ, as in بَيْعَةَ جُفْتُ, [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 جَعْفَتَيْنَ َبْيَدُ Zaid feared me and بَعْنَيْنِ لَسْرُ, sold me to ‘Amr and عَاطَنِي عَنْ كَذَا hindered me from doing such a thing: then you [suppress the ag., and (Tsr)] put the vs. into the pass., [substituting a ت for the ِ of the 1st pers. (Tsr)]; so that, if you said جُفْتُ I was feared and بَيْعَةَ جُفْتُ I was sold with Kasr [of the خ and ب (Tsr)], and بَيْعَةَ جُفْتُ I was hindered with َدِسمَ [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., خَفْتُ and خَفَتُ (Tsr);] and Ishmām or Kasr in the third, [i. e., خَفْتُ (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 ِب when pronounced with Ḍamm in the act., and Ḍamm of the ِب 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 مَخْتَار choosing, or chosen, [an act. or pass. part, its] being converted from a ی pronounced with Kasr or Fath, respectively (Tsr, Sn),] and تَضَارُر II. 233. shall harm, or be harmed (Aud, A), orig. تَضَارُر (K, B), act. or pass., the first, being pronounced [before the incorporation (Sn)] with Kasr or Fath, respectively
(Tsir, 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 (Sn). 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 َعَفِيْتُ ِيَا ُعْبِدُ and َقُلْتُ ِيَا ُقُرْوُلَ and َعَفِيْتُ ِيَا ُعْولَ Thou wast feared, O terror, pure Damm 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 Damm [or Ishmām] in the two others (R on SH). And the cat. of َحْتَيْرِ and إِخْتَيَرِ [i.e., of َأَفْتَعِلْ and َأَفْتَعِلْ from the hollow (R),] is like that of َبِيْعَ َقَيْلَ and َبِيْعَ [in allowability of the three modes (R)] in both (SH) cases mentioned under َقَيْلَ, i.e., absence, and attachment, of “that which makes the َل quiescent” [above], the sense being that, in both cases, َخْتَيَرِ and إِخْتَيَرِ, like َقَيْلَ and َقَيْلَ, have three states, [vid. in the first case] pure ُي, which is the chastest; and Ishmām; and [pure] ُؤُخُتَرُ and ُؤُخُتَرُ [486]: and similarly [in the second case] pure
Kasr, which is the best known, like إِنْ تَقْدِينَ إِخْتُرْنَ; and Ishmām; and [pure] Damm, like إِنْ تَقْدِينَ إِخْتُرْنَ (MASH): contrary to the cat. of أَقْرِمَ أَقْرِمْ (SH), because Damm and Ishmām are allowable only in consequence of the Damm of the letter before the و, and ي; whereas in أَقْرِمَ أَقْرِمْ, أَقْرِمَ أَقْرِمْ, and أَقْرِمَ أَقْرِمْ, 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 و and ل [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 R.Sht (Sn).

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

§. أَقْرِمُ يُبِعُ (Jrb), How well Zaid speaks! and مَّا أَقْرِمُ (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 اَنْعَلُ of superiority [351, 703] and the ep. اَنْعَلُ مَنْهَ (2) (SH), i.e., the اَنْعَلُ of superiority (R, Jrb), as رَيْثُ اَقْوَلُ مَنْ عَمْرَ Zaid is a better speaker than 'Amr and أَبْيَعُ 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 اَنْعَلُ imputing a saying and of the اَنْعَلُ of superiority from قَوْلُ 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 لَتْلُ [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 اَنْعَلُ, when a n., complete, in order to
distinguish it from the plastic v. [أَفْعَلْ] and [703] (S): but he makes the v. of wonder conform to it (Jrb), [saying that] the [above] is complete, because its sense is that of

a greater doer than thou and the greatest doer of mankind; and similarly [أَفْعَلْ] مَّا أَفْعَلْ أَلَّا س [أَفْعَلْ], because i. q. مَا أَفْعَلْهُ (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” [above], since the أَفْعَلْ 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 [703]: and, though the [two] kinds of ns. [there] described are [so] transformed, as already explained, still the condition of the augmented kind commensurable with the v., when we intend its إِلَّا to be transformable, is that it should be different from the v. in some respect [703, 712]; whereas this [n.] does not differ from the v. in anything: (c) [if any excuse for the omission to transform were required,] his [second] saying “because it might be mistaken” would suffice (ل); [492, 684 (condition 9, a)], because i. q. [703] (SH), i. e., [أَفْعَلْ] تَقَامَلْوَا (Jrb): (a) if the sense of تَقَامَلْ would suffice.
not intended in إِنْتَفَأَ, you transform [the ا in] it, as [sought out (M.A.R)] and [خُتَتَرَ (703, 706): (4) [the conj. of [غَدَرَ (684 (conditions 7, 8, b)), [سُوْدَ (703], and إِصْبَدَ [below], because the transformation of such as أَقَّمَ and إِسْتَفْقَمَ [703], besides being contrary to the general rule, [since the أ is not preceded by a letter pronounced with فاث,] is only for conformity with the transformed tril. [قَامَ]; whereas there is no transformed tril. here (R): (5) the conj. of [غَرَّأَ] became blind of one eye and [سُوْدَ became black [714], because of ambiguity [below] (SH), since, if the أ were converted into I, its vowel being transferred to the preceding letter, the conj. Hamza and one of the two I's would be elided; so that عَارَ and سَانَ 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 أ or أ is preceded by a quiescent, is its being a deriv. of a v. whose transformation is authorized, as in أَتَقَامَ and إِسْتَقْمَمَ [703]; whereas غَزَرَ and بِحَرَ and إِسْوَدَ and إِعْوَرَ are not transformed, so that إِسْوَدَ and إِعْوَرَ might be made conformable to
them; nay, the case is reversed [below]: (b) if indeed it be asked "How is it that إِسْرَأَعَ and إِعَوْارَ are not transformed, when they appear to be like ۲۱۰۳ [703]?", the answer is that there is a distinction between them, vid. that the cause [of transformation] exists in ۲۱۰۱, not in إِسْرَأَعَ [or إِسْرَأَعَ] (R): (6) the *conjunct* of (MASH) became blind of one eye and سُودَ became black [and صِيدَ (S, Jh, M)], because i. q. إِسْرَأَعَ and إِعَوْارَ (SH) and إِسْرَأَعَ [above] (Jh), since the original *conjuncts* for colors and external defects are ۴۹۳A; so that, though the *trill* is the original of the augmented in form, still, since these two *conjuncts* are original in sense the case is reversed [above], the *trill* 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) ۴۴۷ is made quiescent [in the ع] from لَيْسَ, like صِيدَ [456, 703], as they say علمَ for عَلِمَ [482]: but they make it permanently quiescent, because, not being as plastic as its congeners, it is not put into the form of [the v., like (IY), صِيدَ, [where the ع is sounded true (IY),] or هَلَبَ, [where the ع is transformed (IY);] but into the form of what is [a pure p. (IY),] not a v., as لَيْسَ: (b) for the same reason they do not transfer the vowel of the ع to
the 

(703) (M), لْسَنَا I) : (c) the proof that the ع [of ليس] is [orig.] pronounced with Kasr is that Fatha of the ع is not elided, ضرب not being said [for علَم], as عَلَم is said for عَلَم [Note on p. 246, l. 2]; and that the conj. of نَعَل with دَامَم [of the ع] does not occur in the ي cat. of the hollow, except هَبُوت [704], which is anomalous (R): (7) the variations of those [vs. (Jrb)] whose ع is sounded true, like (a) فأَغْرَتْهُ إِسْتَعْرَتْهُ (SH), if you were to form عَرَرْ عَرَرْ (M), and أَصْبِبَ اللَّهُ بعْرَة إِسْتَعْلَتْ (S, M), because their o. f. صيد عَرَرْ is not transformed, so that they might be conformable to it in transformation (R); and [similarly (R)] (b) مُبْاَيْعَ and مُقْاَإْلَ (SH), act. parts. of قَلَّ and بآَّبَع [683 (case 1, a), 703] (Jrb), and عارَر [683 (case 2), 708] (SH), because the transformation of such as جَلَّ and بآَّبَع is for conformity to its transformed v. [684, 703], whereas the vs. of these things are not transformed (R); and (c) أَسْوَدَ [348, 712] (SH), the ep. أَنْفَعَ [above] from سيَّنَ (MASH). But sometimes the conj. of فعل from [inf. ns. denoting] defects is transformed, as

God caused his camel to have the disease termed صيد (S, M), because their o. f. صيد عَرَرْ is not transformed, so that they might be conformable to it in transformation (R); and [similarly (R)] (b) مُبْاَيْعَ and مُقْاَإْلَ (SH), act. parts. of قَلَّ and بآَّبَع [683 (case 1, a), 703] (Jrb), and عارَر [683 (case 2), 708] (SH), because the transformation of such as جَلَّ and بآَّبَع is for conformity to its transformed v. [684, 703], whereas the vs. of these things are not transformed (R); and (c) أَسْوَدَ [348, 712] (SH), the ep. أَنْفَعَ [above] from سيَّنَ (MASH). But sometimes the conj. of فعل from [inf. ns. denoting] defects is transformed, as
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 لَمْ تَعَارَنَّ with the single corrob. لى, for which the poet substitutes the ١ of pause [614, 649, 684] (IY). And he that says عَار and إِسْتَعَارَ and أَعَارَ (SH), its deriv. also being then transformed (R). Such [formations], however, as أُجَرِت I made good (M), whence صَدَب ٣٣٨, whence أَطُوْلَت (IY), إِسْتَحْوَدُ [703], إِسْتَرْجِعُ [565] فأَطُوْلَتِّ الْحُجُّ (case 6, c), 699 (M), as إِسْتَحْوَدُ عَلَيْهِمْ ٱلسَيِّةَ (IY). LVIII.

20. The devil hath gotten the mastery over them (IY), أَطَيْبَتُ إِسْتَنْقَبَ (IY), I found pleasant, أُحِبَّتُ أَعْلَتُ أُخْلَت rakdhah أُرِئَتُ in HB’s reading حَتَّى إِذَا أُخْلَتَ ٱلْأَرَضُ زَخْرُنَّهَا وَأُرِئَتُ X. 25. [Until when the earth taketh its garniture, and becometh possessed of adornment (K, B)] on the measure of أَفْلَكُ (IY), and becamlike 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 ٣ and ٤, when near the end [of the word], and preceded by an aug. ١, are converted into ١, provided that, to the cause requiring conversion [684,
703], another requirer be adjoined, because the cause is then weak through the separation of the ʿ and ʾ from the Fatha by the ʿ, and their not being at the end. That [other] requirer is (1) either resemblance to the transformed ʿ. [703], or conveyance of its sense, and exercise of its government [703], as in قائم [343] and باتع [below]: (2) enclosure of the ʿ 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 أرأئل [703, 715], and همئل، pls. of عجتا، باتعة، and (3) the ʿ, and ʾ's being in the ultimate pl. in whose sing. they are aug. letters of prolongation, as in كباير [717] and [661], because of the intention to distinguish the two aug. letters of prolongation from the ʿ and ʾ that have a vowel in the sing., whether they be rad., as in مقاوم and معليش، pls. of مقامة and معيشة [717]; or aug., as in عتبار and جداول [253], pls. of عتبار and جداول [374]: since that [ʿ or ʾ] which has an original vowel, being harder and stronger, is not converted. But, when the ʿ and ʾ are far from the end, as in طاووس [pl. of طاووس peacock (KF)], they are not converted into ʿ [715]. According to this, it is plain to you that the Hamza in such as ʿس and ʾس [683 (case 1), 723], ʿائل and ʾائل ʿائيه.
[683 (case 2)], \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ورأئن}} \) and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \), [683 (case 4), 715], and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) [683 (case 3), 717], is orig. \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) converted from \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \). For, since mobilization of the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) is needed, [in order to avoid a concurrence of two quiescents] while its conversion into \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) or \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) is disallowed, because we have only just escaped from them, it is converted into a letter that, after \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \), and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \), is most akin to it, vid. Hamza, because both are guttural [732]. The first \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) is not elided [723]; for avoidance of] the two quiescents, as is necessary in the like [663], because the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) of such as \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) is the sign of the act. part., and the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) of such as \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) is the sign of the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \); while such as \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \), if the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) were elided, would be confounded with the abbreviated. But, as for the Hamza in such as \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) [246, 683 (case 3, a), 717], it is a subst. for the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) in the sing., not for the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) converted from \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) or \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) (R). The \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) are converted into Hamza [below] in [the act. part. of the unaugmented tril. (Jrb),] such as \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) [683 (case 2), 703, 712], whose \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) is transformed; contrary to \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) [below] (SH). The saying of the G, in this cat., "The \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) and \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) are converted into Hamza" [above] is not in accordance with reality, because the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) is converted into \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) [683 (case 2, c)], which is then converted into Hamza; so that the \( \overset{\text{موانع}}{\text{ربآكير}} \) and
\(\text{ṣ} \) seem to be converted into Hamza (R). The o. fs. of َعَلَّ and بَيْعَ السَّلَّ, 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 \(\text{ṣ} \) is therefore converted into َ, either because they do not take the preceding َ into account; so that the unsound letter, coming, as it were, immediately after the Fataha, is converted into َ, as being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fata [684, 705]: or because they consider the َ equivalent to Fata [697], as being an augmentation of the latter, and having the same essence and outlet. And, since two َ s 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 َ [732]. But to dot [the \(\text{ṣ} \) representing] the Hamza, as H dots it, in the "Speckled Epistle", in such as َلَلَّ, where he says َلَلَّ, where he says َلَلَّ. And the gift of his hands has been abundant, is a mistake (Jrb): As for ُعَباَرُ [683 (case 2), 707].
[above], and the like, the \( \text{ع} \) [in them] is sounded true, not converted into Hamza, because sounded true in the v., as \( \text{ع} \) and \( \text{ع} \) [707], since the act. part. is conformable to its v. in respect of sounding true and transformation \( [683 \text{ (case 2, b)}] \); and, for the same reason, the \( \text{ع} \) is sounded true in \( \text{مُبَأَيِّن} \), \( \text{مَقاَم} \), and the like [707], because sounded true in \( \text{بَأَيْن} \) and \( \text{قَارِم} \) [703] (IY). Some of the Arabs transpose the \( \text{ع} \) and \( \text{ج} \) in some act. parts. of the hollow, and then subject the act. part. to the same transformation as \( \text{قَافِض} \) [16, 719], as

\[
\text{لَا هِيَ اَلْأَلْسِيَّة} \cdot \text{وَ الْعَبْرَ}.
\]

[by Al' Ajjāj (S), Wherein the things, and the lote-trees growing on the banks of the streams, are tangled (MAR)] and

\[
\text{فَتَتَعَرَّفْنِي إِنْذَا أَنَّا ذَاتُمُ} \cdot \text{فَهَا سَلَاحِي فِي} \cdot \text{الْحَوْادِي} \cdot \text{مَعْلُومٌ}.
\]

(R), by Ṭarīf Ibn Tamīm al' Ambarī (S, I Ath) at Tamīmī (I Ath). 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 Khī [below] into venturing upon transposition in the whole act. part. of the hollow whose \( \text{ج} \) is a Hamza. For he says that, since they transpose the \( \text{ع} \) and \( \text{ج} \) of the hollow] sound in the \( \text{ج} \), from fear of a single Hamza
after the I, they are more inclined to escape from the combination of two Hamzas. And similarly, since he sees them say شراح, by transposition, for [شموتَع] pl. of شمْطَع dispersed, he says that in such as خطاباً and [661, 726], and جوَآه and [248, 726], transposition is more appropriate. But the answer is that they resort to transposition in لاث and only from fear of Hamza after the I; whereas, in such as جَآه [below], one Hamza after the I is inseparable, whether the J and ع be transposed, or not (R). And [S says that (R)] most of the Arabs say شال and لاث (S, R), by elision of the ع (R). But such as شال and لاث are anomalous (SH). شال is from شِوَّة, i.e., vehemence of prowess or valour (IY, Jrb), and point or edge, and weapon (IY); or [from] قد شال أَلِبِّجُلُ (Jh, KF), inf. n. شَرُك, i.e., The man's vehemence of prowess or valour, and his sharpness, have been displayed (Jrb). It has three forms [of act. part. (Jrb)]:—

(1) شَائِكِ (276), with Hamza, according to rule (IY, Jrb), like بَّائِعُ and قَائِمُ [above] (IY); (2) شَاءِ (276, 278), by relegation of the ع to the position of the J, [its measure being فَافِع (Jrb), of the class of the defective (IY),] like قَائِمِ [16] (IY, Jrb) and عَارِ [685] (IY):
(a) similarly *لَآ إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَلََّٰهُ* [278], from *عَلَى رَأْسِهِ* He wound the turban upon his head, aor. *بَلْوُتُ* (IY, Jrb), inf. n. *لَّوُتُهُ* (Jrb); and *هَارُ* , as IX. 110. [276], i. e., *هَآئِرُ* (IY): (3) *لَآ أَلْدَأَلْ* [276, 278], by elision of the *ع* [above] (IY, Jrb). Z says in the K [on IX. 110.] (Jrb), *هَأْلْ* is [i. q.] *هَآئِرُ* , i. e., cracked, on the point of being demolished and falling: but its measure is *فَعَلُ*, abbreviated from *فَعَلْنِلَْ*; like *حَلْفُ* [pregnant she-camels (Jh, KF)] from *حَلْفَتْ* ; while its counterparts are *شَأَلْ* [711] and *صَّبُتْ* *شَأَتْكَ* : and its *لَهْ* is not the *ل* of *نَفَعْلَ*; but only its *ع*, the o. f. being *هِيَرَ* , *شَوْكُ* , and *صَوْبُ* *شَأَتْكَ* (K, Jrb). And [R says that] *لَآ أَلْدَأَلْ* and *شَأَلْ* *لَرَثْ* , *شَوْكُ* , *صَوْبُ* *شَأَتْكَ* and *خَلْفُ* [343], like *عَمَلِهِ* and *لَيْسُ عَمَلِهِ* and *كُبْشُ صَافِئًا* [312], in which case they are like *كُبْشُ صَافِئًا* [708] and *رَأْحُ* *رَأْحُ* , *وَسِعَة* *رَأْحُ* , *وَسِعَة* *رَأْحُ* , *وَسِعَة* *رَأْحَٰلَ* (*windy day* (R). But this is contrary to what Z mentions in the M, about what has a *رَاء* letter elided from it, and not restored in the *دِيمَ* [276], which is confirmed by what IH mentions in the CM on this passage of the M, vid. that *هَأْلْ* may not be *فَعَلُ*, because Z lays down that a letter is elided from it; nor transposed, because its predicament would be like [that of]
[above], where the ێ is quasi-expressed, its elision being accidental, as [you see in] I saw a little judge; so that it must be ئە پەل، its ئ being elided: while this [conclusion] is corroborated by what is mentioned in some of the Glosses (Jrb). The o. f. of ەژار and ژاژەر is ژاژەر and ژاژەر: so that the ێ is irregularly elided; the rule being to convert it into Hamza [above], as ژاژەر and ژاژەر, which also occur, on the measure of ژاژەر (Sn on the Diminutive): [er] it seems that they convert the ئ into ١, and then elide the ١ because of the two quiescents; and do not mobilize [it], in order to escape from Hamza: the elided [١] being apparently the second, because the first is the sign of the act. part. (R): [or] these [Arabs] elide the Hamza (S). Their measure is, therefore, ژاژەر [by elision of the ئ, considered as ژاژەر or ژاژەر or Hamza, from ژاژەر]. Some say that the aug. ێ is elided, and the ئ converted into ١, because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath. Their measure is then ژاژەر with quiescence of the ئ from regard to its state after conversion, and with Kasr of the ئ from regard to its state before conversion. But A proceeds on [the assumption] that the elided is the ئ, since he says "And ژاژەر by restoration of the elided is
anomalous” [276]; because the discussion is on restoration of the rad., not of the aug., elided (Sn). And about such as جامع [661] there are two sayings:—(1) Khl [above] says that it is transposed, like شاذ: (2) it is said [by others] to be [formed] according to rule (SH). But قاعل [247, 373] is treated as sound, like what is not a n. [on the measure] of a v. [703, 712]: you say قاول and بايع (S).

§. 709. When [the pass. part. (MKh)] مفعول is formed from the ِّئيل. (MKh)] v. whose و is unsound, ال or the, the same transfer and elision are necessary as in استفadult [338, 697, 703, 714]; so that from ِّئال and قال you say مبيع and مقول [347, 703]. The o. f. is مبوع and مقول: but the vowel of the و is transferred to the preceding quiescent; and, since two quiescents, the و and the of مفعول, then concur, the of مبيع is elided (IA), according to S (MKh) مبيع ought to be said for مبيع (IA), like موقُول for ميِّقن [686] (MKh); but they convert the دامن into كَسْرا, in order that the و may be sounded true (IA). The elided, (1) according to S, is the, 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 ٰ in the pass. part. [of the hollow] belonging to the cat. of ٰ remains extant, as مَبُيِّع, he opines that in it the ٰ [of مَفْعُول] is the [quiescent] elided, and then extends this decision to the hollow belonging to the cat. of ٰ: (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 ٰ and ٰ respectively, which, if the first [quiescent] were elided, would be liable to confusion, one with another: (d) when the ٰ of مَفْعُول is elided, the Damma is pronounced as Kasra, in order that the ٰ may be preserved, by analogy to the saying of S on such as تَبَيِّع from تَبَيِّع [710] (R): (2) according to Akh, is the ۡ: [that is plain in the cat of ٰ (MASH)]; while [in the cat. of ٰ (MASH)] the ٰ of مَفْعُول is, according to him, converted into ٰ 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 ٰ and ٰ, as is the rule in a concurrence of two quiescents: (b) it being said to him “Then, according to thee, مَبُرِع ought to remain: so what is this ٰ in مَبُيِّع؟”, he said “When the Damma 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]: (c) this requires consideration, because it is only when the ی is going to remain that it is entitled to have the یamma 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 یamma 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), S 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 یamma [710], though the ی [so converted] is going to remain; whereas here he converts the یamma 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] (Ts′r). The [effect of the dispute appears in the (Ts′r)] measure [of مصروع preserved
(A), which (Ts')], according to S, is مَفْعُولٌ [with Damma of the ف, and quiescence of the إ (Sn)]; and, according to Akh, is مَفْعُولٌ (A, Ts'). And the utility of the dispute is displayed in such as مَسْرُوًى vexed, [orig. مُسْرُوًى on the measure of مَفْعُولٌ (Sn)], when alleviated [658] (A), by changing its Hamza into، and then incorporating the، of مَفْعُولٌ into it, according to the opinion of Akh; or by transferring the vowel of the Hamza to the، which is an إ, and then eliding it, according to the opinion of S [below] (Sn). IJ says, F having asked me about the alleviation of مَسْرُوًى, I said "According to the saying of Akh, I say رَآِيَتُ مَسْرُوًى I saw a vexed, as you say مُقَرَّرٌ مَسْرُوًى [658], because, according to him, the، of مَفْعُولٌ is the، of مَسْرُوًى; but, according to the opinion of S [above], I say حَبْبُ مَسْرُوًى, as you say حَبْبُ مَسْرُوًى [by elision of the Hamza after transfer of its vowel to the ب (Sn)] for حَبْبُ [658], the، being mobile, because, in his opinion, it is the إ"; and F then said "So it is" (A), i.e., the alleviation of مَسْرُوًى, because the mobile Hamza, when the [quiescent]، before it is a non-co-ordinative aug., is converted into، and has the [preceeding]، incorporated into it; but, when the [quiescent]، before it is a rad., has its vowel transferred to the، and is elided [658] (Sn). But مُشْوِبُ مَشِيبٌ mixed, [as
(Jh, IY), by AlMukhball 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 يُشْوَب, aor. يُشْوِب, [inf. n. يُشْوَب mixing (MAR),] and مَنْيِلْ for given, from نَال gave, aor. يَنْوَل, and مَلْوِم blamed, as though formed according to [the pass. (Jh)] was mixed [436, 706] was given, and لِمْ was blamed, are anomalous; as likewise is مُهَوِّب[dreaded (Jh), as
وَ تَأْوِي إِلَى رَفَافٍ مَسَاكِينِ ذُوْحُم لهم فَ دَعُوْتَ إِلَى ذِكْرِهِ مَهْووب (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 هُوَبُ dread, as though formed according to [the dial. of those who say in (IY) the pass. (Jh, IY)] [436, 706] (R). The Banu Tamim treat the cat. of ي as sound; [but not the cat. of د, because ي is lighter to them than د (Tsr):] so that they say مُبْيِعُ sold and مُخْضُوط sewn. (Aud), as they say مُضْرَب [347]; and that is regular,
according to them (Tsr). A [Tamīmī (MN, Tsr)] poet says, [describing wine (Tsr),]

وَكَانَتَهَا تُفَاحَةٌ مَطْيِرَةٌ

(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, [like مَطْيِرَةٌ (Tsr),] but pronounced according to the o. f. (MN, Tsr); and the poet [Al'Abbās Ibn Mirdās (MN, Tsr, Jsh) as Sulami (Jsh)] says

قدَّ كَانَ تَوَّمَّكَ يَحْكِيَ بَوْنَكَ سَيِّدًا ⋆ وَإِلَّا ذَلِكَ أَنْذَكَ سَيِّدٌ مُعْيَنٌ

[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, عَنْتُ الْرَّجُلْ مَعْيِنٍ, from مَعْيَنٍ (MN, Jsh), as Sulami (Jsh) says, I smote the man with the evil eye, act. part. مَعْيَنٍ, pass. part. مَعْيَنٍ, according to rule, and مَعْيَنٍ according to the o. f. (MN, Tsr); and the poet ['Alkama (IY, MN, Jsh) Ibn 'Abada (MN, Jsh), describing a male ostrich (Jsh),] says

حتَّى تَذَكَّرَ نَبْضَاتَ وَهْيَكَةٌ ⋆ بَيْمٌ رَدَأَ عَلَيْهِ الدَّجَّانُ مَفْيُوِمٍ

[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, مَفْيُوِمٍ (MN, Jsh). The right way is to say مَيغاً ⋆ and مَيغاً (M, A)
upbraided, like their counterparts in the Kur.

XXII. 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 inf. n. (K, B), orig. and whereas a man indebted or a man indebted and or overlooked, i. e., that the evil eye has smitten, are anomalous; and hence

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 and have been heard from the Arabs, contrary to rule; while the KF has or or or He is upbraided, and also or He is sold; and all of this is according to the o. f., so that what H mentions is only from crabbedness. And or is said, as [above] (CD). And they say or or food dressed with olive-oil, [the like of] which is frequent (IY). Mb says that the pass. part. in the cat. of may be complete in poetry, citing the saying of 'Alkama.
[above] as an instance of that (CD). But this is a Tami-
mí dial. (A) ISh says "The Arabs differ about the
pass. part. in the cat. of ی: for the Banū Tamīm make
it complete, saying مکبر, مخبوط, معيوب measured, and
مَرْيَت; while the inhabitants of the Hijāz say معييب,
مکبر, مخبيط, and مَرْيَت [above]. But both parties
agree upon making it defective in the cat. of ی, except
what occurs anomalously, vid. مَرْيَت مضرُون [below],
لفظ مقول, مقول, مضرُون, مَرْيَت مضرُون a word said;
where the better-known [form] is مَرْيَت, مضرُون, مضرُون,
and مَرْيَت" (CD). Some of the Arabs treat a few pass.
parts. in the cat. of ی as sound, whence مَرْيَت مضرُون a
garment preserved, [from صان, aor. مضرُون (Tsr); and
مَرْيَت مضرُون (A, Tsr), i. e., moistened musk (Tsr, Sn);]
and مَرْيَت قُول مقول a led horse (Aud, A), from كأن, aor. يَقول;
and مَرْيَت قُول مقول a saying said, from كأن (Tsr); which have
been heard (Aud). And Mb allows completion of مَرفوض
from [the cat. of ی, as مَرفوض مضرُون a sick man visited;
that, says he, not being heavier than سُروع inf. n. of I leaped and سُروع inf. n. of غاور [683], because سُروع
contain two ئ and two دامم; whereas مضرُون
[above] contains, with two ئ, only one دامم (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 ی preceded by a letter pronounced with ـ, is that the ـ is converted into ـ in order that the ی may be preserved (M). But Akh differs from him in this rule, and substitutes ـ for the ی (IY). S converts the ـ into ـ, in order that the ی may be preserved; and does not convert the ی into ـ, 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 ـ into ـ, because of ـ on the preceding letter, as in ـ موسر [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 [a ـ (IY)] as [the sing.] ـ a kind of striped garment is formed from [يغ] ـ sale and (IY)) [بيغ] ـ whiteness, S says [بيغ] ـ and (IY)) [بيغ] ـ; but Akh says [ـ] ـ and ـ: and restricts conversion [of the ـ] to the pl., such as ـ ـ. [686 (case 1, α, γ), 718 (M), where, the pl. being heavier than the sing. [below], he substitutes ـ for ـ, in order that the word may not increase in heaviness (IY). Similarly such [sings.] as ـ saying and ـ ـ ـ, according to S, may be ـ or
but Akh differs from him in that, holding that their measure must be [\textit{نَعْلُى}, \textit{سَعْلُى}, \textit{مَعْلُى}] according to the apparent [form] (BS). And \textit{مَعْيَشَة} [333, 686], (1) according to S, may be (a) \textit{مَعْلُى} (M), in which case it contains transfer and conversion, transfer of the \textit{ذَام} to the \textit{ن}, and its conversion into Kasra, in order that the \textit{ى} may be sounded true (IY); (b) \textit{مَعْلُى} (M), in which case the vowel of the \textit{ع} is transferred to the \textit{ن}, nothing else [being done] (IY): (2) according to Akh, is [only (IY)] \textit{مَعْلُى}; while, if it were \textit{مَعْلُى} (M), you would say \textit{مَعْيَشَة} (M).

But Akh contravenes this rule in such [\textit{pass. parts.}] as 
and [709], where the elided, according to him, is the \textit{ع} of the word, because it is the first of the two quiescents [663]; so that [first] the \textit{ذَام} [of the \textit{ى} in \textit{مَبْيَع} and \textit{مَبْيَع} ] is transferred to the [\textit{ع} and \textit{ب} [respectively], for transformation [697, 703]; then Kasra is substituted for it, in order that the \textit{ى} may be preserved; and then the \textit{ى} is elided, because of the two quiescents; so that the [quiescent] \textit{و}, coming immediately after Kasra, is converted into \textit{ى} [685 (case 5)]. Therefore the measure of the word, according to him, becomes \textit{مَغِيل}; and this demolishes what he sets up [above] as a rule (IY). And, when a [\textit{n.}] like 
\textit{تَرْتِب} [274, 678] is formed from \textit{جَيِّع}, S says \textit{جَيِّع} [709, 712];
but Akh says تَبْعِعُ یٰ (712) (M), changing the ی into ق, because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with دامم، as in مَرْسَرٰ [above] and مَرْتَنٰ [686], because كاسرا is not substituted [by him] for دامم in what is a sing. [above]. And, but for the saying of the Arabs مَثْعَبٰ and مَثْعَبٰ [above], Akh’s rule would be sound, strong; but hearsay furnishes cause for dissatisfaction with his rule (IY). And مَصْوَفَةٰ in the saying [of Abù Jundab alHudhali (DH, Jh, MN)]

کُنْتَ إِذَا جَاءَتِ ذَنَا مَصْوَفَةٰ
اَشْهَرُ كَثِّئَ يُنَصِّفَ أَلسَانَ مَنْ تَرَى

[And I was wont, when my neighbour called me for a matter that was feared, to tuck up my waist-wrappEe 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 تَرْنَ [684, 703, 711] and أَلْفَضْوَةٰ [685 (case 6, c), 725] (M), by rule مَصْيَفَةٰ (IY); but, according to Akh, regular (M). مَصْوَفَةٰ is from ضَفْتَ الْرَّجُلَ مَفْعَلَةٰ [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 مِنْ أَلْفَوْةٰ, 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 Damma into Kasra, but the ی into ی (Jrb). This verse, however, is [said by Skr to be (Jh)] related in three ways, with مُضْفَة [above], مُضْفَة, and مُضْفَة (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 (IY). 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 رَجُل مَال جَلا [708], [and the like, which, being of the same formation as the v. (IY),] because on [the measure of] فَعُل فَعَل [M], بَاب and دَار on [the measure of] فَعَل [with Fatha of the ج], and شَاكَة [708] and مَال on [that of] فَعُل with Kasr of the ج, have their ج converted [into I], because mobile and preceded by a Fatha; so that they become among *ns.* like قَال and بَعَب 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 قَال and بَعَب, and
Kār, 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) [684, 703], and [247, 684] and [pl. of جَلَطِر acting wrongfully (KF), which belong to the cat. of بَا بَ and دَا رَ (IY)]; (2) a timid man and حَوْل [below] (M), which belong to the cat. of شَا كَة and مَال (IY). Their sayings رَجَل رَغْ [684] [dependents, sing. حَافِئْ [684, 257, 684], حَوْل [684], غَيْب [MAR].] and قَرْن [above] are anomalous; and so are رَجَل حَوْل an artful man and رَغْ [above]. But فَعَل with ئامن of the ل does not occur in the hollow n., from the heaviness of ئامنma [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) لُوْمَة blaming much (IY), نُومَة [sleeping much (IY)], and غَيْب [703] (M) one that upbraids people much, where the formation becomes [a preventive of transformation.] like the augment in جُرُلَّان and صَرُّى [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): (2) \( [684, 713] \), \( [685, 713] \) (M), \( جَرَّب \) [below], and \( طَوَّل \) \( جَرَّب \) together, all of which are [treated as] sound because their formation differs from that of \( v \): (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 \( جَرَّب \) in such as \( جَرَّب \) and \( جَرَّب \), since the preceding letter is pronounced with Damm; and at \( \\) in such as \( جَرَّب \) and \( جَرَّب \), since the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr; contrary to such as \( دَار \) and \( بَاب \), where we arrive at \( جَرَّب \), a letter with which one is safe from a vowel (IY). They transform \( قِبَّم \) \( [685, 713] \) only because it is an inf. \( n. \), i. q. \( قِبَّم \); [though] used as an ep. in [the reading (IY)] \( دِينِيَّة قِبَّم \) VI. 162. \( [368, 713] \) (M): and, but for that [quality of inf. \( n. \)], it would be [treated as] sound, like \( جَرَّب \) [removal from one place to another, which is a simple substantive (Jh, KF)] in َلا يَبْعَى عَنْهَا جَرَّب. 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. \( خَالٍ \), \( حَالُ \), \( خَالٍ \), you would say َلا يَبْعَى عَنْهَا جَرَّب, 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 لَيْس الْئَدْرَك لِيُقَدِّمُهُ in. n. of لِيُقَدِّمُهُ [713], and لِيُؤْتَيْنِ inf. n. of لِيُؤْتَيْنِ [685 (case 2, b), 699, 711], because of the connection between them (IY): while حَلَّ inf. n. of حَلَّ [685 (case 2, d), 713] is [explained] by Z as anomalous (IY),] like قَرْد [above] (M); though the [better] account is what we have premised, ّ-vid. that حَلَّ is a simple substantive, not an inf. n.,] because it is [then] regular (IY). And فَعْلُ, (1) if from [the cat. of'O, has its ع made quiescent, because of the combination of two Dammas and the ع, as نُور [712, 721] and عَوْن and عَوْن [246]; but in poetry is uncontracted, [according to the o. f. (IY).], as دَمَّر أَخْرَ أَلْفَانَا إِمْعَل ٌ [246, 712] (M) and ٌاَلْأَخْرَ أَلْفَانَا إِمْعَلَ ٌ [246]: (a) the use of the o. f., vid. Damm [of the ع], 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 ع [683], that [substitution] is allowable, because the ع is pronounced with Damm (IY): (2) if from [the cat. of] ي, is like the sound: he that says كُتِب and رَسُل says غِير and بِيض in the pl. of غَيْر [246, 348] and يَدُ وَال [246]; while he that says كُتِب and رَسُل says غِير and بِيض [246] (M), because, being


\(\text{فعلُ،} \) it is subject to the same [transformation] as the pl. of \(\text{مُبْيِغُ} \) [686 (case 1, \(\alpha\), \(\gamma\), 718] (IY).

§ 712. The condition of transformation of the \(\text{عُ} \) in the \(n. \) [of more than three letters, like \(\text{مُفْعَلُ} \) and \(\text{مُفْعَلُ} \) (Jrb),] not \(\text{تَرِلَ.} \) [like \(\text{بَاءُ} \) and \(\text{تَابُ} \) (MASH),] nor conformable [below] to the \(v. \) [like the \(\text{inf. n.} \) and \(\text{act.} \) and \(\text{pass. parts} \) (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 \(\text{مُفْعَلُ} \) (MASH),] or a mode of formation, [like \(\text{مُفْعَلُ} \) (MASH),] peculiar to the \(n. \) (SH). In the \(\text{ترِلَ.} \) [\(n.\),] together with commensurability with the \(v. \) [703, 711], no difference is prescribed. The reason why difference is not prescribed in the \(\text{ترِلَ.} \), 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 Tanwm [17]; whereas the \(\text{ترِلَ.} \), even if a proper name, is distinguished from the \(v. \) by its Kasra and Tanwm. By "conformable" [248, 252, 331, 343, 349] IH means (1) the \(\text{inf. n.}, \) such as \(\text{نَفَامَة} \) and \(\text{إِسْتِقْماَة} \) [703]: (2) the \(\text{act.} \) and \(\text{pass. parts.} \) from the \(\text{ترِلَ.} \) and \(\text{non-ترِل.} \) [703, 708, 709, 714]: (a) they may be said to contain commensurability, \(\text{مُعَلِّلُ} \).
being on the measure of \( \text{يُفَعَّل} \) [343, 703, 714] in respect of vowels and quiescences; and the \( \text{مُفَعَّل} \) being contrary to the o. f., which is \( \text{يُفَعَّل} \) [347, 703, 714]. IH’s saying “such as has not been [hitherto] mentioned” is not needed, because, for conversion of the \( \text{ع} \) into \( \text{ل} \) [703], every \( \text{n} \), whether such as has, or such as has not, been [hitherto] mentioned, must possess the agreement specified [above], in the case of [both] the \( \text{تمل} \) [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 \( \text{ع} \) of the augmented to the preceding quiescent, except in such as [697, 699, 703], which, notwithstanding [their] lack of the agreement specified, contain transfer and conversion, because of their perfect affinity to their \( \text{v} \); and except in the cat. of \( \text{بَوَأَيْتُ} \) [703, 708, 715], which also, notwithstanding [its] lack of agreement, contains conversion, because of [its] extreme heaviness. In the augmented \( \text{تمل} \), then, together with commensurability with the \( \text{v} \), difference from it in some respect is prescribed, like the aug. letter (1) not used as an aug. in the \( \text{v} \), like the \( \text{مُقَلَّم} \) [703]; for in the o. f. [\( \text{مُقَلَّم} \) and \( \text{مُقَلَّم} \) they are like \( \text{تَكَبَّرُت} \) \( \text{Thou praisest} \) and \( \text{تَقَبَّرُت} \) \( \text{Thou art praised} \), but in the initials of the \( \text{v} \) \( \text{م} \) is not used as an augment: (2) used as an augment in the
\( \text{(1515)} \)

... but mobilized with a vowel not used as its vowel in the \( v. \), as \( 
\text{تَعْلِم} \) on the measure of \( 
\text{تَعْلِم} \) with Kasr of the \( \text{ت} \) and Fath of the \( \text{ع} \); for it is commensurable with \([\text{the imp.}] \text{إِلَّم} \text{KNOW thou}, \) but in the initial of the \( v. \) there is no \( \text{aug.} \) \( \text{تَعْلِم} \) pronounced with Kasr, such \([\text{a formation}] \) as \( 
\text{تَعْلِم} \) being \([\text{merely}] \) a \( \text{dial. var.} \) of some people \([\text{below}], \) and withal not being general \([\text{even among them, but confined to particular classes of} \ v s.] \), as before explained \([\text{404}]. \) Sometimes the augmented \( \text{tril.} \) is transformed because of a difference other than the two mentioned, as \( [683 \text{ (case 2), } 703, 708]: \) for they are commensurable with \( 
\text{يَفْعَل} \) \([\text{above}]\); but their \( \text{aug.} \) is not in the same place as, nor identical with, its \( \text{aug.} \) \([\text{R}]. \) Therefore, if from \( \text{بَيْع} \) you formed \([\text{an augmented} \text{tril.} \ n.], \) (1) like \( \text{مَضْرَب} \) \([\text{361}] \) and \( \text{تَكْحِلَة} \) \([\text{372, 678}], \) you would say \( \text{بَيْع} \) and \( \text{مَبْيَع} \), transformed \([\text{SH}], \) because of their agreement with the \( v. \) in vowel and quiescence, together with \([\text{their}] \) difference \([\text{from it}] \) in \( \text{مَبْيَع} \) through the augment \( \text{م} \), which is not used as an augment in \( v s. ; \) and in \( \text{بَيْع} \) \([\text{below}] \) through the Kasr of the \( \text{ت} \), since \( \text{ت} \), though used as an augment in the \( v. \), is not pronounced there with Kasr together with Kasr of the \( \text{ع} \) \([\text{404}]: \) so that no confusion \([\text{of the} \ n. \ \text{with the} \ v. \) results from transformation \([\text{MASH}]: \) (2) like \( \text{ضْرَب} \) \([\text{678}], \) you
would say َتَبيِعَ, 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. [708] 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 َمَقَامٌ standing-place [above]: for it agrees with the v. in its measure only, [because orig. َيَفعَلُ (Sn);] but contains an augment, vid. the َمُبْهَة, announcing that it does not belong to the class of vs.; so that it is transformed: (a) similarly such as َمَيِّضٌ setting upright and َمُيِّضٌ separating: (b) if from َتَبيِعَ you formed َمَفْعَلةُ with Fath [of the ع], then you would say َمِبَأَة; if َمَفْعَلةُ with Kasr, then َمِبَأَة; and if َمَفْعَلةُ with Damm, then also َمِبَأَة according to the opinion of S, but َمِرْعَة according to the opinion of Akh[710] (A): (α) َمَفْعَلةُ is transformed on account of its resemblance to the aor. in measure, but not in augment; because the ِ of femininization,
being virtually separate [266], does not prevent [agreement with] the measure (Sn): (c) such as (M) مَكْوَزَة Makwaza [4, 716] (M, R), ﻣَرْيَم Mazyad, and [below] (M), among (R) proper names (IY, R) of human beings (IY), and مَدْيَن [below] (M), a name of a place (IY), and مَشْوَرَة consultation, counsel, مَصْيدَة snare, trap, net, [with Fath of the M (R), as ﻣَوْقعَ آل الصَّيْد ﰲ مَصْيدَتِنا The game fell into our trap (IY),] and [above] ﻣَقْوَدة, as ﺍ لْفَكَاةُ The jest is a means of leading to annoyance, [among ns. not proper names (IY),] are anomalous (M, R), by rule [Part I, Note on p. 8, l. 1]; مَكَارِزَة, and مَدْان, مَرْام, مَرَان [above]; and مَشَارَة, [مَصَادَة, and مَقَادة,] like مَقَا لَة saying and مَعَانَة help (IY): and مَشْوَرَة II. 97. [591] is read (M), like مَشْوَرَة [above] (K, IY, B), by Katāda and Abu-sSimāk, by rule مَثَابَة; while AZ transmits هَذَا شَيْء مَطْيِبٌ لِلْنَفْس This is a thing giving pleasure to the soul and هَذَا شَرَاب مَبْوَلَة This is a diuretic drink: (d) this in the n. is like ﺍ لْغَيْلِتُ ﺍ لْمَرَاةُ [703, 707] and استَشْرَوْنَ 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 مَذْيِنَةُ and مَرْيَمُ [above] (R, A), if you make them تَعْيِلُ, there is no anomaly, since the ي is co-ordinate [703]; whereas, if you make then 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 تَعْيِلُ, 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 قولَ and بَيَعُ, a n. on the model of تَحْلِيّةٍ with Kasr of the جُلُو, in which case you say تَعْيِلُ and تَعْيِلُ [above] with two Kasras followed by a quiescent ي [original in تَعْيِلُ, and converted from, in تَعْيِلُ, the transformation of تَعْيِلُ being by transfer only, and of تَعْيِلُ by transfer and conversion (Sn)]: (a) when you form from بَيَعُ a n. on the paradigm of تَرْتُبُ, you say, according to the opinion of S, بَيَعُ with ذَمِم and then Kasr; but, according to the opinion of Akh, بَيَعُ [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 تَعْيِلُ with Kasr, or ذَمِم, of the جُلُو [and غ 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 Mb, 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 مَدِينٌ مَرْيَمَ and مَدِينٌ مَرْيَمَ [above] are not transformed; and, according to him, are not anomalous: nor are تَقْرِيْلُ تَبْيعُ and تَبْيعُ 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 أسَدُ أَبيضُ [348, 707] (A), which are eps. on the measure of أحمر أَعْلَمُ 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 أسَدُ أَبيضُ and أسَدُ أَبيضُ [above], أَدْوَرُ منك، أَسَدُ أَبيضُ lower than thou and إِبْنُ on the measure of 6ََٰ٥٤َ on the measure of إِضْغَعُ [372], and تَبْيعُ 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), pla. of دَارُ and عَيْنُ (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.,]
(a) with the pret. of ِدَأَرُةُ making to turn round and ِعَمًَّا reaching a spring in digging for water, if they were transformed by conversion of the ِهِ and ِيَ into ِلِ, 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 ِدَأَرُ تُوَدَّعَ turned round and ِعَلَّامَ [683 (case 2)], if ِأَعِينُ and ِأَعِينُ 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 ِعَرَّجَةُ (M, R) and ِعَرَّجَةُ (R), pls. of ِجَرَّةُ جَرَّةُ table [713] and ِصَرَّائِمَ [685, 713] (MAR), and ِعَبْنَة (M), pl. of ِعِبَانِ [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 ِأَسْوَدُ fem. of ِأَسْوَدُ serpent [685 (case 7, d)], it is [virtually] non-existent. Nor is transfer employed in such as ِأَبْيَنَاءُ ِأَمْوَنَاءِ [251, 714], because the [prolonged] ُ of feminization,
being inseparable and like part of the word, excludes them from commensurability with the \( \text{v} \), as the [abbreviated] \( \text{r} \) does in \( \text{ضَرَّرُي} \), and the \( \text{t} \) and in \( \text{طَيَّرَان} \) [684 (condition 11, a, d), 703]. Some of the Arabs transfer the Kasra of the \( \text{ی} \) in \( \text{أَبِنَّا} \), saying \( \text{أَبِنَّا} \) [714], not because of resemblance to the \( \text{v} \), otherwise they would also transfer [the Kasra of the \( \text{و} \)] in \( \text{أَبِنَّا} \); but because of dislike to Kasra on \( \text{ی} \), they being similar [697]; as the [second] Damma is elided in \( \text{نُور} \) [for \( \text{نُور} \) \( \text{ضَرَّرُي} \) \( \text{ضَرَّرُي} \) pl. of \( \text{نَورَة} \) [246, 711, 721], because Damma on \( \text{ی} \) is deemed heavy: so that such as \( \text{أَبِنَّا} \), exclusively, notwithstanding the lack of the commensurability mentioned, is transformed by transfer because of the extreme heaviness. But [even] in such as \( \text{أَبِنَّا} \), non-transformation is more frequent: nay, transfer is anomalous, contrary to \( \text{نُور} \) [above], where quiescence is more frequent, because \( \text{ی} \) pronounced with Damm is heavier than \( \text{ی} \) pronounced with Kasr; so that the \( \text{و} \) and Damma in \( \text{ضَرَّرُي} \) [246, 711] are anomalous (R). As for such as \( \text{يَزِد} \) Yazid [4, 18], when a proper name, [which resembles the aor. in measure and augment (Sn),] it was transformed when a \( \text{v} \), and afterwards transferred to the cat. of proper name (A, MASH). And [similarly (MASH)] \( \text{أَبَنُ} \) Abän (R, MASH),
when a proper name, if said to be َأَفُّلُ (MASH),
according to those who decline it as a diptote, is trans-
ferred from a transformed v. (R); whereas, if said to be
َنَفَلَ (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 مَخْيَطٌ [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 مَخْيَطٌ
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 مَخْيَطٌ ought to be transformed, because its aug-
ment is peculiar to ns.; while it resembles تَعْلَمْ [404],
i. e., with Kasr of the aoristic letter in the dial. of some
people [above]: but that it is made to accord with
مَخْيَطٌ [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 تَحْسِبٌ [above]
would not be transformed, because it resembles تَحْسِبٌ
[with Kasr of the و (Sn)] in its measure and augment
(A); while the reply that Kasr of the ع in تَحْسِبٌ [482]
is anomalous is effective only in تَحْسِبٌ exclusively, not
in other aor. vs. regularly pronounced with Kasr of the ت, like َ, تُعَفِّ، تَمْرَب، تَجْلِس، and which, according to the dial. of those who pronounce the aoristic letter with Kasr, إبتَا is commensurable without any anomaly in respect of Kasr of the ت (Sn). And moreover, if it were admitted that transformation was obligatory because of what they mention [about the resemblance of مَخْيَطَة to تَعَلَّم], 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 مَخْيَطَة (Sn),] by his saying "But مَفْعُول is treated as sound, like مَفْعُول", meaning that مَفْعُول being different from the v., i.e., not resembling it in measure or augment, is entitled to be treated as sound, like مَسْوَال tooth-stick and مَكْيَال corn-measure; and that مَفْعُول is made to accord with it in being treated as sound, because resembling it in sense, like مَقْرَل loquacious, eloquent [714], مَخْيَطَة and مَخْيَطَة [above] (A). By analogy, such as مَقْرَل and مَخْيَطَة should be transformed, since they are on the measure of إِعْلَم [above]: but Khal says that they are not transformed, because contracted from مَفْعَال, which is incommensurable with the v.; the
proof that مَفْعَالُ being that they are often associated, as مَفْعَالٌ and مَخْيَاطٌ and مُنَصَّاتٌ adz (R). The obvious [conclusion], however, is what I have mentioned before, vid. that the cause of مَخْيَاطٌ's being treated as sound is that it differs from the v. in measure and augment, because, being contracted from مَخْيَاطٌ [366], it is [identical with] the latter; not that it is made to accord with مَخْيَاطٌ: and many etymologists are of this opinion (A). And such as مَخْيَاطٌ [369], عُلْيَب [374], and مَخْيَاطٌ [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 مَعْرِي [272, 375, 673], does not spoil the measure; while elision of the final consonant, on account of Tanwin [643, 683], as in مَعْرِي, is like no elision, because Tanwin is not inseparable from the word [609, 731 (condition 1, f, b, α)]: مَعْرِي [374], according to Akh, is co-ordinated with مَخْيَاطٌ [392]:
and, according to S also, is due to co-ordination, like ُسْرَدَ [331, 718]; although ُمَعَلِّم [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 َو precede by a quiescent are converted into ُهُوَل 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 َو, except at the end of the word [301, 721], like ُرَأَيَتْ َالْعَيِّرِ I saw the raider [16, 685 (case 1), 720, 724], as the mobile َو preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm is not converted into َو [even at the end], like ُالْمُثْرَقَة competition in shooting, [orig. ُهُيَأَم (MAR)], ُعْيَمَة [686 (case 1, α, α), 714, 724], and ُعْيَمَة [703, 711, 724], because Kasra's requirement of َو after it is like Damma's requirement of َو after it; while, the, and َو 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 ٌٖٓٔٓ (332, 685 (case 5, b), 716) and ٌٖٓٔٓ, while ٌٖٓٔٓ (685, 716) is anomalous. But the non-final mobile ٖٓ preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr is sometimes liable to the intervention of what requires it to be converted into ٓ، vid. conformity to another [word], as ٌٖٓٔٓ inf. n. of ٌٖٓٔٓ [below]. That does not occur in the non-final mobile ٖٓ preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, which therefore remains in its o. f. (R). The ٖٓ, [mentioned, then (R)], preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is converted into ٓ، in [three things (R),] (1) such inf. ns. as ٌٖٓٔٓ [685 (case 2), 699, 724] inf. n. of ٌٖٓٔٓ sought protection (R)], ٌٖٓٔٓ [685 (case 2, d, a), 711], [and ٌٖٓٔٓ 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 ٖٓ in ٌٖٓٔٓ is converted into ٓ، because ٌٖٓٔٓ is transformed by conversion of the ٖٓ into ٓ، (b) if it be said "How is it that such [an inf. n.] as ٌٖٓٔٓ is, and such as ٌٖٓٔٓ [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 ٌٖٓٔٓ ,
it is so in طی‌ران? I say that Kasra's demand for conversion of ہ, after it into ی is stronger than Fatha's demand for conversion of ہ, and ی after it into ہ, since such as ہیٰہٰ ہوٰیٰ and ہیٰہٰ ہوٰیٰ are frequent, while such as ہیٰہٰ ہوٰیٰ is rare, and such as ہیٰہٰ ہوٰیٰ with Kasra of the ف and quiescence of the ہ, 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 ہ into ی, because of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Kasr, since the incentive to such conversion is strong (R): (c) ہوٰیٰ (inf. n. of ہوٰیٰ ہال [685 (case 2, d), 711] is [anomalous (R, Jrb)], like قُوِّ (703, 711) (SH), the regular form being ہیٰہٰ (Jrb); contrary to the inf. n. of such as ہوٰیٰ [685 (case 2, b), 699] (SH) and قُوِّ [698], which have ہوٰیٰ (Jrb), because [the ہ in (Jrb)] the v. is [treated as (R)] sound (R, Jrb), whence ہیٰہٰ. XXIV. 63. [Those of you who steal away from the congregation, covering themselves one by another K, B)]; whereas, if the v. were لَا ہیٰٰ لیٰذًا would be said [711] (Jrb): (d) [the ہ of] such as یُعْرَفُ [684, 711] is not converted, because it is not an inf. n.; while قُیِّمَا in VI. 162. [368, 711] is orig. an inf. n. (R): (2) such [pl. (R, Jrb)] as ہیٰہٰ and ہیٰہٰ ہوٰیٰ [685 (case 3, a, and b, d, 168a]
α), 724] and دیم پیاح and دیم پیاح, because [the ē of (R)] the sing. is transformed (SH) by its conversion into (a) ی, as in تار و [238]; (b) ی, as in دیم پیاح, pl. دیم پیاح [238, 278, 685 (case 3, a)], and دیم پیاح, pl. دیم پیاح [237] (R): (a) the proof that the ی of تار پیاح is [orig.] I returned to him time after time and The people return time after time; and [also] what AB mentions, vid. that the ی of تار پیاح is substituted for ی, its derivation being from تار, which is a messenger between people: but the [opinion] mentioned in the Jh is that it belongs to the [cat. of] ی [below] (b) similarly دیم پیاح is orig. دیم پیاح, because it is from دام continued, aor. یکوحرم: this is mentioned by one of the learned in his commentary on the Taṣrif 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 ی, because of their saying دیب انسان: The sky rained continually, inf. n. تبدیم: so he mentions in the Jh; whereas the truth is that it belongs to the cat. of ی (Jrb on the Plural): (c) طیبال [pl. of طیب (R) in ی (Jrb)] is anomalous [246, 685 (case b, d, α)] (SH), by rule (Jrb), since [the ē of (R)] its sing. is not transformed (R, Jrb); and by usage also, since
the most frequent [form] is طَّوْرُ ُ(Jrb): (d) [685 (case 3, b, d, 6)], pl. of رُبْاَن، [notwithstanding that its sing. is transformed in the ع (R).] is [treated as] sound, [like and طَوْرِي (R),] from dislike to [the combination of (Jrb)] two transformations [728]: and [so is (R, Jrb)] pl. of نَارُ (SH), i.e., fat [camel (Jrb, MAR), from 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 [pl. (R)] as جَيْاَضُ [685 (case 3, b), 724], فِيَابُ [242, 279, 724] (SH), and حَيْاَضُ [242, 685] (R), because the ا is quiescent in the sing., and followed by an ل [in the pl.]; contrary to عَرَة [685 (case 3, b, c), 711] and كَورُ, [because the ل is missing (Jrb)]: whereas ثُجَرِ [685, 724] is anomalous (SH), by rule ثُجرِ [below], because the ل is missing; but, like إِسْتَحْوَرُ [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 ا occurring after Kasra should be followed by ل; because the ا 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 ı is like a combination of three unsound letters [697]; so that the heaviest of them, i.e., the ı, is converted into what is homogeneous with the preceding vowel, vid. ı: (c) although this condition is not prescribed for the two first [things], as in [the inf. n.] َﺦَوَنَ [above], and [the plns.] َكِيْرَ [below] and َكِيْرَ [above], still it strengthens them; and therefore َحَوَلَ [above], though an inf. n. of a transformed v., may be treated as sound: (d) َثَرَّرَ, together with َثَرَّرَ [above], is allowable, for conformity with َكِيْرَ [685 (case 3, b, c, d)]: (e) َحَوَلَ [712] and َصَوَان [685 (case 5)] are [treated as] sound, because they are not plns. (R). But [Jh says that] َكِيْرَ [238] is contracted from َكِيْرَ; and is [so] altered only on account of the unsound letter, [which he holds to be ı (above)]; while, but for that, it would not be altered, since they say َرَحَبَ, and not َرَحَبَ, as pl. of َرَحَبَةَ [238, 254] (Jh).

§. 714. The [augmented tril.] n., when not like َإِسْتَقَامَةَ [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 ı or ı is quiescent (M); so that, if the ı and ı 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)] [experienced
(IY)] and معايض [717] (M), as in the saying of AlAkhtal

\[\text{And verily I am wont to stand in places wherein Jarir is not, nor the patron of Jarir, one to stand and جَعَلَتْا} \text{kَمْ نَيْهَا مُعايِشَ}
\]

VII. 9. And have made for you therein means of subsistence [717] (IY); and أَبِيْنَا أَهْرَنَا and سَوْق [251, 712]: (2) [the letter after the \(ع\), like (IY)] [242, 683], and طَوْبَل [242, 683] [239, 683]; and شُيْبَخ [686, 713]; and as [686, 713] [686-685]; and جَيْرَل خِيَارَم مِنْ قُرُّم, خِيَارَ [348, 9]; and جَيْرَل خِيَارَ A good man, come of good people (IY]) : (3) the letter before, and the letter after, the \(ع\), like (IY) [ophthalmia and بَيُّّاَّغُ great seller (IY)]; and مَشْرَأٌ [place where beasts are exhibited and مَقْرَأٌ copious, excellent, in speech (IY)]; and تَفْعَال [M], تَفْعَالٌ and (IY) [489] and I said much, like تَسْبَارٌ [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 I, 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 أَعْيَبْنَاهُ and أَعْيَبْنَاهُ, however, the I 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], أَضْرَبَ being like أَضْرَبَ I should strike; while the I 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 I, as حَمْرَآءٍ and حُنُفْسَآءٍ and خُنْفْسَآء [274, 282, 283]: although they do say أَعْيَبْنَاهُ and أَعْيَبْنَاهُ [728] and أَعْيَبْنَاهُ [712], the Kasra of the being thrown upon the preceding [quiescent] letter. As for إِسْتَفْعَالٍ [699, 703], we transform them, as we transform their vs., because إِسْتَفْعَالٍ and إِسْتَفْعَالٍ are as inseparable from [the inf. ns. of] إِسْتَفْعَالٍ and إِسْتَفْعَالٍ [332] as يُفْعَلٍ and يُفْعَلٍ 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 َفَعَول , like ُخَوَر , is (IY). Such [ns.] as َتَوَالِل gift and َسُيِّئَل ُسُيِّئَل J a species of mimosa or acacia, ُطَويِّل [above], َكَفْوَال eloquent [730. A.], َتَفْوَال and ِتَفْيَّاَر [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 ِتَفْيَّاَر [708] : but this is reputed by [the fact] that transformation is proper if its cause be existing, as in the exs. mentioned (R). َتَفْوَال and ِتَفْيَّاَر , [though inf. ns. of transformed vs. (R, MASH), i. e., َقَال said and َسَار journeyed (MASH),] are [treated as] sound, because of ambiguity [above] (SH); and are not made to conform to their vs., as َإِقَامَا and ِإِسْتَقْمَاةٍ are made to conform to َإِقَامٰم and َإِسْتَقْمَام [703, 712], lest, after transformation, they be mistaken for ْكَفَال [below] (R). The generality of Commentators say that, if the ل here were converted into ل, after mobilization of the ف, two لs would be combined; and, after elision of one of them, َكَسَار and َكَفَال would remain, which might be mistaken for the pass. of َتَفْوَال and َكَسِبٍر: but this is [unsatisfactory,] as you see, since the ل 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 [ناك] [above], the ث 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 [نِسَّاق] and [نِسَّاق] [699, 703]; whereas مَكَاط and [نّسَقُ] are not so (R, MASH). And مَكَاط [above] and مَكَاط [366, 712], (1) because of ambiguity (SH), since, if they were transformed, مَكَاط and مَكَاط would be said; so that one would not know whether they were مَكَاط or مَكَاط (Jrb): (a) IH means that, being instrumental نس [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 [مَكَاط or مَكَاط]: 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 n. 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 | after the ع: (3) because the unsound letter here is enclosed by two quiescents [above]: while that necessitates sounding [it] true [even] in the v., as إسْوَانٌ [707]; and a fortiori, therefore, in the n. (Jrb). And [252, 712] and مَخْيِطٌ [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 إِدْهَبٌ Praise thou and إِحْمَدٌ [428, 667], and containing the [prescribed] difference [712] by the aug. م at the beginning, they ought properly to be transformed. And the excuse is that, being contracted from مَعَالِٰ, they are treated like their o. f.: or we may say that, though they are not derivs., but o. fs., مَعَالِٰ is made to conform, in omission of transformation, to مَعَالِٰ, because syn. with it; and this is more appropriate, since agreement of مَعَالِٰ with مَعَالِٰ in meaning does not prove it to be a deriv. thereof (R). But such [pass. parts. (Jrb)] as مَقْومٌ مَقْوُومٌ undertaken (Jrb) and مَيْبِعٌ are transformed by another [process] (SH), not by conversion of their ع into | (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 مَقَامٌ and مَبَاعٌ would be said, for conformity with قَالُ and بَاعُ; but by quiescence
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of their  and transfer of its vowel (Jrb), because of ambiguity (SH), since, if مَبَاغ and مَقَام were said, no one would know whether they were مَفْعُول [697, 703, 709] or مَفْعُول [763, 712] (MASH). And such [formations] as طَوِيل [246], غَيْر (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 1, two quiescents would be combined, the first of them an 1: so that, if the second were mobilized, and طَأْطِل, جَادت were said (MASH),] they might be mistaken for فعل; or if the first were elided, and غَرُون, جَاد, and remained, they might be mistaken (MASH) for فعل (SH), with the  mobile in جاَد, and quiescent in the two last: while, if the second quiescent were elided, then غَرُون, جاَد, and would remain, which might be mistaken for فعل mobile in the  or for the pret. of جاَد was liberal, aor. طَال, يَجْبُون was long, aor. يَفْأَر (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 √ " and " √ " respectively, ["of its v." (M on §§. 343, 347)]; and, in explanation of the assimilate √ , 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 √ mentioned by us [703] as transformed (R).

§. 715. When the ꞌ of [the pl. belonging to] the cat. ꞌ of ꞌ (case 1, a, b) [18, 256] is enclosed by two unsound letters, the second is converted into ꞌ, because of (1) its nearness to the end (R) of the word, for which reason it is assimilated to the ꞌ of ꞌ ꞌ [246, 683 (case 1, k, b)], as they say √ [below], treating it like ꞌ √ [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 ꞌ , which is so faint that [for ꞌ ꞌ ] you seem to say ꞌ ꞌ (S). And afterwards the second ꞌ is converted into Hamza, as in ꞌ ꞌ and ꞌ [683 (case 2), 708], whether each of the two [enclosing letters] be a ꞌ , as in ꞌ [357, 683 (case 4, b), 708, 726] (R), orig. ꞌ ꞌ ꞌ (IY); or a ꞌ , as in ꞌ ꞌ ꞌ pl. of ꞌ ꞌ ꞌ seller,
chafferer [730. A.]: or the first be a، and the second a ي، as in pl. of بَرَّعَةٍ [on the measure of] فَرْعَةٍ from بَرَعُ; or the converse, as in pl. of عَيْبُ [below], because from عَيْبٍ [had many dependents to support (MAR)], aor. يُعْبِرُ (R), inf. n. عَوْرُ (MAR). And, as for ضَيَاوِنُ، [by rule ضِيَاءَتْنَ with Hamza (R),] it it anomalous (R, A) in the pl., as [ضِيَأَتْ is] in the sing. [685 (case 7, c, b, α, and d, ω)] (R): but, since the يُ in the sing. is sounded true in the sing., it is sounded true in the pl. so that they say ضَيَاوِنُ، as they say ضَيَاوِنُ، by rule ضِيَأَتْ [685, 716] (A). That [conformity of the pl. to the sing. in lack of alteration] is, however, not universal, since you say بَنَاتُ أَلْبِبٍ [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

ثَانِيَ كَذَا بَنَاتٌ أَلْبِيبٍ

My heart-strings forbid, or My tenderness forbids, that for him (Jh, MAR)]; and, in the pl. بَنَاتُ أَلْبِبٍ incorporated (R): though it is stated in the ِسَحَاحِ that (MAR), in the pl. and dim. of أَلْبِبٍ، you say أَلْبِبٍ and أَلْبِبَنَاتٍ، which [statement] is more probable than the saying of those who transform them (Jh MAR) by
incorporation of the ب into its like (MAJh). And the correct [opinion] is that ضیاًون is not to be taken as a precedent (A) for sounding the ج true, whenever a pl. is found resembling it in soundness of [the ج in the sing.]; though some people make a precedent of it: so in [the commentary of] IUK (Sn). Out of all those [four cases] the [only one actually] heard is where the ج of the pl. is enclosed by two د; while S constructs the remaining three by analogy to it, because two د د, or د and د, are deemed heavy like two د د (R). What is mentioned [in §. 683 (case 4)] as to there being no difference, in the two soft letters, between two د د, two د د, and د and د, 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 د د: and (Tsr)] that [by analogy (R)] there is no Hamza in the case of two د د, or of د and د [716] (R, Tsr), because their combination is not like that of two د د [in degree of heaviness] (R); so that you say ضْرَبْذ، ضْرَبْذ، ضْرَبْذ، ضْرَبْذ، سَبَّأَرْذ، سَبَّأَرْذ،according to the o.f. (Tsr); while بَثْقَة [247] is pronounced with Hamza only because it is pl. of what has its ج converted into Hamza [708], [an argument which applies equally to نُوَثْقَن ]. Therefore, when you form the act. part. from جَبْر [697, 728] and جَبْر حَبَّي [685 (case 10, b, a)], like جٰبَيْن [16], you say,
in its pl. for irrational objects [247], (1) according to S حَوَايَا and شَوَايَا [726], because the َ of the pl. occurs between ، and ى in the pl. of حَوَايٍ, and between two و in the pl. of شَوَايٍ: (a) you do not make the pl. of هَارِب imitate its sing., as you do in the pl. of ُبَدَأ [281], since, if you did, you would say شَوَايِى [726], which would be a flight [back] to what has been fled from: (2) according to the opinion of Akh، حَوَايٍ with ى: (a) as for شَوَايَا، there is no dispute about it, because of the combination of two ، s (R). Akh's doubt is that the substitution in the case of two ، s is only because of their heaviness; while there is a precedent for that, vid. [in] the combination of two ، s at the beginning of the word [683, 699]; whereas, when two ى s, or , and ى، are combined at the beginning of the word, there is no [substitution of] Hamza, as َيِٰبَسَم and ُبَيْسَم [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] أَرْأَيْنِل is only by conformity to [the final of] كِسَاى and رَدْأَى كِسَاى [683 (case 1), 723], because of its resemblance to the latter in respect of its nearness to the end; while in كِسَاى and رَدْأَى there is no difference between ى and ، and so therefore here: (2) hearsay, because AZ transmits سِبْيَٰئُق with Hamza, as pl. of
stalking-animal, which is from ساقِلُ تَجَّلٍ (drove), aor. يُسَرَق; and Jh transmits جَبِياَكُنُ (Jh) with Hamza, as pl. of سَيَدُ جَيْدُ (Ts) and سَيَدُ جَيْدُ (Jh). Mz says "I asked As how the Arabs form the broken pl. of َعَيْلِ [below], and he said 'They pronounce with Hamza, as in the case of two َسْتُ "; and this is an authority in support of Khl and S (IY). When the unsound letter after the َل of the pl. is far from the end, you do not convert it into َل, whether the two enclosing letters be both َس, as in حَمَّامُ [708]; or both ى َس, as in ْبِيْعُ pl. of قَيْبَمُ [714, 730. A]; or different, as in قَيْبَمُ pl. of قَيْبَمُ [384, 716], and ْبِيْعُ pl. of ْبِيْعُ [685 (case 7), 716] on the measure of تَهَرَبُ [377], from ْبَعَ, if you give these [broken] pls. to the َنَس mentioned [252]. As for كُوْرُ [252] pl. of كُوْرُ [714] meaning mote, as

وَكَكُلُ َةِ َلَعْنِيَي لِبَالْعَوْيَرَ

[258], [the in (MAR)] it is [sounded true (MAR)] because its َلِلُ is كَوْرُ, the ى being elided because sufficiently represented by the Kasra: while َعيِةَيْلُ, as

فيَّهَا َعيِةَيْلُ أَسْوَد ْوَنْبُرُ

[287], is [pronounced] with Hamza because its َلِلُ is َعيِةَيْلُ, the Kasra being impleled (R), since it is pl. of
Gw" •

meaning poor (R) [or dependent], sing. of dependents (Aud, A), having thus two pls. عيال, عيال, جياث, جياث and جياث, جياث, pls. جياث, جياث, like جياث, جياث, pls. جياث, جياث, like جياث, جياث, and جياث, جياث] the o. f. is observed (R). And hence the transformation of صم" [above] and قيم" [247], [by conversion of the ج into (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 فلان من صيابة قوم [Such a one is of the choice, or best, set of his people, transmitted by Fr (IY),] and نما أرق الميام الح [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 ج by two unsound letters] occur in the non-pl., then also S converts the second into ج, and afterwards into Hamza; while Akh and Zj do not alter it [683 (case 4, b)] (R).

§ 716. The ج, whether [it be (MASH)] an ع, or a ج [722], or anything else, [i. e., an aug., like the ج, of مفعول and the ج of the pl. (MASH),] when it is combined with ج, and the first [of them, whichever it be (MASH),] is quiescent [below], is converted into ج; and
[the first ی (MASH)] is incorporated [into the second (MASH)]; while the preceding [vowel], if Damma, is converted into Kasra [below]: as, (1) [when the ی is an ع (R)].

685 (case 7, a, a), 703 (Jrb): (b) ٌ آیام [747] (SH), orig. ٌ آیام (R, Jrb):

322, 499 (SH), orig. دیاً (R, Jrb): (c) ٌ دیاً, being from نوشت I went round (Jrb); and قیام [384, 715] (SH), orig. قیام (R), being قیام (R, Jrb) from قلم, aor. قیام (Jrb): whereas, if یا and (Jrb) قیام were [on the measure of (Jrb)] فعال, then دوار and (Jrb) قوم would be said (R, Jrb), because they are from [vs. whose ع is] و (Jrb):

377 (SH), orig. ٌ قیوم, being ٌ قیوم (R, Jrb) from قیام [713] (Jrb); whereas, if it were [on the measure of (Jrb)] فعال, then ٌ قوم would be said (R, Jrb):

278, 302, 685 (case 7, a, b]) (SH), orig. طولی, inf. n. of طولی (Jrb): (2) [when the ی is a ل (R),] ٌ طولی (SH), orig. ٌ طولی (R, Jrb), because dim. of ٌ کل bucket [280], the ی being put because یا is masc. and fem. [282] (Jrb):

3 [when the ی is anything else (R),] (a) ٌ مَرُى (294, 347] (SH), orig. ٌ مَرُى (Jrb), the ی being the of مَفْعُول (R), because it is مَفْعُول from شیت [685 (case 7), 728, 730], when a nom. (SH), orig. مَفْعُول.
(Jrb), the, being the, of the pl. (R): (a) IH says "when a nom." [above], because and  are not combined in مُسْلِيْي when an acc. or gen. [129]: (b) مُسْلِيْي and مُسْلِيْي, though not belonging to this chapter, [which treats of the unsound letters as  } 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  and  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 incorporation (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 atTaghlab] after


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 \( \ddash \), whether it precede or follow, is converted into \( \ddash \), in order that the intended alleviation may be realized, because \( \ddash \) and \( \ddash \) are not heavier than double \( \ddash \) [715]. You do not incorporate, however, in (1) [685 (case 7, b, b, β), 730] and ١٧٢١٧٦٨١٧, (a) because, says Khl, the \( \ddash \) is not inseparable; but its predicament is that of the \( \ddash \), for which it is a subst., since their o. f. is ١٧٢١٧٦٨١٧٧٠٨; and therefore, as \( \ddash \), which is the o. f. of this \( \ddash \), is not incorporated into anything [739], so likewise the \( \ddash \), which is a subst. for it: (a) for the same reason you do not incorporate in such as تُقُولُ [730, 731] and تُقُولُ ١٧١٧٦٨١٧٧٠٨ and تُقُولُ ١٧١٧٦٨١٧٧٠٨, they might be mistaken for فَعَلَ and فَعَلَ: (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 قَالُوا رَأَبَلُوا XII 71. They said (and came forward) and فِي تَوْمٍ XIV. 21. On a day [731]: not in a single word, as مَدْفوعٌ [301, 685 (case 8, b), 722], and ١٧١٧٦٨١٧٧٠٨
[above]: (2) such as اِجْلِيقْرَاذَ [332, 685] و یِدْرَوْان [685, 713], because the conversion [of the first ی into ی] supervenes irregularly; and ceases in the pl. and dim. of یِدْرَوْان, as دَزْرَوْان [685]; while for یِدْرَوْان you more often say یِدْرَوْان [332, 685 (case 5, b), 713]:

(a) if یِدْرَوْان were یِعَمَّل [377], conversion of the ی into ی and incorporation of the [first] ی into it would be necessary, as in یِعَمَّل [above]; but it is یِعَمَّل [384], the [first] ی being irregularly converted into ی, as in یِعَمَّل [pl. یِعَمَّل 278, 332, 685], یِعَمَّل 387 (3) [685 (case 7, b, b, b)], when you alleviate یِعَمَّل by converting the Hamza into ی [658]. Some of the Arabs convert [this, into ی], and incorporate [it into the second ی], saying یِعَمَّل and یِعَمَّل [685 (case 7, c, a), 702]. That is nowise allowable in یِعَمَّل and یِعَمَّل [above], because confusion with the conjug. of یِعَمَّل would be produced, contrary to such as یِعَمَّل and یِعَمَّل [above]. But, by analogy to it, some of the GG say یِعَمَّل [685 (case 7, b, b, b)] (R). As for یِعَمَّل [685, 715] [below], and یِعَمَّل [686], they are anomalous (SH). The second ی of [یِعَمَّل o. f. of (Part I, p. 7 A)] [4, 685, 689, 698] is converted into ی, in the proper name
exclusively, because proper names are often altered to a form different from that which the word must assume, like مَكْرَة مَرْحَب [4, 712], for a notification of their exclusion from their original application; but, according to Mz, the حَنْيَة is original, as we mentioned in the case of حِيْدَان [698] (R). The دامما is changed into كَسْر in مُسْلِمَي and مُمْسَّي [above], lest a quiescent ى preceded by دامما should occur (Jrb). But ى with كَسْر and دامما occurs in the pl. of أَلْوِي [728] (SH) violent in altercation; contrary to the inf. نَأِن [278, 685 (case 7, a, b)], where كَسْر and دامما are not allowable (Jrb). And, when you alleviate such as مَيْن [above] and نَرَى trench dug round a tent, to keep out rain-water [by converting the Hamza into ], and [then convert this , into ى , and] incorporate [it into the second ى ], دامما and كَسْر are allowable [in مَيْن and ى ], as in نَأِن [above]: and so, when you form نَعُول from ى أَنْيَت I promised [699], and alleviate the Hamza by conversion [into ], you say ى شَمَي ; and similarly ى شَمَي for نَعُول from شَنَبَت I roasted (R). But ى صَمَي and ى قَيْس and ى قَيْس and ى قَيْس [SH], because they convert the ى notwithstanding the lack of motive (Jrb). IH means
that the property of، is to be converted into ی when it is combined with ی، and the first of them is quiescent [above]: whereas here two ی، are combined, the first of which is quiescent; and are then converted into ی، which [conversion] is therefore anomalous. Such anomalies, however, should rather be mentioned after the section on ٍ and ُ مُرْضِيٍّ [722]; for double ی، [713], though approximate to a sound letter, is still converted into ی when it occurs in the pl. as a final, because the pl. is heavy, while the final is the seat of alteration: whereas in ْنَمَّ and ْقَرَم* [247] it does not occur as a final; but is nevertheless converted into ی، which is anomalous. The reason of its conversion is its nearness to the end in the pl.; and it will afterwards be shown that, in such [a position], conversion is [not anomalous, but] regular [722] (R). And ٍ ـَا أَرْاقِ ٍ ٌذِيَٰمُ ٌجِح [685, 715] is more anomalous (SH), because the [double (R)] ی، [is converted without any motive; and, by reason of the ی occurring here (Jrb),] is [more (R)] remote from the end (R, Jrb), which is the seat of alteration (Jrb).

§. 717. If there be no ی، or ی before the ی [715], then the unsound letter (Jrb), [whether] ی، or ی (R), occurring after the ی (R, Jrb) of the [ultimate] pl. [18, 256] (R), (1) if rad., as in َمَقَارِم and َمَعَايِش ٌمُقَارِم [246, 279, 683 (case 3, e, b), 708, 714], remains [unaltered]; (2) if
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 and , or aug., as in and , ] 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 , and then into Hamza, as in [pl. of d serv (MAR)] [661, 708], and [above] (R). But [sometimes (R)] with Hamza [246, 683 (case 3, e, b, β)] occurs (SH), by assimilation to (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 ی is aug., like (B)] [above] (K, B): though it is weak (SH); and Hamza is oftener eschewed. And similarly pl. of [683 (case 3, e, b, α)], by assimilation to ; though the chaste [form] is (R). And [683] is constantly pronounced with Hamza
(SH), (1) by assimilation of ًّعَيّنَةٌ to مَصِيبَةٌ, as channel of a torrent, [pl. مَسَايِل (Jh)], has [also (Jh)] for its pl. [ًّعَيّنَة, مِسْل، and (Jh)] مَسْلَانٍ [irregularly (Jh)], by assimilation to ًّعَيّنَةٌ (R), like ُرَغْفَةٌ، ُرَغْفَتْ، pl. ُرَغْفُّانٍ (Jh); or (2) by imagination (R). As for مَصِبَّةٌ [above], it is a blunder of theirs, because they imagine that مُفْعَلَةٌ is مَعَيّنَةٌ, whereas it is only مُفْعَلَة; but they do say مَصَارِبٌ [683] (S). Jh says that all the Arabs pronounce it with Hamza, (1) because they imagine that مَعَيّنَةٌ is مَعَيّنَة; so that they pronounce it with Hamza, when they pluralize it, as they pronounce the pl. of مَعَيّنَةٌ with Hamza, saying سَفَاطٌ [246]: or (2) [because] they assimilate the [rad. (Jh) َيْيُ in مُصِيبَةٌ to the [aug. (Jh) َيْيُ of صَحِيفَةٌ, since it is substituted for َيْ in صَحِيفَةٌ, and is not original, as the َيْ of صَحِيفَةٌ is not original. But the regular form is مَصَارِبٌ, [which also is used (Jh),] because the َيْ of the sing.] is mobile in the o. J. [below]. And Zj used to hold the Hamza in مَصِبَّةٌ to be converted from the, pronounced with كَأْس in مَصَارِبٌ, as in ٌشَاح [683, 699], which [opinion] is not free
from weakness, because the <, 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 < here should not be converted into Hamza because it is the э of the word, and there is no or i before the ْل [715]; for which reason the rule requires it to remain, as in مُقاوم [above]: but that they constantly pronounce this pl. with Hamza, irregularly, for a notification that it is not pl. of مَفْعُولة or مَفْعُولة, like مُقاوم and مُعَبِّيُش; but of مَفْعُولة, since the o. f. [above] is مُضْرَبة, the vowel of the < being transferred to the ِص, and the < [then] converted into ى because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr. This notification is needed because, by rule, the pl. of such an act. part. should be sound, as مُصَبِيبات, since, in such as مُكْرِم [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 مَفْعُولة, but of مَفْعُولة or مَفْعُولة, with Fath of the <, and Fath or Kasr of the э; and therefore the < is converted into Hamza, for a notification that it is pl. of مَفْعُولة with دَامَم of the <, and Kasr of the э, contrary to the general rule that the pl. of the latter should be sound (Jrb). But مَخَالِفَات, مَصَالِف, and مَمَأْشٌ with Hamza are anomalous (R).
§. 718. The \( \text{ي} \) [serving as the ع (IY)] of نُعِلَى، when a substantive, is converted into ر (M, SH), because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm [686 (case 1)] (IY), as ٌكُوسَيْ طُرْبَيِّ and ٌكُوسَيْ طُرْبَيِّ (IY). ٌكُوسَيْ طُرْبَيِّ is either an َينف. ِن., like ٌرُجَعَي [248, 272], as in XIII. 28. [686 (case 4, a, a)], i.e., ٌفَنَفُسَا لَهُم. XLVII. 9. [62]: or fem. of َالْأَطْرَبَيْ، in which case it ought to be ِرَثَي بَيْكَ with the art. [356]. But [even in the latter case] its predicament is that of substantives [686 (case 4, b, e, β), 725], as S says "This is the cat. of what has its ٌي converted into ر، vid. نُعِلَى when it is a substantive" (R), as ٌالْأَطْرَبَيْ (S, M) from ٌطِبَ happiness and ٌكِيسَ ٌكُوسَي طُرْبَيِّ shrewdness (M). The author of the CHd mentions that ٌكِيسَ ٌكُوسَي طُرْبَيِّ and ٌأَطْرَبَيْ ٌكُوسَي are fems. of ٌأَطْرَبَيْ ٌكُوسَي and ٌأَطْرَبَيْ ٌكُوسَي ٌكِيسَ; but that, though orig. eps., they are treated as substantives, because without an art. they are not quals. (Jrb). The reason why نُعِلَى 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 َأَطْرَبَيْ of superiority is part of the post. [118]; so that you do not say عَنْدِي جَارِيَةٌ حُسْنَى ٌأَطْرَبَيْ In my possession is a girl, the most beautiful of the girls [with the intention
of making an ep. of جَابِرَةُ, because [the ep. would then be pre. to its qualified (121), since] نَفْعَلِٰ� indicates the qualified. And, since 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 أَنْفَعُلُ of superiority, this أَنْفَعُلُ divested of مِن is triptote, by common consent, when made indet. after being a proper name, contrary to the cat. of أَحْمَرُ [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 ضَيْرَى مِشْيَة جَيْحَى [686 (case 4, b, c)] (M, SH), which are [judged to be (Jrb)] نَفْعَلِٰٔ (R, Jrb'), orig. ضَيْرَى جَيْحَى (IY, Jrb), with Damm, [not نَفْعَلِٰٔ (R, Jrb) with Kasr (Jrb)], because, [says S (R),] there is no نَفْعَلِٰٔ [with Kasr (IY)] among eps. (IY, R, Jrb), except عَرْعَةٌ [272] (Jrb), while عَرْعَةٌ is with ٍ [272]; though some authorize زَجْلٌ كِبْصَى [272], which may, however, be نَفْعَلِٰٔ with Damm, co-ordinated with جَحْضَبُ [392], like سُوَدَدَ [331, 712] and عَرْطَطُ [said by Ks to be (Jh) pl. of عَكَّاَمُ (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 Ḍamma [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 فَعَلَى with Ḍamm, like حَبْلَى (IY, Jrb) and فَضْلَى [272] (Jrb). They do not convert the ی into ِ here (IY, Jrb), as they do in طَرْبَى and كُرِسَى [above] (IY); but convert the Ḍamma into Kasra, in order that the ی 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 ی into ِ (Jrb).

And so in the cat. of ِ ِ [686 (case: 1, a, γ), 710, 711, 728] (SH), i.e., the pl. فَعَلَى, from the heaviness of the pl. (R). ِ ِ is orig. ِ ِ with Ḍamm of the ِ, because pl. of ِ أَبْيَضُ, like pl. of ِ أَحْرَمُ [249]. They convert the Ḍamma into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved, because the pl. is deemed heavy; so that, if they converted the ی into ِ, the heaviness would be excessive (Jrb). But sometimes the Ḍamma is left unaltered in the cat. of ِ ِ pl. of أَبْيَضُ, and the ی then converted into ِ, because of the lightness of the measure [ُفَعَلَ] (R).
THE \( \mathbf{\tau} \) AND \( \mathbf{\imath} \) AS \( \mathbf{\lambda} \) S.

§. 719. The \( \mathbf{\tau} \) and \( \mathbf{\imath} \), when \( \mathbf{\lambda} \) s, are more unsound, and weaker in state, than when \( \mathbf{\epsilon} \) s, because (1) they are consonants of inflection, which become altered by the vowels of inflection [16, 404, 720]; (2) the \( \mathbf{\imath} \) of prothesis [129], which causes the preceding letter to be pronounced with Kasr, is affixed to them; and (3) the \( \mathbf{\imath} \) of relation [294] and the sign of the \textit{du}. [228] are affixed to them: while all of that necessitates their alteration. Therefore, when \( \mathbf{\lambda} \) s, they are weaker than when \( \mathbf{\epsilon} \) s [703]; and when \( \mathbf{\epsilon} \) s, are weaker than when \( \mathbf{\mathbf{\imath} \lambda} \) 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 \( \mathbf{\epsilon} \) r. (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 \( \mathbf{\imath} \) [684]; (b) of one of them into its fellow [685, 686]: (2) quiescence (M). They are converted into \( \mathbf{\imath} \), 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 رَمْيُ غَرَرْ (403, 663, 673, 684), is strong and يُحَكُّبُا يَعْقُوْرُ [728, 730: A], and حَرْقُي [16, 300, 328, 673]; contrary to (1) رَمْيُ غَرَرْ, and بُرْيَانًا [403, 697, 698], and يَقْصُّيْسُ (SH), where the, and يَ are quiescent: (R) : (a) تَقْصُّيْسُ and يَقْصُّيْسُ are [2nd or 3rd pers.] pl. fem., their measure being تَقْصُّيْسُ [406] or تَقْصُّيْسُ [663] and بُرْيَانَ are 2nd pers. sing. fem., orig. تَقْصُّيْسُ and يَقْصُّيْسُ, like تَقْصُّيْسُ [405], their ج being converted into ی, 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 تَقْصُّيْسُ: while the ي [before the ن, whether this ي be the ج of the ی, as in the two pla. fem., or the pron. of the اغ, as in the sing. fem.,] is not converted into ی, because it is quiescent (Jrb) : (2) رَمْيُ غَرَرْ and یَقْصُّيْسُ [684 (condition 5), 698] (SH), where the، and يَ are preceded by a quiescent (R) : (3) رَمْيَا غَرَرْا [663, 684 (condition 6, b)] — with which تَقْصُّيْسُ [229, 684] 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 l converted [from the , or ی] would inevitably be elided, on account of the concurrence of two l's: (a) the attached pron. and the l of the du. are, each of them, the "cause necessitating Fath" [of the ل] (MASH): (b) these affixes, as [will be] mentioned, necessitate return of the l's [converted in the sing. from , and ی] to their o. fs. [below], lest ambiguity be produced; and, after restoration to the o. f., the , and ی are not converted into l, lest such conversion be a return to that [ambiguity] which has been escaped (R): (4) لَا تَخْشَى ~ لَا تَخْشَى، because it belongs to the cat. of لَا تَخْشَى Ye two shall not dread (SH), since the imp. is derived from the aor., and in [each of] them the ل is followed by the l of the pron.; so that, since the ل is not transformed in [the subj.,] such as لَا تَخْشَى, lest it be elided, and the du. be [then] mistaken for the sing., it is not transformed in [the imp.] لَا تَخْشَى also, although ambiguity would not be produced [by its elision], because لَا تَخْشَى with l would then be said, and in the sing. لَا تَخْشَى without l [428, 431] (Jrb): لَا تَخْشَى (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 l; so that لَا تَخْشَى is...
like (R),] contrary to [below] and [below] and [610, 663, 664] (SH), orig. and and , where the l is converted into l, and elided, because elision of the l does not produce ambiguity here, as it would in , 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 in such [a position] resembles the ! [of ]. But, [in the chapter on the Corroborative ] 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 (MAIR)] when it is after the prominent pron. [as in and ] becomes like a separate word, because the pron. is a separative; but, when there is no prominent pron. [before it, as in ], 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 ! [in and ]; but also the , and in [663], with which you do not retain
the J, as you do with the l; 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 [ рых*], and (R on IH) [ like рых* and ла тур* below,] is because the J is restored [to its place], on account of what we mentioned there (R), [vid. that] its elision [in рых* and рых*] was [a substitute] for apocopation [404] or quiescence [428, 431]; whereas, when the v. is intended to be uninf. 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 рых*, is because it is a deriv. of *[663]. 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 would not be restored in [663]. We have mentioned the predicament of such as рых* and рых* [above] in the chapter on the Concurrency of Two Quiescents [663]. And in such as рых* and рых* [above] the and َ 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)], 172a
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 ] (R). IH's saying "[when] they are mobile" [above] means "with a permanent vowel" [684 (condition 2)], to exclude such as and and [above], [and [below]: while, in such as and although the inflectional vowel is accidental, the and 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 as ). The , and when s, are converted into 1 , 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 , , gain and [pl. of a kind of small beast or reptile (MAR)]: or in a n. commensurable with, but not differing from, the v., as [black (MAR)] and more wretched: for the conformability, or the affinity mentioned, is prescribed only in the [703, 711, 712], not in the , because the 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
(R on the, and ى as لs). And the reason why such as عَلِيّاَنْ and طَيِّبٌ are not transformed is only that the و and ن, being inseparable [from the word], exclude the ج from the end; so that the و and ى become [medial,] as in طَيِّبٌ and ُجُرَّانۡ [684 (condition 11, a), 703]. If it be said “Why does not the inseparable ى in such as عُنۡصَرَةٌ [247] and ُتُقَبَّلُةٌ [689] prevent transformation of the ج [into ل], as the inseparable ى in such as خَنۡصَرَةٌ [721] prevents conversion of the ج into ى?”, I say “Because ج preceded by a letter pronounced with Fattah is not converted into ى in any position except when final, contrary to the conversion of ج and ى into ل, which is often found in the medial also, as in كَلَلّ [684, 703] and مَقَالَ [712]; so that the ى, which is orig. not inseparable [266], is not taken into account; contrary to the ج and ن, which are constitutionally inseparable”. And, from the affinity of conversion to the end of the word, the ج and ى, when final, are subject to this transformation, even if they be preceded by ل, provided that the ج be Ausp., because then it is virtually non-existent, as ٓيٓرُآف [683 (case 1), 720, 723]; whereas, when it is rad., as in ِرَأٰيٓ and ُنَآؤٰيٓ [728], they are not transformed, because the [ ] intervening as a] separative [between the mobile ج or ى and the preceding Fatha] is strong by reason of [its] originality. But, from the
weakness of this cause——I mean mobility of the  or  and precedence of a letter pronounced with Fath [703]—-in necessitating conversion, the  is restored to its  o. f. [above] of  or  and admits of being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, when omission of restoration would lead to ambiguity in the  or  , 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  is such as (1)  and  [above], where the  of the  pron. is attached to the transformed  and  [above]: so that, if the  [converted from the  or  ] were not restored to its  o. f., it would be elided because of the two quiescents; and [then] the  attributed to the  pron. of the  du. might be mistaken for the  attributed to the  pron. of the  sing., or to the explicit  [21]: (2)  [and  above], because the  would be elided in the [subj. and] apoc. [405]: (3)  or  according to  , because it is a deriv. of  [above]. And the  is such as (1)  prayers [726] and  damsels [234], where, if the  [converted from the  and  ] were elided because of the two quiescent, the  pl. might be mistaken for the  : (2)  two  staves [above] and  two youths [684 (condition 6, b)].
where, if it were not restored, the du. might, on pre-
fexion, be mistaken for the sing.; while [عَسْرَيْنٍ and] نَتْيَانٍ and رَحِيـَيْنٍ and are deriv. of [عَسْرَانِ and Tanwin, is restored [to its place], because the [concur-
rence of] two quiescents, the $ and Tanwin, ceases to
exist; and, after its restoration, you convert it into $, on
account of the $ of relation [300], as you convert the $ in [the synarthrous (MAR) أَلْفَةٌ أَلْفَةٌ and أَلْفَةٌ [above] when you form a rel. n. from them : but you do not say
that the elided $ is restored to its o.f. of $ or $; 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 $ [of relation] affixed to it.
And, after restoration and mobilization of all the letters
mentioned, you do not convert them into $, notwith-
standing 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
تَفَرَّفٍ تَفَرَّفٌ and تَفَرَّفٍ, or. تَفَرَّفٍ تَفَرَّفٍ, it is not from
fear of ambiguity, but for conformity to $ نَفَرَّفٍ and
The l is restored [to its place] in such as 
[above], and similarly [663] and similarly
and incorrectly [663], and incorrectly
because with the
the v. is not quiescent [in the final] nor apocopated,
while elision of the l is only [a substitute] for apocopa-
tion [404] or quiescence [428, 431]. And, after restor-
ation of the l [to its place], the y in
[above] is not converted into l, lest elision of the l be
entailed thereby, which would lead to what one has
fled from, [vid. elision of the l without apocopation or
quiescence] (R on the w and y as e s). But, in the
dial. of Tayyi, according to what Fr transmit from
them, the y that is a l is elided in the sing. masc.,
after Kasr or Fatha, in the infl. [i.e., aor. (AKB),]
and uninfl. [i.e., imp., the Kasra or Fatha remaining
unaltered (AKB)], as By God, assuredly.
Zaid shall shoot and
Do thou surely shoot,
O Zaid, assuredly Zaid shall dread and
Do thou surely dread, O Zaid: and hence
إذا قلْ قطْلْي قِلْتُ بِاللَّهِ حَلْفَةٌ لَّنْ تَقْتِلْي عَنِّي ذَٰلِكَ أُجْمَعْ
[119] (R on IH), where there is another version
meant to be with the single n, which, says IY, is
suppressed by poetic license [614]; and
وَأَبْنِ اَنْشَأَ تَفْضِي بَعْدَ جَدَّيْهِ # طَانِثَ أَصْائِلَةَ فِي ذِلِّكَ الْبَلَدِ
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 *أَهْلُهَا يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ* Assuredly the rights shall indeed be rendered to their owners on the day of resurrection (AKB). And so in *إِرَضُنْ يَا أَمْرَأَتُكُمْ* [above], the , and ی are not converted, (1) because the vowel is accidental [684 (condition 2)], as we mentioned [under *إَخْشَيْنَ* and *إِرَضُنْ* ] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents [663]; (2) because the , and ی [here] are independent n.s.; (3) because , and ی 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 ی ] is another word; (4) because, if altered by conversion, they would be elided without any indication of them, such as is [provided] in *أَفْرَزْنَ* [663, 664] (R on the , and as ِ), where the indication of the elision is the Damm and Kasr, respectively [610] (MAR); [since *إِرْضُنْ* and *إِرْضُنْ* would both be reduced to *إِرْضُنْ* ]. But IM says that elision of the ی of the pron. after Fatha, as *إِرْضُنْ* from *إِرْضُنْ* [663], is a َTā‘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 They raided and They shot, and They shot, and

They are pleased, and

They are pleased [663], and

They raided and They shot, and

They shot, and

They are made quiescent in the cat. of (1) raids and shoots [404, 720], in the ind.; (2) the raider [below] and the shooter [720] in the nom. and gen. (SH). The —and this [termination] is peculiar to the v., not being [found] in the n. [721]—is made quiescent, because, pronounced with Damm after 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 Damma [on the ], because the vowel is after the consonant [667, 697], is elided. Similarly ی pronounced with Damm after Kasra is made quiescent: but this [combination] is less heavy than the first; and is [found] in n. and v., as هو يرسم He shoots and The shooter came. IH mentions [685 (case 1, a), 724] and in order to explain that the ی whose o. f. is ی, is like the original. And similarly ی pronounced with Kasr after Kasra is made quiescent, because of the combination of likes, as in ی pronounced with Damm after Damma [above], which is heavier:
and this [combination] is [found] in the n., as إِرمِيَ (R). The ﷲ and ﷳ are elided in such as (M, SH) ﷲ) تَمَّ (1) ﷲ Raid not and ﷲ Shoot not [404, 697] أَحْرُزَ (R). The ﷲ and ﷳ are elided in such as (M, SH) ﷲ) تَمَّ (1) ﷲ Raid not and ﷲ Shoot [428, 431, 697] (M): (2) They [masc.] raid and ﷲ They shoot (SH): (a) ﷲ يُفَلُّونَ is orig. ﷲ يُفَلُّونَ [above], to which the ﷲ of the pl. is affixed; so that the first ﷳ is elided, because of the two quiescents: (b) ﷲ يُفَلُّونَ is orig. ﷲ يُفَلُّونَ, to which the ﷳ of the pl. is affixed; so that the ﷳ is elided, because of the two quiescents; and the ﷲ is then pronounced with دٞمٞم, in order that the ﷲ may be preserved, since it is a complete word, which must not be altered (R): (3) أُغْرِنَ and أُغْرِنَ [above], إِرمَٰنٌ (SH): (a) أُغْرِنَ [663], to which the double ﷲ is attached; so that the ﷳ is elided, because of the two quiescents: and أُغْرِنَ is similar [mutatis mutandis]: (b) إِرمَٰنٌ [663, 664] are like إِرمَٰنٌ and إِرمَٰنٌ, because orig. إِرمَٰنٌ and إِرمَٰنٌ [663] (R): (4) يَدَّ and دَمٞمٞ (M). But such as ﷲ يَدَّ and ﷲ كَمٞمٞ [687, 697, 698], أَخَ and أَخَ [260, 307 689], are not regular (SH), which means that the elision of the ل in these ns. is not for any regular cause; but for bare alleviation, on which account the inflection
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rests on the final of what remains (R). Analogy requires retention [of the ج] in some of them, like ٰٓ and ٰٓ and ٰسم ٰٓ, because the letter before the unsound letter is quiescent, as in ٰٓطبي [643, 720] and ٰٓقث [667]; and change [of the ج into ى] in others, like ٰٓاٰخ and ٰٓإبن, because the unsound letter is mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as in عصا [above]: but they are docked [of the ج], contrary to analogy, because frequent in their speech (Jrb). As for ٰٓأخت, however, it is not docked of the ج; but the ر is a subst. for its ج [689] (R). The ٰٓ and ٰٓ are preserved in such as (1) ٰٓيرميان ٰٓغرث and ٰٓرمي ٰٓغرث [above]; (2) ٰٓيغمزز و ٰٓمكزز (M), where the ٰٓ and ٰٓ are preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm and Kasr, respectively [684 (condition 3)] (IY); (3) ٰٓرميا ٰٓعشر and ٰٓرميا ٰٓعشر [above] (M).

§ 720. As regards bearing the vowels of inflection, the ٰٓ and ٰٓ, (1) when preceded by a quiescent, proceed like sound letters, as in (a) ٰٓطبي ٰٓكث [16. 302, 643, 728] (M), because the origin of their unsoundness is their resemblance to ٰٓ, which they are like only when quiescent, and preceded, the ٰٓ by Kasra, and the , by ظamma, in which case they become like ٰٓ, because quiescent and preceded by a vowel homogeneous with them, as likewise is ٰٓ, 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 ل, because ل is preceded only by a letter pronounced with Fath (IY): (b) عدّ (643, 780) and عّدّي (299) (M), because the first, and ال here are quiescent, like the ال of عَلْبَي [above] and the ح of حُيّي [85] (IY): (c) زاو (683 (case 1, c), 723), and آي [302, 683, 723, 728] (M), because ال and ال, when final, are transformed only after an aug. ل, as in كُسَيّ and رَدَأ (683, 719, 723), not after an ٖl converted from a red. letter, lest two transformations, of the ال and the ل, occur consecutively in the word (IY): (2) when ٖl preceded by a mobile [below], bear only [Fatha (IY),] the sign of the subj. or acc., [because Fatha is light (IY),] as in (a) لَن يَفْرَزَ أَرْيَدُ أَنْ تَسْتَقَرَّ He shall not raid and I desire that thou shouldst draw water and تُستَدْعَى تستدعي shouldst summon; (b) رَأَيْتُ الْأَرْأَيْي (I saw the shooter and the blind (man) and the shouter (M): (α) by “mobile” [above] ز means “with the vowel permissible”, vid. (α) دامما before ل, which [combination] is [found] only in مس., as يَفْرَزُ [404, 719] and يَدْعُو يَدْعُو calls [727]; not in مس. [721]: (β) كسر before ال, which [combination] occurs in مس., as الْعَقَافِي the judge [16, 294, 724] and الْأَرْأَيْي [719]; and مس.; as يَمْرِي [404, 719] and يَسْتَقِى waters: (b) when preceded by
a letter pronounced with Fath, and ی are converted into لـ [684], as when preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, ی is converted into ی [686]; and, when preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, ی is converted into ی [685]: while only Damma occurs before ی, and only Kasra before ی (IY). But [some of the Arabs assimilate the ی and ی to لـ, 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 A†Tufail (IY, MN) al'Amir alJa'di, the chief of the Banū '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 أَسْمُوُهُ أَنَّ أَسْمُوُهُ ِبِّيُمَ وَلَا أَبِّي (MN)]; and [hence (IY)] the saying of AlA'šā [Maimūn Ibn Kais, praising the Prophet (Jsh).]

Then I swore that I would not be merciful to her for any weariness, nor for any soreness of foot, until she should meet Muḥammad, by rule ُلَفَّاقَيْنِ (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'dīs (S).]
O dwelling of Hind, that hast been effaced, save its stones used to support the cooking-pot (M), where [properly ] is an acc., because an exc. from an aff. [83]; and hence ِکَفَّٰنَى بِالْتَّأُّلِيْلَِ (IY); and the prov. ِعَطِیْلَ اَلْقُوْسِ بِارِبِهَا Give the bow to its maker (M), meaning Seek aid for thy work from the possessors of knowledge and skill therein (Md), where [properly ] is obj. of ِعَطِیْلَ : (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 ِعَطِیْلَ quiescent in such comps. as مَعْدَیْلٌ كَرِیْبَ [below] and كَانَ اَئِیْدِیهِنَّ الْغَیْبَ [215] (AKB on ِعَطِیْلَ below). Ka'b's saying [444] with quiescence [of the ] admits of two explanations, (1) that he makes the infinitival inap., as in

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 یَمِّنُ in
II. 233. [525, 572]: (a) so they say: though the latter may be explained on [the supposition] that *آنَََ* is op.; but that the *أَنََ* is *يَتَّعَونَ* with the *بِيَّْٰنَِِٰ* of the *بِيَّْٰنَِِٰ* by concord with the sense of *مِنْ* like X. 48. [182, 581]; and that the *نَ* is afterwards elided [405] because of the subjunctival [410], and the *بِيَّْٰنَِِٰ* because of the two quiescents [663]: (2) that he treats *فاَتُحَةُ* on, like *ثَمَّمَةُ*, by poetic license, which, says *مَبْ* is one of the most beautiful poetic licenses [above]: (a) that occurs even in the case of a [letter] lighter than *وُلْدَتْ* *وُلْدَتْ* as in *أَلْسَنَََ* *أَلْسَنَََ* *أَلْسَنَََ* *أَلْسَنَََ*. Quiescence of *وُلْدَتْ* occurs in prose, as in the reading of one of the ancients *وُلْدَتْ* *وُلْدَتْ* [565]. Quiescence of *وُلْدَتْ* occurs in prose, as in the reading of one of the ancients *وُلْدَتْ* *وُلْدَتْ* [565]. Quiescence of *وُلْدَتْ* occurs in prose, as in the reading of one of the ancients *وُلْدَتْ* *وُلْدَتْ* [565]. Quiescence of *وُلْدَتْ* occurs in prose, as in the reading of Ja‘far Ibn *Muḥammad* *وُلْدَتْ* *وُلْدَتْ* *وُلْدَتْ* [V. 91. 543] (BS), according to the dial. of those who make it quiescent in the three cases, like *وُلْدَتْ* *وُلْدَتْ* *وُلْدَتْ*.
[below] (B), for lightness, as they say [above], by assimilation of ی is ۱ (K); and also in the readings ژزی حفت الموالی من ژرآیی 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 نَذَكْرُوا أَنْ أَلْلَهَ عَلَیْهَا صَرَافِي XXII. 37. Therefore mention the name of God over them, when pure, this being with a quiescent ی, pl. of صَلاِیْة, i. e., exclusively belonging to God (BS). In [the position of (IY),] the ind. or nom., the ی and ی are quiescent (M), because پَمَامَة upon them is deemed heavy; so that you say [in the v.] هَرْ يَغْرُزُ He raids and يَرْتَبُ shoots [719], and in the n. هُدَا آلِ الرَّبِی This is the shooter and الْعَبِی the blind (man) and البَضْرُمَی the shouter. But some of the Arabs treat this ی like the sound [letter], mobilizing it with the vowels of inflection, as هُدَا تَمِیْ This is a judge, زَمَرْتُ بَقَاهُی 643, and I passed by a judge (IY). Mobilization [of the ی (SH)] is anomalous (M, SH) in the nom. and gen. [below] (SH), as قدَّ کَانَ یَدْهَبِ بِالْدَنِیا وَلَدِتْهَا مَوْالیْ کِبْشَ الْعُورٍ سُقَاح (M, R, Jrb) Plump darlings, like the rams of the breed of sheep called آلْعُور, have-wellnigh taken away (the life of) the world and its pleasure (Jsh), and ما إن رَأَیْتُ آمِع
[below] (IY, R, Jrb): like (1) quiescence [of the, and ی (R, Jrb)] in the subj. or acc. (SH), as (a) قَنْبَا سَوْدَنِي (R, Jrb): [above] (R, Jrb): (b) ۴۱۷٠۱٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩آ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩; the saying كَأَنَّ أَنْبِهَيْنِ بِالْقَدْرِ عِلَيْهِ ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ (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. ۴١۷٠۱٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ [above] (Jrb): (2) retention of both [ , and (R, Jrb)], and of ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ [below] (R, Jrb), i. e., ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ (R); and, in some readings, (a) أَوْسِلَةْ مَعَن١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ يَرْتَعِى وَيَلْعَبُ XII. 12. Send him with us to-morrow: he will feed, and play [from ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ (K, B)], where ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ being the correl. of the command, is governed in the apoc. [420] (Jrb); while Nafi reads ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ with Kasr, and ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ (B); and Ya‘lā Ibn Siyāba reads ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ with Kasr of the ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩, and ۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ And he will play in the ind. by inception [423] (K): and (b) إِنْتَ مَنْ (۴١۷٠۱١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ بِتَقِي أَلّ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ XII. 90. [below] (Jrb): (α) Damma is then
supplied on the , and ٣، in order that it may be elided [404] by the apocopative, because the apocopative must govern [419]; but more frequently and properly on the ٣، because ُٰمَامَة on ٣، is heavier than on ٛ (R): (c) ُلا تَفْقَوْا عَلَى ٰمَا أَنْبَأَ لَهُ أَنْسَاهُ ٰمَمَمَم [below] (Jrb), and ُلَا تَفْقَوْا عَلَى ٰمَا أَنْبَأَ لَهُ أَنْسَاهُ ٰمَمَمَم [below]: (a) to supply ُٰمَامَة on the ٣، is more strange, because ٣، does not bear a vowel (R). In the gen. only ٣، occurs, because [the gen. is only in decl. ns., while (IY)] among decl. ns. there is none whose final is ٣، preceded by a vowel [721]. And the predicament of the ٣، in the gen. is the same as in the nom. [above]. But ُمَا يُضْجَرُونِ الرَّءُبِ غَيْرَ مَأْسِيُّ وَيُؤْمَأْ كَرَى مَنْهُمْ غَوْلًا تَفْقُوْ ِاللهُ [below] by ٰجَرِر, [And one day they reward love with an ineffective (meeting), and another day thou seest in them a she-devil that destroys (man), orig. ُتَفْقُوْلُ (MN),] is cited; and [‘Ubaid Allāh (Dw)] Ibn [Kais (Dw)] ArRukayyāt says ُلا بَرَكَ آلَةَ فِي أَلْفَوْانِيِّ الْعَمَّ [547]; and another says ُمَا إِنْ رَأَيْتُ وَلا أَرَى فِي مَدْنِيِّ #ٰكَبَوُارِي يَلْعَبُونِ فِي الْصَّحْرَاءِ [above] (M) I have not seen, ُإِنْ لَنْ يَرَى فِي مَدْنِيِّ #ٰكَبَوُارِي يَلْعَبُونِ فِي الْصَّحْرَاءِ [653], 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, Kasr of the ٣، in the gen. [16], and triptote declension [17, 18] (IY). But [R says that] the ٣، and ٢ are treated like
the sound [letter], in a case of choice, by some of the Arabs, who mobilize the ٥ of الْلَّمْ [719] in the nom. and gen., and of ٣ [404, 719] in the ind.; and similarly the ٥ of يَفْعَلُ [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 Zabban; then thou camest, apologizing for satirizing Zabban: thou didst not satirize (him), nor let (him) alone (MN, Jsh), by rule ١٧٥ (Jsh)]; and in ٤٢٥ [508] (M), properly ١٧٥ (Jsh); while one version reported from Ibn Kathîr is ١٧٥ (IY, Jsh) Ibn Waqqâs alHârîthi (Jsh)]

XII. 90. Verily the case is this, whoso feareth etc. [404]. As for the ١ [above], it is retained, always quiescent; except in the apoc. mood [404, 697], where it is elided, like the ٥ and ٥ [above], as ١٧٥ did not dread and ١٧٥ was not called. But it is retained in the saying [of 'Abd Yaghûth (IY, Jsh) Ibn Waqqâs alHârîthi (Jsh)]
And an 'Abshami [309] old dame laughs at me, as though she had not seen a Yamnā [311] captive before me, by rule; and [similarly (IY)] in

\[\text{ما أنس لا أنسة آخر عيشتي ما لاح بالعرا ظلم سراب} \]

[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

\[\text{لا أنسة (Jsh) : and hence} \]

إذا العجز غصبت نبطي ولا ترضعها ولا تملق

[above] (M), by Ru‘ba. Ibn Al‘Ajjāj, When the old woman is angry, then divorce (her); and seek not to pacify her, nor coax (her) (MN), cited by AZ (IY); though IJ says that there is a version

\[\text{ولا ترضعها} \]

(according to the more recognized form (MN).

§ 721. Among decl. ِنِس there is none whose final is \(\) preceded by a vowel [719, 720], because the vowel, if Fatḥa, makes the \(\) become \(\) as in عَصَا [684, 719]; and, if Kasra, converts it into \(\) as in أَفْتَرَى [685, 719, 724] (IY on § 720); while there is no [decl. (Jrb)] \(\) n. whose final is \(\) preceded by ِDamma [686 (case 2, c, a)], that being [found] only in \(\) as يُفْرَو [727] (IY, Jrb), and indecl. \(\) ns., as هُو [below] and دُو [176] (Jrb). The cause of that will [now] be explained (IY). When \(\) after an
original Damma occurs as a ج, final, as in ُادنَّ (248), or virtually final, as when followed by a separable letter, like the س of feminization, when separable [266], as in ُتَفَصَّلْ [336, 686 (case 2, b)], or an l of dualization [228], as in ُتَفَيَّضْ (727), and that [combination] is in a decl. n., the ج must be converted into ى, and the Damma before it into Kasra, because ج precedent by a letter pronounced with Dam 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 ُأَدَلْ (248, 685, 727) and ُأَحْقِيٌّ (IY), [by analogy ُأَخْفَر], for the pl. of paucity (IY) on [the measure of] أَفْعَلَ, from ُدَلْلُ ُحَقْرُ َعَرْقٌ َقَلَّ نَسْةٌ َقَلَّ نَسْةٌ (248, 728) and ُقَلَّ نَسْةٌ َقَلَّ نَسْةٌ (254, 390, 729), [by elision of the س (IY)], on the principle of تَمْرَةٌ and تَمْرَةٌ (254), as

لا صبر حتى تلاحظني بعضي أهل الرَّبَاط البَيْضِيِّ والقَّلِنس

[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 Kasra for the Damma before the ج, in order that the ج may be converted into ى, as in ميقات and ميقات [685 (case 5), 699] (M); so that the word becomes of the
class of the defective, like قافِٰ [16] (IY). [According to R, however, first] the ٰ is converted into ی; and afterwards the ذامما into كسر: and one does not begin by converting the ذامما into كسر, because alleviation of the final is more appropriate. The ٰ, is not converted into ی, (1) when it is not a ی, whether it be pronounced with (a) فتح, as in ُقُبْنِياء [273, 385]: (b) ذامما, in which case, (α) if followed by a quiescent, as in حَكَّامُ عَلَيْهِمْ ِالْكُحُولُ The year passed over him (KF, MAR)], it may be retained, or be converted into حامزا [683] (R), [as] ُحُرُولُ (KF); (b) if followed by a mobile, it must be made quiescent, as ُنُوارُ [orig. ُنُورُ (MAR)], pl. of ُنُوارُ [711, 712]: or (c) كسر, in which case it remains unaltered, as ُأَكْرَمُ on [the measure of] ُأَكِيمُ from ُأَوْدِ مجَذَنَة affection: (α) as for ُقِبْلَ, orig. ُقِلْ [436], it is because of what has been mentioned in the Commentary on the IH [706]: (2) when it is a ی, but is followed by an inseparable letter, like the ی of feminization in ٤٣٣ و ِفِتْحَةُ ِعَنْصَرَةِ and ِقُبْرِةُ ِعَنْصَرَةِ [385, 399, 719, 724], and the nondualistic ٰ and ُن in ُفْلكُ ِفْلَكُ and ُفُلْكُ ِفُلْكُ [274, 390, 724]: except when the ذامما before it is upon another ی, in which case it is converted into ی, because of the excessive heaviness, even if it be immediately followed by an inseparable letter, as in ُقِبْرِةُ and ُقُبْرِةُ ِقُوْرِيَةٌ [730. A] on [the
measure of) سَمْرَةٌ [254] and سَبَعَانٌ [385, 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 ئَامَّة [before it] is not permanent, as in (a) َأَبُوكُ ُتُبَأَكُرُ thy father, ُتُبَأَكُرُ thy mouth and ُتُبَأَكُرُ thy brother [16]: (b) خُطْوُاتُ steps [238, 240]; for, though
the ٰ and َ [234] are separable, like the َ [336] of تَغَافُّ ئَاءٌ [above], still the ئَامَّة of the َ is accidental in the
pl., where the َ may be made quiescent: (4) when the
ٰ is in a ُ, like ُسَرَّرُ was liberal [729], aor. يَسِرُّ [730],
and [like] يَدْعُرُ [720], because, though the ُ is heavier
than the َ, so that alleviation is more appropriate and
suitable for it, still the word becomes a ُ only through
the measure, since the o. f. of the ُ is the inf. َ [331],
which is transferred to the cat. of the ُ through the
formation only, the inf. َ being like the material, and
the ُ like a compound of the material and the form;
and, since the quality of ُ comes into existence through
the formation only [724], while the formations of the
tril. ُ vary, and are distinguishable, one from another,
only through the vowel of the ع [482, 704, 730. أ.], the
Arabs take care to preserve that vowel, which is there-
fore not elided, except when the formation is not dis-
tinguishable by transfer [of that vowel] to the preced-
ing letter, as in َتُعَبِّرُ and َتُعَبِّرُ, contrary to ِفَتْحُهُ and
and طُلْطُ [705], and to يَبِيعُ and يَكَفُّ [697, 703], as before explained: (a) similarly they say رَمَّرَ and أَلْرَجُلَ How well the man shoots! [476, 686 (case 2, a), 724], contrary to such as آَلْتَرَامِيَّ [713]. (b) thus it is established that the Damma of ِسْرُرَ and ِيِذَّمُرَ [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. [ِهِيَ she], if the ِ were converted. And IH, notwithstanding that he is discussing the ِ preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, mentions حُيِّكَةْ [273] together with قُوْبَاَ [above], to demonstrate the predicament of the ِ preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, as respects the fact that with the ِ conversion of the Damma into Kasra is necessary where it is necessary before the ِ, as تَرَامِيْ [332] and تَرَامِيْ [336, 686 (case 2, b)], according to what we have mentioned [in connection with and تَغَارَ] and unnecessary where it is not necessary with the ِ [above]. Fr says that سِيْرَةْ [273, 385] is orig. فِعْلَةْ with Damm, being
pronounced with Kasr on account of the ی, as یُمْوت and یُعْرُون ٛ[242], یِبَت and یَعِينَة ٛ[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] فعَلَه، with Kasr of the ِف, except the hollow whose ِع is a ٌی: but Khl says that no فعَلَه with Kasr of the ِف occurs in the language, except یِعُبَد یَعْبَاء, ِسَبَآء, [686], ِعَبَد and ِحُولاَه یِعَبَاء, ِحُولاَه and i. q. ِحُولاَه membrane enclosing the fetus in the womb of the she-camel (R), which have no fourth (KF, MAR). They say یُفَحُدوة and یُقَلْنُسْرَة [above], یَفَحُدوة and یَقَلْنُسْرَة [283, 389, 685 (case 1, b, b), 724], where the ِی is not final. And the counterpart of that is the transformation in such as یُكَسَأ and یِرَدَآآ [683, 723], and its omission in such as (1) and یِفَحُدوة and یَفَحُدوة and یِقَلْنُسْرَة and یَقَلْنُسْرَة [266, 683 (case 1, d), 723]; (2) paternity and یَفَرَاتِنَة [722] (M), inf. ns. on [the measure of] فعَلَة [331], from which the ِی is inseparable in the first state of their formation in this shape [265 (case 10)] (IV); and [مِدْرَاؤِن یَنِثَیاَی] (3) 228-230, 683 (case 1, f), 723, 727. S asked Khl about their saying یَعْفَآیة یَعْبَاء and یَعْفَآیة یَعِبَاء; and he said “They only pronounce the n. un. [254] conformably to یَعْفَآیة [723], یَعِبَاء (M); as they
say مَرَضْيَة مَسْنُونَة and مَرَضْيَة مَسْنُونَة, pronouncing them conformably to مَرَضْيَة مَسْنُونَة [685 (case 8), 722]” (S, IV); meaning that سلّة and عُبَاءة are not treated like نِهَائِية [above] and إِذَا [281, 683 (case 1, d)], because the إ is affixed to سلّة and عُبَاءة after the conversion [of their ل] into Hamza has become necessary in them (IV): “but, as for those who say مَرَضْيَة and مَرَضْيَة [266], they do not pronounce the ن. un. conformably to سلّة and عُبَاءة; as those who say حُصُيّة [228] do not form the د. conformably to the sing. used in speech (M), whereas, if they meant that, they would say حُصُيّة” (S).

§ 722. They say عَتْيَة and جَتْيَة [act of] kneeling upright [728], and عَتْيَة [with Kasr of the ع and س, or with Dolma of the ف (IV)], doing to the final , after دامما in يُحُوَّل, notwithstanding that the letter of prolongation is a barrier between them, what they do to it in أَدْل [721], as they do in كَسَاء [683, 723] the like of what they do in عَصَا [684, 719] (M). The , is converted into ي 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 د of the word, comes, as it
were, immediately after the Damma, عصر becoming constructively عصر; and is therefore converted into ی, as in أذلٰلٰ and أَحْيٰ [721]. Then, this ی being combined with [the preceding] و, the, is converted into ی [685 (case 7)]. And they pronounce the ی with Kasr in such as غصی, as they do in أذلٰلٰ أَحْيٰ [721] (IY). This process is invariable in what is a pl. [above], except in such an anomaly as إنك لتَنظَرُ في نَحْرٍ كَثِيرٍ 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 وَّقَدْ عَلَى مُطْرَقٍ (M), as XXV. 23. [685 (case 9, b)] (IY); but they do say وَّقَدْ عَلَى مُطْرَقٍ as [685 (case 8, b, a, γ)]: and they say أَرْضٌ مُسْيَتَةٌ irrigated land [from سَنتَوْنَ أَرْضًا I watered the land (IY)], and مَرْضٌ [685 (case 8), 721]; or مَرْضٌ [below], according to rule. S says “The proper letter in this sort”, [i. e., what is a sing. (IY),] “is ؤ; but the other is [good] Arabic, [and] frequent: while the proper letter in the pl. is ی” (M). The final , preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, 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 Damma is on another, as غزى on the measure of [396] from غزى [728, 730. A]; and hence مقومى pass. part. from قوة [685 (case 8), 730. A]:

(b) a pl. on [the measure of] فْعَلُ [243, 685 (case 9)], like عصى pl. of جَاثِي kneeling upright, and غصى pl. of عصى [above]; and hence قاسي after transposition [243]:

(a) pl. of نَحْوَ pl. of ِلَتْنَاطُر في نَصْوُ كُتْبَرَ Verily he looks etc. [above] is anomalous; and so are نَحْوَ pl. of نَحْوَ cloud, pl. of نَحْوَ chest, and أَبَّ and أَحْوَ, pls. of أَبَّ and 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 قْوَنَ (IY, Jrb) and خَرَّجَ [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 Damma is not on [another], but which belongs to the conjug. of فعل with Kasr [of the ع], as مَرْضَى [685 (case 8)], which is more frequent than مَرْضَى [above], for imitation of the pret. v.: (3) properly omitted, in every inf. n. on [the measure of] فْعَلُ, like جَعْرَ [act of] kneeling upright and عَتَرُ [685 (case 9, b)]; while those who convert [the ] into ى do so because of the transformation of [the ] into ى in] the v. [عَتَرَ and جَعْرَ]. If not final, the is not converted, as أَبَّة and أَحْوَ [721].
Conversion is extraordinary in (1) and لَعْنُوتُهُ and, like لَعْنُوتُهُ and لَعْنُوتُهُ, but or riddle occurs; and hence لَعْنُوتُهُ from I expanded (Jh), and لَعْنُوتُهُ or لَعْنُوتُهُ, 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) as an oath, which may be لَعْنُوتُهُ or لَعْنُوتُهُ while its ل is a, because they say أُنَّهُ in the same sense: (3) the pass. part. in which the دامْمَة is not on [another], and which does not belong to the conjug. of فَعَلَ with كَسْر, like مَفَظُورُ [685 (case 8, b)]: but مَفَظُورُ or مَفَظُورُ [above] is said; and the poet says

أَنَا الْلِّيْثٌ مَعْدَرِيْ عِلْيِهِ وَعَادْيَا

[above] (R). The saying أَنَا الْلِّيْثٌ مَلَحَمَ is recited in both ways [685 (case 8, b, a, a)]. The cause of the transformation is disputed, being said to be (1) conformity to the pass. v. [عَدَيْ (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 أَّجْرِ and أَدْلِ [243, 721], because the first, [of مَفَظُورُ (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 دamma ; and is therefore converted into ي, as in لُدِلِ and أُجْرِ [above] (A). The pass. part. whose ل is a Hamza is sometimes subjected to this transformation, like مَخْبَرٌ, orig. مَخْبِرٌ, hidden [658]. And فَتْوَ occurs anomalously as pl. of فَتْنَي youth, notwithstanding that its ل is a لُحْرُ, as لُحْرُ is anomalous, except that the anomaly in فَتْوَ is conversion of the ي into لُحْرُ [243]. and in لُحْرُ is non-conversion of the ت into ي [above]. After conversion of the ت into ي [and of the دamma into Kasra], you may make the ف of فَعَّلَ, whether a pl. or otherwise, imitate, or not imitate, the الع [in its vowel] as عَتْي [684, 685 (case 9, b, a), 730. A] and دَلِي [243, 685 (case 9)]. And in فَعَّلَ, when a pl. of the hollow whose ل is, as لُحْرُ fasters [247] and saysers [730. A], you may convert the ت into ي, as ضِصْمَ and قَلِبَ [685 (case 10), 715, 716], though it should rather be sounded true. That is allowable only because it is a pl. [above], and the ت is near the end; while عَلِم. for حَرْوَ [714] is not allowable, because it is a sing. [above]. IH has previously adjudged this conversion to be anomalous [716]: whereas the language of S notifies that it is regular. But, as for مَثَأ أَرّقَ آئَلِيَّمَ آئَلِيَّمَ [685, 715, 716], it is anomalous, because of the remoteness from the end (R).
§. 723. The \( \text{ه} \), \( \text{و} \), and \( \text{ي} \) are converted [into \( \text{ل} \), and afterwards (R)] into Hamza [683 (case 1, \( k \), \( b \))], when they occur as a final [below] after an aug. \( \text{ل} \), [because, the \( \text{ل} \) being then like the non-existent, the mobile \( \text{و} \), and \( \text{ي} \) occur, as it were, after Fatha (R),] as \( \text{ر} \) 丹麦 and 丹麦 [328, 683, 708, 719] (SH), which are 丹麦 丹麦 from 丹麦 丹麦 丹麦 such a one is good in the fashion of wearing the cloak (Jrb); contrary to 丹麦 and 丹麦 [719] (SH), where the \( \text{ل} \), being converted from a rad. letter, [ 丹麦 in the former ex., and \( \text{ي} \) in the latter,] is taken into account (R). It is mentioned, in the commentary ascribed to IH, that 丹麦 and 丹麦, are pl. of 丹麦 and 丹麦: but this requires consideration; and it should rather be said that 丹麦 and 丹麦 [301, 302, 305], 丹麦 and 丹麦 [305, 684], are [collective generic ns. and ns. un., respectively,] on the principle of 丹麦 and 丹麦 [254] (Jrb). The 丹麦 and 丹麦 mentioned are converted into \( \text{ل} \) because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha [684, 719]. Then, two quiescent 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 \( \text{ل} \), 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 ٰ or ی, because one has only just escaped from them (R). It is stipulated, in the case of the [ٰ or ی (IV)] converted after that the ٰ should be *aug.* [374, 673], as in ٍکَسْاَلَ and ٍثْٰر [above]: whereas, if it be *rad.*, the ٰ or ی is not converted, as ٰٰٰ [683 (case 1, a), 697, 698, 720] and ٰٰ [below], ٍیَٰٰ and ٍثَاَٰٰي [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 Fatha; and is therefore treated, in respect of conversion and transformation, in the same way as in ٍغَاٰ and ٍرِخَى [719]: whereas, when the ٰ is *rad.*, this assumption is not permissible: (2) that the ٰ, when *rad.*, is converted from another [letter]; so that, when you proceed to convert the ٰ or ی, which is a ل, you make two transformations consecutively, which is a catachresis. And Mz exaggerates in precaution by stipulating that the ٰ, with which the ٰ or ی is converted into Hamza, should be [not only] *aug.*, [but] third, to guard against ٰٰ [below] and ٰٰ [720]; for, though "*aug.*" is sufficient as a safeguard, he corroborates it by "third" (IV). As for ٰٰ [321, 720], its ٰ is converted from a ٰ, and
its ج is a ى, because it is from the crude-form of جَعْتُ I collected, except that its ى is transformed, and its ج preserved. The general rule is that the ج should be transformed, and the ى sounded true, as [683, 684 (condition 10, a, a, γ)] and [683, 713]; but جَىَىْ is co-ordinated, in anomalousness, with جَىَىْ [above] and غَالَىَىْ [684 (condition 10, b)]. And, as for ثاى [above], the [fold or] nightly resting-place of camels, [sheep, or goats (Jh),] it is from ثَوْبُ I abode. Similarly, if the ج and ى be followed by the [inseparable] ى of feminization [below], as in ىَشَقارْ and ىَشَقاْ [266, 683 (case 1, d)], then being considered not quasi-final, but quasi-medial, because the ى of feminization is [permanently] attached to the word, they are not converted into Hamza (Jrb). Since the ج and ى’s being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha is a weak cause for their conversion [703], and, above all, when an ج separates them from the Fatha, it is prevented from taking effect by the occurrence of an inseparable letter after the ج and ى, because their conversion into ج 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 ى of feminization [above], when inseparable from the word [683 (case 1, d)], as in ىَنْقَرْا choice part and ىَنْهَالْىَىْ [266, 721];
(2) the ٧ of dualization, when inseparable, as in ٧٠١٨٢, ٦٨٣ (case ١, ١٨١), ٧٢١, since ٧٠١٨٢ for the sing. does not occur; (3) the non-dualistic ٧ and ٧٠١٨٢, on the measure of ٧٠١٨٢ [٣٩٠], from ٧٠١٨٢ and ٧٠١٨٢: whereas, (a) if the ٧ be separable, which is (a) the ٧ distinguishing the fem. from the masc. in eps. [٢٦٥], as ٧٠١٨٢ [٦٨٢, ٦٨٣ (case ١, ١٨١)] and ٧٠١٨٢, because they say ٧٠١٨٢ [٢٨٢] and ٧٠١٨٢ great raider, and (b) the regular ٧ of un. [٣٣٦], as in ٧٠١٨٢ a drawing of water and ٧٠١٨٢ a choice, an election, or, (b) if the ٧ of dualization be separable, as in ٧٠١٨٢ and ٧٠١٨٢ [٢٣٠, ٦٨٣ (case ١, ١٨١)], the ٧ and ٧٠١٨٢ are converted, because quasi-final. And the reason why ٧٠١٨٢ [٢٦٦, ٦٨٣ (case ١, ١٨١), ٧٢١], ٧٠١٨٢ or ٧٠١٨٢, ٧٠١٨٢ or ٧٠١٨٢, with Hamza or ٧٠١٨٢, are allowable, although in them also the ٧ denotes unity, as in ٧٠١٨٢ and ٧٠١٨٢ [above], is only that, in the inf. n. [٣٣٦], the ٧ of un. is regular, frequent, so that its adventitiousness is obvious; contrary to the concrete n. [٣], where those [specimens] whose n. un. is distinguished from their generic n. by the ٧ [٢٥٤, ٢٦٥] are rare, whether they be [denotative of] created things, like ٧٠١٨٢ and ٧٠١٨٢, or [of] others, like ٧٠١٨٢ and ٧٠١٨٢ [٢٥٤]: so that, in the three ns. [under discussion], Hamza is allowable from regard to the
separability of the ی, since ی [721], عطاء, and ی are said for the generic n.; while ی is allowable, because the ی [in the concrete n.], being generally inseparable, since, as we said, it is not regular, becomes like the ی of شقاعة [229, 266]. And, since the ی of un. in the concrete n. is quasi-inseparable, عُرْطُوئِيَّة and قَلْنُسُوئِيَّة are allowable, although the generic n. is عُرْطُوئِيَّة and قَلْنُسُوئِيَّة [721]. But [the inf. ns.] شقاعة and شقاعة are not like [the concrete ns.] عطاء and عطاء [above], since شقاعة does not denote the individual, and شقاعة the genus; nay, the n. un. would by rule be شقارة a misery [336]: so that شقارة is not orig. شقاعة augmented by the ی; and for this reason the ی is permanent, as عبارة, not عبارة [266]. The reason why the occurrence of an inseparable letter [after the ی and ی] prevents conversion in the cat. of شقارة [above] and خرائیة being ashamed [below], and in the cat. of قُمُدُوئیة [719, 721], but not in the cat. of عَزَیة [685, 686, 724], and فَعَلْة, respectively, with Kasr of the ع, even if we hold the ی [and ین] and the ی 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 ی into ی, notwithstanding that it is separated from the Kasra by a sound letter, in
such as ٌدنیَا [724]. The Hamza in such co-ordinates as ٍجْرِبَاةٌ ٌعُلْبَةٌ [248, 273, 385] is orig. ٌconverted from the ٍی added for co-ordination [683 (case 1)], as is proved by their fem. analogues, like ٌدِمحَالِیةٌ [282] and ٌدِمَکُاءٍةٌ [short, fat (IY on § 683), fleshy, whether tall or short KF, MAR], where, the ی being inseparable, as in ٌحَرْبَاةٌ [above], the ی is not converted, contrary to ٌحَرْبَاةٌ female chameleon (R).

§ 724. The [final (Jrb)] َو preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr is [unavoidably (M)] converted (M, SH) into ی (IY, SH), as ِنْذِعِی and ِزُذِعِی [below], and ِنْذِعِی [685 (case 1, a), 719, 721] (SH); [and] as ِمْقُعَأةٍ ٌحَِّنْرُبُتُ ٌحَِّنْرُبُتُ I bent, orig. ِمْقُعَأةٍ (BS). For the َو, in addition to being preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is a ُج, while the ُج is weak as being at the end [719]; and, since they convert the َع in the like of َثَنَرُبُتُ ِضِلِلْ [685 (case 3, b, c, α), 713], and ٌقِتَبُمْ ٌتَبَلْ [685 (cases 2, 3), 713], notwithstanding that the َع is stronger than the ُج, much more should the ُج, which is weaker, be converted because of the Kasra before it (IY). The mobile َو 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 ی, because the final is the seat of alteration: (a) it is then converted into ی, whether it be in (α) a n., as رَأِيَةُ الْفَارِی [713]; or (β) a v., act., like رَضُوْانِ [685 (case 1, a)], or pass., like دَعِیُّ was called [629]: and whether it (α) become virtually medial, through the occurrence of a subsequent letter inseparable from the word, as in قَرْيَانَ upon [the measure of] فَعَلَانٌ [685 (case 1, d), 686 (case 2, c, α), 723] from غُزْوُرَ and قَرْيَانَ upon [the measure of] فَعَلَانٌ [723] from the same, with inseparability of the ی, as in عُنْصِرٌ [385, 721]; or (β) do not become [so], as in غَارِیةٌ [265 (case 1, a, α), 685 (case 1, b)]: (β) مَقَتْوُرٍ pl. of مَقَتْوُرٍ [685 (case 1, b, e)] is anomalous, being treated as sound for conformity to مَقَتْوُرٍ: (c) they say جَنْدِیَزَ [overlapping peak of a mountain (MAR)], with ٖ, lest the rare فَعِلْیَةَ be confounded with the frequent فَعِلْیَةَ, as فَعِلْیَةٍ [385], فَعِلْیَةٍ [an all. seq. of فَعِلْیَةٍ (KF, MAR)], فَعِلْیَةٍ [385], and the like: (d) if you contract رَضَیِّ [above] and قَرْيَانِ was raided, you say رَضَیِّ and قَرْيَانِ, as you say عَلَمِّ for عَلَمٍ [482, 685 (case 7, b, b, γ)], and عُسْرُ for عُسْرٍ 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 رَضِيْا They were pleased and رَضْيَا They were raided, taking the supplied Kasra into account as respects conversion of the ā into ى, but not as respects retention of the Damma on the ى: whereas, if they took it into account in every respect, رَضْيَا and غَزْيَا would be said, because Damma on the ى is deemed heavy after Kasra; and then the ى's being affixed to the contracted رَضْيْرَى and رَضْيَى would not be plain: (2) that it be an ى in a ى. made conformable to something else, as in ىَتَمْ [above], and ىَدَماَر and ىَدَماُس [685 (case 3, a, b)], as before explained [713]. As for the mobile ى preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, (1) if it do not occur as a ى, then, (a) if it be not pronounced with Kasr, as ىَهْيَأْر [713], and ىَعْيَن pl. of ىَعْيَّان [246], it is not converted into ى, because it is strengthened by the vowel, and is also medial; (b) if it be pronounced with Kasr. as in ىَبَع [436], its predicament has been explained [706]: (2) if it occur as a ى, then, (a) if Fath be inseparable from it, the ى is converted into ى, 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, ى preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm is not deemed heavy at the end, as it is not so deemed in ىَهُر [161, 721]: that is [found]
Most excellent in shooting is the man, Zaid! [468, 686 (case 2, a), 721] from زید. If you contract [َفَعْلُ by eliding] the دامма of the إ, the إ is not altered, because the contraction is accidental, as زید the آرْمُؤُ. Like طَرْفَ for طَرْف, the أ, but only when the أ is followed by an inseparable aug. necessitating فَتَحَ of what is before it, [i. e., of the أ] like [the أ and أ in] أَرْمُؤُ on the measure of أَسْحَبْ[^{389, 390, 399, 721}], because the أ is, as it were, not a أ: and like [the أ in] زیز on the measure of أَسْحَبْ from أَسْحَبْ, when the أ is inseparable [686 (case 2, b)]; whereas, if it be not inseparable, you say زیز and زیز [686 (case 2, c, a)], by conversion of the دامма into كَسْرَا [721]: (α) the reason why كَسْرَا is inseparable from the letter followed immediately by the أ in such as طَرْفَ أَسْحَبْ with كَسْرَ of the أ, [orig. طَرْفَ] on the measure of تَرْفَ with دامم of the أ, from كَسْرَا [hungered (MAR)], and كَسْرَا [hungered] on the measure of كَسْرَا [362], from the same, is only that, the أ of such as تَرْفَ being always converted into أ [685 (case 1, a, α), 728], the أ of طَرْفَ [or كَسْرَا] cannot
possibly be converted into ۳رَبُّ ۳ةَرَبُّ ۢبَيۡنَ ۢبَيۡنَ, (b) if فَاتِلَ be not inseparable from it, as in ۢسُيِّر ۢسُيِّر ۢنِسۡرُ ۢنِسۡرُ ۢقِهۡلَنَّ ۢقِهۡلَنَّ rivalry, competition and disputing, one with another, the دَامَّا is converted into كَسْرَا [700]; and not the یَ become ۢبَيۡنَ ۢبَيۡنَ, because the heaviest of the unsound letters, i.e., preceded by the heaviest of the vowels, i.e. دَامَّا, is deemed too heavy to be a seat of inflection: (a) as for ۢبَهۡرُ ۢبَهۡرُ, aor. ۢبَهۡرُ, i.e. ۢبَهۡرُ, aor. ۢبَهۡرُ, meaning [The man] became handsome, its [original] یَ, notwithstanding its being a seat of inflection [in the aor.], is converted into ۢبَيۡنَ because of what we have mentioned (R), [i.e.] on account of the دَامَّا [in ۢنُعۡلَ], because in vs. the formations are observed, never confused one with another, since the quality of ۢدَامَّا comes into existence only by means of the formation and measure [721]; the o.f. of the ۢدَامَّا being the inf. ۢنَّا [331], which is a n., but, on being invaded by the measures, becomes a ۢلَ (R on the Preterite): (b) similarly the دَامَّا is converted into كَسْرَا, when the یَ that is the seat of inflection is doubled, as in ۢرَمِیَ [375, 730. A] from ۢرَمِیَ (R). But ۢنِمۡلَه ۢنِمۡلَه ۢنِمۡلَه [acquiring for oneself, not for traffic (Jh)] and ۢنِمۡلَه ۢنِمۡلَه ۢنِمۡلَه ۢنِمۡلَه [in جۡرَبَ] He is the son of my paternal uncle, closely related [723] are anomalous (SH), by rule ۢسَیِّبَا ۢسَیِّبَا and ۢسَیِّبَا ۢسَیِّبَا (Jrb); because you convert the ۢبَيۡنَ that is a لٰ into یَ, notwithstanding its separation
from the preceding Kasra by the quiescent. The reason of that, besides its anomalousness, is that the, is a ج, and the quiescent like the non-existent. [on this hypothesis] belongs to [the cat. of] the ج, because you say [I acquired for myself, not for traffic (Jh)]: but it should rather be said to belong to قَتْرُتُ, because its ج is biform; and hence مَالِ [قَتْرٍانٍ property acquired for oneself, not for traffic (Jh, MAR)], with Damām of the ج (R). And [similarly] صَبْرُ [ذِنْوْ nearness (IY)]. Tayyi convert the ج in the cat. of دُمَا and دُعَى and دُعَى into 1 (SH), saying رَمَا and رَمَا and رَمَا [349, 482], because, deeming Kasra before the ج to be heavy, they convert it into Fatḥa; so that the ج becomes converted into 1 (Jrb), as before explained [703]. This is a universal rule, according to them, whether the ج be orig. ج or ج ج [above]; or not, as in ج (R). But that is peculiar to ج., to the exclusion of ج., like ٌلَّاقِيٌّ [16, 294, 720] (Jrb).

§ 725. When the ج of جَعَلَ, with Fatḥ of the ج, is unsound, then, (1) if a و, it is preserved in the substantive, as جَعَلَ [248, 272]; and ep., as جَعَلَ [fem. of نُفْرَانَة 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 ي /, either in the substantive, as شَهْرَى [above], or ep., as شَهْرُى fem. of شَهْرُى lustful, because the beginning and the end of the word are moderate [in weight] through [the lightness of] the Fatha and [the heaviness of] the /; whereas, if the / were converted into ي /, both ends of the word would become light (R): (2) if a ي /, it is preserved in the ep., as صَدَبًا and حَنْسًا [686 (case 3, a)], fems. of صَدِبَانِ and حَنْسَانِ; and converted into / in the substantive, as [686 (case 3)], شَرْبِى and تَقَرُى, 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 ي /, moderation is intended in it: so that first [the excessive lightness of] the substantive, which is anterior to the ep., is moderated by conversion of its ي 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 هِيٰ [686 (case 3, a)], and يَعِيْى /, 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, IH,] and most of the GG: I mean that, in the substantive, change of ی into ے is regular, and retention of ی anomalous. But in the Tashil he reverses [the rule], saying that the substitution of ے for the ی [serving as the ل] of ے, when a substantive, is anomalous. And, in one of his [other] compositions also, he says "One anomaly in transformation is the substitution of ے for ی in ے, when a substantive, like تشریی Nashvā, [a district in Adhrabijān (Sn),] تفری [above], عتری [with an undotted ع and a ن in the MSS, but not found by me in the KF or Msb or any other (work on lexicology) (Sn),] and تفری [above], the o. f. in them being ی". Then he says "But most of the GG make this regular; and, to the four [exs.] mentioned, they append شری [above], طهیاان (686, case 3, a) (Sn), لفری, [so in the MSS, with ی, but not found by me in the KF or elsewhere, what is in the KF being لفری with the dotted غ, i. q. لفری, 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 تفری [above], asserting that their o. f. is ی: whereas, in my opinion, these last, [i. e., شری and the three after it (Sn),] should rather be regarded as
belonging to [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 ى [in ن ش ر ى and the three after it (Sn)] into ، is anomalous, is the sounding [of the ى ] true in َبِيَا [above], سَعْيًا ، and سَعْيًا ; for these three, which occur [with ى ] 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 فُلْلَى ، with ِّحَمَّامُ of the ٌف ، is unsound, then, (1) if a ى ، it is preserved in the substantive, as الْأَلْقَضِيَّة a legal opinion; and ep., as الْأَلْقَضِيَّة fem. of الْأَلْقَضِيَّة the most decisive (A), to be distinguished, say our Master and YH, from الْأَلْقَضِيَّة , as to which the difference between the Hijâzis and Tamimis will be mentioned below, the o. f. [of the ل ] in the latter being ى ، while in this it is ى (Sn): (a) they make no distinction between the substantive and ep. in the فُلْلَى belonging to the cat. of the ى ، as they make none in the ل فُلْلَى belonging to the cat. of the ى [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 Ḍamma at its beginning, and the lightness of the ی at its end; whereas, if the ی were converted into ی، both ends of the word would become heavy (R): (2) if a ی، it is preserved in the substantive, like حَرْزَی [272]، as 685 (case 6, e)]；and converted into ی in the ep., as XXXVII. 6. and ی لِلُبْطَقِينِ ғَلَحَ [685 (case 6)] : (a) as for the saying of the Hijāzīs ғَلَحَ [685 (case 6, e)], it is anomalous by rule, [though] chaste by usage, serving to notify the o. f. (A), i. e. و (Sn); while Ṭāmīm say ғَلَحَ [above], according to rule : (b) the sweetest also is anomalous, according to all. The opinion adopted by 1M is contrary to what is held by [S, Z, IH, and] the [other] Etymologists, who say that the ی of ْفُعَلَ، when a ی، is converted in the substantive, not in the ep.; and make حَرْزَی anomalous [685 (case 6, f)] (A). As for the cat. of the ی، a sort of heaviness is produced in it by Ḍamma's being at the beginning of the word, and ی's being near the end; while, in addition to alleviation, distinction between the substantive and ep. is intended: so that the ی، 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 ی into ی；and then, the ep., when it is
reached, is left without conversion for the sake of distinction between them. And [below], although feminines of [359] and the feminine of superiority, are mentioned by S under the substantive [below], since fem. of 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 [above] to be a substantive, and [685 (case 6, f)] and [above], fem. of and the feminine of superiority whose j is a, should by rule have [its converted into], because treated like a substantive: Sf says "I have not found S mention any ep. on [the measure of] with Damm, whose j is a, except what is used with the art., as [above], and the like; and these, according to S, are like substantives" (R). But [S adds that], when you say belonging to this cat. [whose j is a], it is pronounced according to the o. f., when it is an ep.; being [then] à fortiori
pronounced according to the o. f., since they saypronounced according to the o. f., though it is a substantive (S).

"And", says Sf, "he means that فَلْيُعُلَى, when a scion of the ج، 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] فَلْيُعُلَى 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 فَلْيُعُلَى, with Kasr of the ج، from the defective, its ج، is not converted into ي، nor its ي into ج، whether it be a substantive or an ep., because Kasra is not so heavy as دamma, nor so light as Fatha, but is intermediate between the two; so that moderateness [in weight] is produced in it with the ج، and with the ج،; while the real reason for converting the ج، with Fatha, and the ج، with دamma, 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 فَلْيُعُلَى pronounced with Fatha of its ج، when belonging to the cat. of the ج،, and the فَلْيُعُلَى pronounced with دamma of its ج،, when belonging to the cat. of the ي،, since moderateness is produced in both? But, as for exs. of فَلْيُعُلَى, with Kasr of the ج، belonging to the cat. of the ج،, and likewise of the ي،, 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 ی (a) second, followed by (α) a Hamza, (α) original, as in شَاوَت ی preceded, outwent; (β) converted, as in شَاوَت ی wished: (b) a ی, as in شَاوَت ی I rosted: (b) third, followed by (α) a ی, as in شَاوَت ی [281] and شَاوَت ی [below]; (β) a ی, as in شَاوَت ی [α thin skin that rises to the top of milk and broth (MAR)] and شَاوَت ی [266]: (2) is not formed in any of these ways, whether its ل be a Hamza, as in خَطَیّة fault [below]; or be not, as in بُلِّیة 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 ی, and the Kasra before it into Fatha; and (2) the Hamza into ی. For, since the ی is allowably converted into ی in such as مَدَار ی [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 ی, because the former
is lighter than the latter, and nearer to Hamza in outlet [732]. The reason why, in such as حَمْرَأَوِر [230, 686], it is mostly converted into ج, not ج, is quest of moderation, because, ج being approximate to ج, the insertion of a ج between two جs would be [equivalent to] a combination of three جs: so that a relief from the succession of likes is sought in ج, notwithstanding its heaviness, (1) because the formation is light; and (2) because the enclosure of the ج by two جs in the du. is not permanent, since, the ج of dualization [16, 228, 685] not being inseparable [from the ج], the ج supervening on account of it is not permanent. But, as for the ultimate ج, the Hamza in it is not converted into ج, (1) because the formation is heavy; and (2) because the enclosure [of the Hamza] by two جs is permanent, so that the ج would be permanent, if the Hamza were converted into it. In the pl. of ج, ج present, however, جدئذ occurs, for the sake of moderation, as in جَمْرَأَوِر; but this is anomalous, except according to Akh [below], who considers it regular, as in جَمْرَأَوِر [above]. The general rule mentioned is contravened in two cases, (1) when the sing. contains an ج [second], followed by a Hamza, as in جَمْرَأَوِر from جَتْبَرْا or from جَتْبَرْت [above]; in which case the Hamza and ج are left unaltered, as جِلْوَلَهِ جَشْوَأَيَّ. These are the predecessors or the wishers, for observance of the
sing. in the pl., as it is observed in such as حَبَّالٍ and حَفناَثٍ [248]: (2) when the sing. contains an i third, followed by a و , [as in ٍٓدا ُ and عَلا ُ (above) and ٍٓدا ُ (266) ] in which case the Hamza is converted, but into ٍٓدوُ and عَلَوُ, not into ی , [this contravention] also [being] for observance of the sing. [715]. And, according to this, in the pl. whose sing. contains an i second, followed by a و , like pl. of ِشَرَايِبٍ [above], the sing. ought to be observed, as ٍٓدوُ [715]; but, since it is orig. ِشَرَايِبٍ, and then the ٍٓد after the i is converted into Hamza, as in ٍٓدَآُنِلُ [663 (case 4), 715], because the i of the pl. is enclosed by two unsound letters, the Hamza is not afterwards converted [back] into ٍٓد , 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 ِشَرَايِبٍ [715]. Similarly, [the general rule is observed] in the pl. whose sing. (1) contains an i [third], followed by a ی , like سَقَائِيَةٍ دَرْوَيْةٍ [above]; so that, if they were given this pl., سَقَائِيَةٍ دَرْوَيْةٍ 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 i followed by a Hamza, ی , or ی; so that the Hamza [in the pl.] is converted into َ178 a
and the ی [after it] into ی، as خطيِتا ی and ی بلاکیَا ی، pl. of خطيِتا [below] and ی بلاکیَا [above]: (a) ی هداوى ی occurs in [the pl. of] هداوى ی [above], as we have mentioned. This being established, know that (1) the ی [third] in all these pl. is imported for pluralization [256], and is not [found] in the sing.: (2) the Hamza after the ی in a شموائی pl. of شموائی [above], (a) from ی شموائی is the original [Hamza], which is [found] in the sing., [being the ی of the word]; (b) from ی شموائی 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 شموائی و ی [247, 686] in the pl. [ی شموائی ] ; and so is the ی of the sing. [ی شموائی ] , which is after the ی [second], is converted into Hamza [in the pl.], as in ی آراؤئی [above]; and then the Hamza [pronounced with Kasr] into ی pronounced with Fath, as we mentioned: (5) the ی [third] in لدؤار ی is converted in the pl. into Hamza, as in ی رَسَائَل [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 ی آراؤئی above]: (6) similarly, [mutatis mutandis] in سقاَیَا سقاَیَا [above]:
the \( \text{ي} \) in \( \text{خَطَابِيَّة} \) \( \text{ below} \) is converted into Hamza, according to \( S \), as in \( \text{صَمْحَاتِيَّة} \) \( \text{ 246, 683 (case 3), 717} \): and, two Hamzas being then combined, the second is converted into \( \text{ي} \) \( \text{ below} \); and the first into \( \text{ي} \) pronounced with Fath, as in \( \text{بَلَاء} \) \( \text{ above} \) and the like; and the \( \text{ي} \) after it into \( \text{l} \) \( \text{ 684, 719} \), because the \( \text{ي} \) necessarily converted from Hamza is in the predicament of an original \( \text{ي} \), \( \text{ which is converted into } \text{l} \) when mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; \( \text{ while the second Hamza here is necessarily converted into } \text{ي} \) \( \text{ above} \), because final \( \text{661} \) : so that \( \text{خَطَابِيَّة} \) \( \text{ below} \), \( \text{i.e. the last letter, of both being converted into } \text{l} \): \( \text{ (a) } \text{Khl below} \) says that it is orig. \( \text{ خَطَابِيَّة} \) with Hamza after the \( \text{ي} \) that is \( \text{ third} \) in the sing., \( \text{ so that its measure is } \text{قَامَل} \) \( \text{ below} \); but that the \( \text{ي} \) is put into the position of the Hamza, and the Hamza into the position of the \( \text{ي} \), \( \text{ so that its measure becomes } \text{قَامَل} \); and afterwards the Hamza, which is the \( \text{l} \) of the word, is converted into \( \text{ي} \) pronounced with Fath, so that its measure is \( \text{قَامَل} \), \( \text{ which, by conversion of the final } \text{ي} \) into \( \text{l} \). becomes \( \text{قَامَل} \) \( \text{ below} \): \( \text{ (b) IH, therefore, says “And hence } \text{خَطَابِيَّة} \), according to the two sayings” \( \text{661} \), meaning that, according to \( \text{ both} \) \( \text{Khl} \) and \( S \) \( \text{ above} \), it belongs to the cat. of conversion of the single Hamza into a \( \text{ي} \) pronounced with Fath \( \text{R on} \)
Alleviation of the Hamza). When Hamza occurs after the ٰ of the pl. upon [the measure of (Tsr)] [18, 256, 685], and that Hamza is adventitious in the pl. [below], and the ی of the pl. is a Hamza, ی or ى, 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 ى converted into ی; and (b) into ى in one case, vid. when the ی of the sing. is ى, apparent (And) in the expression, preserved from conversion into ی: so that these are four cases, which need four eks. [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 جواث [248, 708] and سُوْه, pl. of َآثا and سَاأثا, [which are] فَكَأَلَة from َأث َأثا [orig. جِبَأ] and سَأَث َأثا یَلَبَّث, [orig. سَوَأ,] 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 ى, or ی, as in the two eks. just given by Z, or be original:] so that, in the pl. of جاٰث, [fem.] act. part. from جُلُب عَلَیه, bit it, and of جُثِثا [above] from شَآث َآثا preceded, outwent, him, you say جواث ٰ and سُوْه جواث [248, 708], like جواث girls and جُوثا girls coverings [18], to distinguish the original Hamza,
existing in the sing., from the adventitious (IY). In order that such [a formation] as ابیة شوأ pl. of شوأ or شَابْتَ [above] may be excluded, IH prescribes, as a condition for conversion of the Hamza of the pl. into ی, and of its ی into ٰ, that the sing. should not be like that, i.e., should not have after its ی a Hamza followed by ی, [as شَابْتَ, like شوأ, 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 ِحَبَّالِی as pl. of ِداوُری [248], ِمُدْرَرْی as pl. of ِمَدْرَرْی [above], and شَوَأ as pl. of شَوَأ [above], to make the pl. match the sing.? S, however, [followed by Z and IHsh.] does not prescribe, 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 شَابْتَ [above], S is bound to say شَوَأ, because the Hamza is adventitious [683 (case 4), 715], according to him, [in the pl. شوأ] 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 شوأ from شَابْتَ is a Hamza in the sing. also; so that, by this interpretation, it is not “adventitious in the pl.”
The stipulation of adventitiousness excludes [also] such as \( \text{المرأة} \) \( \text{روية} \) \( \text{مفعلة} \) [658], where the Hamza, being found in the sing., because \( \text{مرأة} \) [366] from \( \text{روية} \) [658], is not altered in the pl. (Aud); although with change, anomalously, has been heard (Tsr). And the stipulation of unsoundness of the \( \text{ج} \) excludes such as [above], [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 necessarily 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 \( \text{ج} \) is a Hamza, is [66i, 708] (Aud), pl. of حُطَابٌ [above], committing a fault (Tsr): [for] it is orig. حُطَابٌ with a \( \text{ي} \) pronounced with Kasr, which is the \( \text{ي} \) of حُطَابٌ; and followed by a Hamza, which is its \( \text{ج} \): then (1) the \( \text{ي} \) [pronounced
with Kasr (Tsř) is changed into Hamza, as in مَكْرَاهٍ فَخْطَالِیُّ with two [above]; so that the word becomes خَطَالِیُّ with two Hamzas, [the first substituted for the ی, and the second the ٰ of the word (Tsř)] : 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 (Tsř)] pronounced with Kasr [661], and а Fortiori after a [Hamza (Tsř)] pronounced with Kasr; [so that the word becomes خَطَالِیُّ]: then (3) the Kasra of the first [Hamza (Tsř)] is converted into Fatha for alleviation, since they sometimes do that where the ی is sound, as in مَدَارِي [above] and مَدَارِي for عَدَّازِی [248, 256], as [684, 719] and [504] and

هدَايَةً مُسْتَشْرَائَتِ إِلَى الْعُلَى
_REASON

تَحْصِلُ الْمَدَارِي فِي مَثْنَى وَمُسْلِمٍ

[which also is (Tsř) by Imra alKals (MN, Tsř), 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 ی is unsound, because [ی preceded by] Kasra is heavy (Tsř); [so that the word becomes خَطَالِیُّ]: then (4) the ی is converted into ! [684, 719], because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha; so that the word becomes خَطَالِیُّ, with two یs, having a Hamza between them: and then,
(5) since Hamza resembles I, [because it is from the same outlet (Tsr),] three I's seem to be combined; and, [that being disliked (Tsr),] the Hamza is therefore changed into ی, [not into و, because ی is lighter than it (Tsr)]: so that the word becomes خطاءًا after five operations (Aud). This is the opinion of S and the majority of the BB [below]. Khl, however, holds that in this [case, where the J 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 خطاءً [661]; and then what has been mentioned [in operations 3—5] above, as to converting the Kasra into Fatha, then the ی into I, 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 АллаТук эЙсвер Алу [661], with two Hamzas, has been heard in their speech; whereas, if it were [formed] as Khl says, no second Hamza would be there at all (Tsr). The ex. of the [second] case, where the J is an original ی, is خطاءًا [pl. of decision (Tsr)]: [for] it is orig. خطاءًا with two ی's, the first the ی of فعلة, and the second the J of فعلة: then (1) the first [ی (Tsr)] is changed into Hamza, as in صحيحًا [above] (Aud); so that the word
becomes \( \text{تَصَّبْنَى} \) (TsR): then (2) the Kasra of the Hamza is converted into Fatha (Aud); so that it becomes \( \text{تَصَّبْنَى} \) (TsR): then (3) the \( \text{i} \) is converted into ! (Aud); so that it becomes \( \text{تَصَّبْنَى} \) (TsR): and then (4) the Hamza [intermediate between the two \( \text{s} \) (TsR)] is converted into \( \text{i} \), [for a return to its o. f. (TsR)]; so that the word becomes تَصَّبْنَى after four operations. The ex. of the [third] case, where the \( \text{j} \) is a \( \text{a} \), converted into \( \text{i} \) in the sing., is مَطْبِّرٌ [saddle-camel (TsR)]: for it is orig. مَطْبِّرٌ, [being] فَعْیَلةٌ from مَطَّرْثٌ meaning back (Aud), or from i. q. مَطْرُتْ بِهِمْ فِي أَلسَّنَى I made them extend the journey, i. e., مَدَّتْ (TsR); but the \( \text{a} \) is changed into \( \text{i} \), and the [preceeding] \( \text{i} \) then incorporated into it, on the principle of the change and incorporation in مِئْتَ مَيْتٍ and مِئْتَ مَيْتٍ, for which مِئْتَ سَيْتٍ and مِئْتَ مَيْتٍ and مِئْتَ مَيْتٍ, [with a \( \text{i} \) pronounced with Kasr before the \( \text{a} \) (TsR)]; where (1) the \( \text{a} \) is converted into \( \text{i} \), because final after Kasra, as in أَلْدَامِى and أَلْدَامِى [685 (case 7, a, a), 716, 747] are said: and its pl. is مَطَّابِرٌ [661, 708], orig. مَطَّابِرٌ [with a \( \text{i} \) pronounced with Kasr before the \( \text{a} \) (TsR)]; where (1) the \( \text{a} \) is converted into \( \text{i} \), because final after Kasra, as in أَلْدَامِى and أَلْدَامِى [685 (case 1, a), 724] (Aud); so that it becomes مَطَّابِرٌ (TsR): then (2) the first \( \text{i} \) is converted into Hamza, as in مَكَانِثٍ [above] (Aud); so that it becomes مَكَانِثٍ (TsR): then (3) the Kasra is changed into Fatha (Aud);
so that it becomes مَكْثَأ (Tsr): then (4) the ي [is changed (Tsr)] into  ], [so that it becomes مَكْثَأ ]: and then (5) the Hamza [intermediate between the two ]s is changed (Tsr) into ى; so that it becomes مَكْثَايَا after five operations. The ex. of the [fourth] case, where the J is aٌ, [apparent (Tsr),] preserved in the sing., is هَجْرَةٌ [big stick (Tsr)], pl. حِكْرَآيَ (Tsr): for (1) we convert the ٌ of هَجْرَةٌ in the pl. into Hamza, as in رَسَالِلُ pl. of رَسَالِلُ [246, 688 (case 3, a-d), 717] (Aud); so that it becomes حِكْرَآيْ (Tsr): then (2) we change the ، into ى, because final after Kasra. [685 (case 1, a), 724] (Aud); so that it becomes حِكْرَآيَ (Tsr): then (3) we convert the Kasra into فَثا (Aud); so that it becomes حِكْرَآيَ (Tsr): then (4) the ي is converted into ٍ (Aud), because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with فَثا [684, 719]; so that it becomes حِكْرَآيَ with a Hamza between two ]s (Tsr): and then (5) we convert the Hamza into , , [in order that the pl. may be conformable to the sing. (Tsr);] so that it becomes حِكْرَآيَ, [which result] also [is reached] after five operations (Aud). As for [عَدَابِيَا pl. of عَدَابِيَا نُفْلُنُ يُؤِدَّيْنَ يَعَلَّقَدَايَا وَعَلَّقَدَايَا] Such a one comes to us in the mornings and evenings, Jj in the Commentary on the Takmilat [الإدّة by F (Hkh)] and Isd in the Exposition of the verses of the Jumal [by Zji
(Hkh) say that َي occurs in it only in order that it
may be akin to َعَشَايَا (pl. of َعَشى (KF)). But the right
[view] is that what is done [here] for conformity is only
to give َعَدَايَا, to which it is not entitled,
[its measure being ْتَعلُّقة], which does not take the pl.
َعَاكَلَ،] contrary to َعَشَايَا, which is like َفِصْيَا [above]
and َفِصْيَا [testament, precept, pl. َرَضَايَا (MAZ)]; whereas,
after receiving this pl., it is entitled to َي, which is
substituted for the Hamza of َتَعَاكَلَل [246], not for the َل
of َعَدَايَا, which is َبَلٍّ, because its pl. is َعَدْرَأَتْ, like
صلوْنَا, pl. ْصلوْنَاتُ [719]. For, since they give َعَدَايَا a pl.
on [the measure of] َتَعَاكَلَل for affinity [to َعَاشَايَا], while
every pl. on [the measure of] َتَعَاكَلَل, whose َل is a Hamza
or َي, or a َب, not preserved in the sing., is entitled to
have َي substituted for its Hamza, like َخَطَايَا [above],
َرَضَايَا, and َمِطَايَا, they do that in َعَاشَايَا, because the َل
of َعَدَايَا is not preserved. If you say "Assume َعَاشَايَا
to be pl. of َعَدْرَأَة [286]: then their language is correct,
because, the َب being preserved in the sing., the regular
form would be َعَاشَايَا, like َهَرَاوُي pl. of َجَدَايَا [above],
I say " This is forbidden by two considerations, (1) that,
since they say only that it is pl. of َعَاشَايَا, 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 غداية is not said for affinity at all, since it is pl. of غداة, not of غداة; and, as evidence for the existence of غداية, he cites the saying

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 غداية may be allowable only for affinity to غداة, not because غداة is said (BS). Three sorts of anomaly occur in this cat. :—(1) sounding the Hamza true after the 1, as

(by 'Ubaida Ibn AlHārith Ibn 'Abd AlMuṭṭalib alKurashi alMuṭṭalibi, 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 آلّما, but pronounced according to the o. f. [by poetic license (MN)]: (2) sounding it, and the Hamza after it, which is a ١, true, as اللهُ آمِرُ آلّه [above], with two Hamzas, by rule خُطَايِّي; and this is more anomalous
than the preceding: (3) changing the letter after the \( \text{س} \) into a letter not required by rule, as \( \text{س} \) pl. of \( \text{س} \) \( \text{س} \) [above], by rule \( \text{س} \) \( \text{س} \) (Tsr). Akh [above] holds \( \text{س} \) \( \text{س} \) 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 \( \text{س} \) [mentioned above as exs. of the four cases] are on the measure of \( \text{س} \) [272] (A), where the letter after the \( \text{س} \) of the \( \text{س} \) is the \( \text{س} \) of the word, and the [final] \( \text{س} \) is for feminization (Sn): the \( \text{س} \) being sounded true in \( \text{س} \), as in the sing.; and transformed [into \( \text{س} \) ] in \( \text{س} \), as in the sing.; while [ \( \text{س} \) or \( \text{س} \) ] \( \text{س} \) is [also] on the measure of the o. f. (A), i. e., matches the sing., its \( \text{س} \) being sounded true, like the \( \text{س} \) of the sing. (Sn); and, as for \( \text{س} \), it comes from \( \text{س} \) [658], with change and incorporation, on the measure of \( \text{س} \) \( \text{س} \) also, according to this, being on the measure of the o. f., like \( \text{س} \) [above], \( \text{س} \), and [ \( \text{س} \) or \( \text{س} \) ] (Sn). But the BB [above] hold that they are [on the measure of \( \text{س} \) (KIAmb)] [\( \text{س} \) [which is the opinion adopted by IM (Sn)],] in order to make the unsound [in the \( \text{س} \)], [like \( \text{س} \) pl. of \( \text{س} \) (Sn),] conform to the sound (A), like
pl. of صَخِيفَة (Sn). And the correctness of their opinion is proved by the saying

حَتَّى أُعِزْرُوا أَنْبَاتٍ

[above]. As for the report [transmitted] from Khl, that the measure of حُطَّامًا [above], it is not like the saying of the KK, because the [final] د, according to them, is [an aug. put (Sn)] for feminization, [the aug. soft letter in the sing. being elided in the pl., to avoid the concurrence of two quiescents (Sn)]; but, according to him, is a subst. for the postpos. letter of prolongation (A), i.e., for that [ى] which becomes posterior [to the َل] in the pl after being prior [to it] in the sing., vid. the letter of prolongation converted into Hamza in [246, 683 (case 3), 717] (Sn).

§ 727. Every (M) [final], occurring fourth or upwards is converted into ى [685 (case 4)], when the letter before it is not pronounced with دَامَم [below] (M, SH), whether that letter be pronounced with فَاث [below] or كَسْر [685 (case 1), 724] (Jrb), as (١)

[685] (M, SH), َتَفَازَتْ I hoped, َتَفَازَتْ I hoped (M) and َتَفَازَتْ I was equipped for raiding (SH), َتَفَازَتْ I demanded a bribe (M) and َتَفَازَتْ [685] (SH); and their aors. [in most cases] (M): (a) every v. whose pret.
is of four or more letters, except تفاعل and تفاعَل, has the penultimate of its aor. pronounced with Kasr [404]; so that its ل, when ا، is converted into ی [685 (case 1, a), 724], because final and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as يَسْتَفْقِي یَغْرُي and يَسْتَفْقِي يَغْرُي: and they make the pret. accord with the aor., saying أَغْرُى أَغْرُى and يَسْتَفْقِيـَی and يَسْتَفْقِيـَی

(b) similarly they convert the و into ی in [the pret. of] تفاعل and تفاعل, as تفاعل and تفاعل and تفاعل are quasi-pass. of تفاعل and تفاعل [486, 487]; so that, since the و is converted into ی in the o. f., it remains so after prefixion of the و of quasi-passivity (Jrb): يَرْضَی‌یان and يَرْضَی‌یان (2) [719] (M, SH) and [685 (case 4, e)], in the aors. of غری and غری [229, 626, 629] (M), du. of مُضْطَقَفٌ‌یان (3): شَا أَمْلِه‌ی (IY); [du. of مُضْطَقَفٌ‌یان] (M), pass. part. of عَلَی raised, aor. يَعْلِی (IY); and [similarly (IY)] [du. of مُضْطَقَفٌ‌یان] (M): contrary to and يَغْرُو [404, 719-721] (SH), where the و, though fourth, is not converted into ی, because the letter before it is pronounced with Damm (Jrb). The final و, fourth or upwards, preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [above], is converted into ی on two conditions, (1) that
its conversion into І be not allowable because of (a) quiescence of the and [684 (condition 1), 719], as in [above]; (b) ambiguity [684 (condition 5, 6, 8, A), 719], as in ] and [above], and [du. of higher]: (a) that is because, their object being alleviation, the, so long as its conversion into І continues to be possible for them, is not converted into І, since І is lighter: (2) that it be not followed by an inseparable letter, making it virtually medial, as in [223, 229, 721]. The І mentioned is converted into І, (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 І—is impracticable, as we have mentioned [in the first condition]; so that it is converted into a letter lighter than І, vid. І: (2) as is said [by IHsh in the Commentary on the IM (MAR)], because it is converted into І in some variations [685 (case 4, a), as and above], the aor. of which is and above: (a) as for and above, although the І is not converted into І in their aors., as and , still they are derivs. of І equipped for raiding and above, the І of which is converted into І [685 (case 4, b)] (R): (b) Akh says that, since they say in the aor. [of ], pronouncing [the Є]
with Fath [482, 685 (case 4, c)], it resembles the aor. whose pret. is فَعَلَ with Kasr, because the normal pret. of فَعَلَ [482] is فَعَلَ and therefore it is treated like [the aor. of زَيِصَ] was wretched, so that they say يَشْقَيْانِ [above], as they say يَرْضِيَايِ [above] and يَشْقَيْانِ (IY): (c) this reason [ascribed to IHsh] is weak, as you see, since (a) it does not apply to أَعْلِيَانِ [above]; (b) if conversion of the ن 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 غَزْيَتْ [for غُرُوتْ] ought to be said because of their saying غُرُوتْ [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 َبَعْرُو and ِيَذَعُ [above], and ns. as ِعُرْتَوْةٌ [283, 385] and ِتَرْعَوْةٌ [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 ِعُفْرَيِ 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 Damm in the v., as مَنْعَرٌ [above]: whereas in the n. the й is converted into ی, [notwithstanding that the letter before it is pronounced with Damm,] as ُمَنْعَرٌ and ُوَدُدُ [721]; [while in ُمَنْعَرٌ and ُوَدُدُ conversion is prevented not, as IY makes out, by the Damma before the й, but by the й 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 Damm", [Z and] IH should rather say "when the letter before it is pronounced with Fath", [Kasr having been provided for in §. 724] (R).

§. 728. The cat. of ْقَرْوَي and ْهَوْرَي is [treated as] sound [in the غ, which, though mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is not converted into ِ (Jrb)], because of the two transformations (SH). For in قَرْوَي [729, 730. A], the غ and й of which are ِ, the [second] й is unavoidably converted into ی [685 (case 1, a)]; so that, if the first were converted into ِ, two transformations would be combined in a tril., which is not allowable: while in ْقَرْوَي fell down [302, 713] you transform the й by converting it into ِ [684, 719]; so that you have no means of transforming the غ, from fear of two transformations (R). And the cat. of قَرْوَي [302, 703, 713, 724] and ْحَبِّي [697, 698, 703] (SH),
notwithstanding that two transformations would not be combined in it, if they converted the ע into כ, is also [treated as] sound (Jrb), because it is subordinate to [the v. מושי [above] (SH): for the root with the ל of the ע [482] is the principal [form of unaugmented tril. pret.], because of its lightness and frequency; and, since the ע is sounded true in the principal, it is sounded true in the subordinate (Jrb). Or [their omission to transform the ע in three of the vs. mentioned, vid. those which are on the measure of קסב with Kasr of the ע, is (R)] because [every hollow v. of the conjug. of מושי, whose ע is converted into כ in the pret., has its ע converted in the aor., as ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב, and, ع"ב ע"ב ע"ב, ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב: so that, if they said ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב, and ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב in the pret., then (R)) would have to be said (SH) in the aor.; whereas, in the aor., Damm of the כ, when a ע, is eschewed [720], even with quiescence of the letter before it, contrary to the כ, as ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב and ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב and רע"ב רע"ב [723], because the v. is heavy. And the like may be said of ע"ב also, because every hollow [v.] of the conjug. of מושי, whose ע is made quiescent by conversion into כ [in the pret.], must have the ע of its aor. made quiescent, the vowel thereof being transferred to the preceding letter, as ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב, and ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב ע"ב [697, 703]; and it would [therefore]
be necessary to say یهی for the aor. of ُهَلی: 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 یهی [697, 698]. Or their omission to transform the ی of طری and ُهَلی [729] may, as before mentioned [703], be accounted for by the fact that transformation of their ی, 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 ُهَلی [684 (condition 10, b, c), 730. A], ُهَلی [300], and ُهَلی date-stone: while ُهَلی [684 (condition 10, b), 723], ُهَلی and ُهَلی [723], and ُهَلی and ُهَلی [683 (case 1, c, b), 684 (condition 10 b, α, γ, b-d), 723] are anomalous, by rule [e. g.] ُهَلی or ُهَلی, more properly the former, because the cat. of ُهَلی is more numerous than that of ُهَلی [698]. We call that [conversion of the first of the two unsound letters into ی] anomalous, because conversion of the last, as in ُهَلی [above] and ُهوی [697], is more appropriate. Fr and many of the Ancients say of ُهَلی that it is quiescent in the ی, the o. f. being ُهَلی and ُهوی; but that the quiescent ی is converted into ی, because of the Fath of the
letter before it, as in 你自己 and 你们 [684, 703] and
[pl. of 你自己 a thicket (MAR)], which [conversion] is
more appropriate here, because of the combination of
two یs: while Ks says that it is orig. یآییة, on the
measure of یناءلة; 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, یآییة is not free from anomalously in conver-
sion or elision. And it is possible to account for یآییة
[above], یآییة [684 (condition 10, b, a, ۸), 723], and یآییة
in the [last] two ways (R). Incorporation is frequent
in the cat. of ۸حییی [731], because of the [combination of
(Jrb)] two likes (SH), as ۸حییی [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 ی pesso (Jrb), [as] ۸حییی [above], aor. یکیلی
[below] (KF). S says “Incorporation is more frequent;
but the other [method] is [good] Arabic, frequent” (R).
Most of them incorporate [the ی into the ی when the ی is
mobile (ІY)], saying ۸حییی and ۸حییی with Fath or Kasr of
the ی [below], as ی or ی is said for the pl. of ی۸ری
[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 حَمِيَّةٌ حَمِيَّةٌ, pl. حَمْيُوُا حَمْيُوُو, and she lived, du. حَمِيَّةٌ حَمِيَّةٌ (R). The Kur has وَٰٓيَّخَيَا مَنْ حَيَّ عَنْ بَيْنِهِ. VIII. 44. And he that should live might live after a manifest sign; and (M) the poet (R) ʿAbid (M), [or] Ibn Mufarrigh (Jh on حَيَّيَا حَيَّيَا), says

(م، ر)، cited by As (IY), They boggled over their business, as the ostrich, or, in the version of the [S,] 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.] مُخْيِمُى quickening and [the du.] مُخْيِمُى quickened, where the vowel is [imported] on account of the ی in the ṣ in the ep. [below] and of the ی in the du. [228], both of which letters are adventitious, [and] separable from the word: and similarly with the inflectional vowels [16, 404], as أَنْ يُخْيَمِى الْمُرْتَى LXXV. 40. [551] and
I saw a ṭāʾīt ṭabīʿī [248]. But, if the vowel be naturally inseparable, as in حَبِيبِي [or حَبِيبٌ (Jh, KF)], or be [imported] on account of an adventitious, [but] inseparable, letter, as in أَحْبَيْبِي [or أَحْبَيْبٌ (S, M)], pl. of حِيَاة vulva, where the ła is inseparable [265 (case 6, a, a)], contrary to the ła of the ep. [265 (case 1, a), 266], then incorporation or display is allowable, for which reason أَحْبَيْبِي or أَحْبَيْبٌ is allowable in the pl. of حَيَاة boggler, because the 1 [of أَحْبَيْبِي] is inseparable. And, in this [second] sort also, incorporation is more proper, as it is in [the first, like] حَبِيبٍ [above] and أَحْبَيْبٌ [below]. The reason why, for allowability of incorporation, it is stipulated in this cat., contrary to the cat. of يَرْدُن restores and يَمْس 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 يَرْدُن [402, 406] and يَرَدْنَ [663]: whereas, in the unsound, as رَآيتْ مُعَيِّي [248] and مُعَيِّي [above], the second is [often] made quiescent without the invasion of anything, as مُعَيِّي [248]; so that they do not approve of incorporating a letter into what is quasi-quiescent [731]. And, when the [first] ى is displayed, whether necessarily, as in مَحَيِّي [above], or allowably,
as in حَيْيَّ [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 حَيْيَّ du. of حَيْيَ [684 (condition 10, a, α, β)], 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 حَيْيَ says حَيْيَ, like خُشْوَا, they dreaded, as

وَكَنَا حَسِبْنَاهُمْ قَوْارِسْ قَهِيمِي
َحَيْوًا بَعْدًا مَاتُوا مِنَ الْدِّهْرِ أَفْضَرًا

(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 Ḥanzala, 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. حَيْيَ (R), when incorporation takes place. Some retain the Fatha of the ف, for lightness; while others pronounce [the ف] with Kasr, for affinity [to the ی], as they say لِي or لَی, with Kasr or Damm of the ل, for the pl. of أَلْرَی [above]. But, it is said, this
requires consideration, because the Damma before the incorporated ین in ین is heavy, so that it is proper to flee therefrom to Kasra; whereas the Fatḥa before the incorporated ین in ین 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] ین to the letter before it pronounce the ح with Kasr; while those who elide the vowel without transfer retain the Fatḥa (Jrb). Apparently, however, this [assertion that the ن is sometimes pronounced with Kasr in the act. voice] is a blunder copied by IH from the M [above]; whereas S cites only ین in the pass., like ین [below], with Damm and Kasr, pl. of قرن ألرى [twisted horn (MAR)], in the n. (R). Similarly (M) incorporation is allowable in (SH) [the pret. of] every pass. v. [of this cat.], as حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ This place was lived in [below] and حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ and حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ for (M) the pass. prets. حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ (Jrb) and حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ (M, SH) and حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ (M), because of the combination of two likes حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ (Jrb); contrary to [the act. prets. (Jrb)] حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ and حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ (SH), because, when the [second] ین is converted into ین, the motive for incorporation does not remain. But it is not so frequent [in حُرِّيَ أَصْحَابٌ and the
following] as in [above], because here the letter before the two likes is quiescent; while it does not follow that should be treated like an was sent on pilgrimage is put on a par with went on pilgrimage, because incorporation in that is necessary, contrary to this (Jrb). [above] is constructed with a prep. and gen., which take the place of the [pro-] ag., since is intrans. [436, 438]. You are allowed the option of pronouncing the 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 and [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, a, b), 731]: and therefore, as the occurrence of a [single] ي preceded by Damma, at the end [of a word], is disallowed, so Damm is rare here, though not disallowed; and like it is [above], where Damm and Kasr are allowable, but Kasr is more frequent; the rarity of Damm [in ل] corresponding to the disallowance of [it in] and gazelles [243, 721] (IV).
If any one say "How is conversion of ّamma into Kasra necessary in [the case of formations] other than نع، as ّسلیمی عتی [685 (case 7), 716], ّجتی عتی [685 (case 9, b, a), 722], and ّخروی [722, 780. A], while both modes [of vocalization] are allowable in نع؟", the answer is that, نع being liable to be mistaken for نع، ّamma 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 ّamm of نع allowable before ي is the lightness of the formation. ّب says that نع، with Kasr may be said as pl. of ينی، like pl. of ينی، pl. of [686, 718], the incorporated quiescent ي being treated like the unincorporated; and that ّحی جی for [above] is like ّحی جی پی and بیغ [436, 706]. Those who incorporate say ّحی جی was quickened, du. ّحی جی، pl. ّحی جی and ّحی جی was left alive, du. ّحی جی، pl. ّحی جی; because the vowel [of the second unsound letter] is inseparable: while those who do not incorporate say ّحی جی، pl. ّحی جی أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی، أُحی, pl. ّحی جی أُرُمی، أُرُمی، أُرُمی، أُرُمی، أُرُمی, pl. ّحی جی أُرُمی، أُرُمی, pl. ّحی جی أُرُمی. But ّحی جی has three dial. vars.:

(1) this, which is its o. f.; (2) incorporation; (3) elision of the first ي, as in [the کت] ّستخشی was ashamed
[below], according to Tamîm. [The act.] استَحْكَمٌ has two dial. vars.:—(1) that of the people of the Ḥijāz is استَحْكَمٌ, aor. استَحْكَمٌ, act. part. and pass. part. استَحْكَمٌ, exactly on the measure of اسْتُحْكِامي asked to keep guard, aor. استَحْكَمٌ: (2) that of Tamîm is استَحْكَمٌ [above], aor. استَحْكَمٌ, with vocalization of the ح ح, and elision of one of the two ی ی: (a) the opinion of Khl is that it is formed from حَابٌ when transformed like حَابٌ [684, 703], as though حَابٌ [above] were said; and therefore, as you say I asked to sell from بَاعٌ, so you say I asked from حَابٌ: (a) the reason why it is formed from the eschewed حَابٌ is that the ع of حَابٌ ought to be transformed, since transformation of its ل is impossible: (b) [the pret.] استَحْكَمٌ, according to this, is orig. استَحْكَمٌ [below], like استَبْعَعٌ: but the vowel of the ی is elided, since no ی of the pret. is found, in their speech, to be a mobile ی preceded by a quiescent; so that, two quiescents then concurring, the first of them is elided; and afterwards the quiescent ی is converted into ی, because preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as in یَاجِلٌ and طَائِثٌ [above]: (c) similarly you say of the aor. استَحْكَمٌ that it ought to be استَحْكَمٌ, like استَحْكَمٌ: but that the vowel of the [final] ی 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 استحا : (e) its inf. n., according to this, ought to be استباحة, like استباحة [338]; but is not used: (f) the act. part. is مستحی, orig. مستحتی, [like مستحی; ] but transformed in the same way as the aor.: (g) the pass. part. is مستحتی, orig. مستحتی, the vowel of the ی being elided, as in مستحتی [720]; and the word then transformed in the same way as مستحتی [above]: (h) there is a weakness, that will not escape notice, in the opinion of Khl, because of [his] venturing upon the disliked [form حا ل : (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 ی is elided] in أحسنتُ I perceived, حلتُ I passed the day, and مستبتُ 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 du. استباحا; and they would say استباحا, like استباحا" (R). The verse تقولُ یا شیخُ الامع [329. A.] contains evidence that مستحتی [above], aor. مستحتی, like
took captive, aor. یَسْتَحْقِبُ, is said; while Ya'kūb and Ibn Muhaisin read إنَّ اللَّهَ لا یَسْتَحْقِبُ أَنْ یَضْرِبَ مَثَلًا II. 24. 

*Verily God is not ashamed to propound a parable, with a single یَ, which is reported to have been read by Ibn Kathir also, and is the *dialect* var. of Tanwīn. The *o. j.* is [یَسْتَحْقِبُ, aor. یَسْتَحْقِبُ] with two یَ s: but the vowel of the َع is transferred to the ُف; and, two quiescents then concurring, the ِی is said to be elided, the measure [of 可ْسَفُحُ in the verse] being تستَحْقِبُ; or the َع, the measure being تستَحْقِبُ (BS). And, as for the *revived, aor. یَکْبَلاَیَ, when you put it into the *pass.* , you say حَرَیبِ, according to the o. j.; or, if you please, you incorporate, saying حَرَیبِ, because the vowel of its final is inseparable. But he that says یَ حَرَیبِ and یَحَرَیبِ does not say یَ حَرَیبِ [for their aor.], because ُذَمَم does not enter [the final of] these *vs.* at all, since the ِی in them takes the place of ُذَمَم, and is not combined with it [720] (IV). In the aor. of [the *pass.*] یَسْتَحْقِبُ and یَسْتَحْقِبُ you say یَحَرَیبِ and یَسْتَحْقِبُ, 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)] یَسْتَحْقِبُ and یَسْتَحْقِبُ, [although two likes are combined in them (Jrb),] it is [in order that ُذَمَ� ث.*
not fall upon the ا (Jrb), lest that [final] whose Damm is eschewed [720], [vid. ا (MASH),] be pronounced with Damm (SH). And so, if you used the subj., saying لَن يُخَيَّيَ لَهُ that He shall not quicken [730. A, 731], you would not incorporate, because the Fatha is adventitious, being an inflectional vowel [730] that is not inseparable, since it is removed in the ind. and apoc (IV). Incorporation is allowable only in [the cat. of] حَيِّيَه (R), contrary to the cat. of قَرْيَه (SH), although قَرْيَه has a double ، as حَيِّيَه has a double ا [697]; so that قَرْيَه is not said, as they say حَيِّي (R), (1) because transformation comes before incorporation [below] (SH), since conversion of the [final] ، into ا is a transformation at the end, while incorporation of the ا into the ج 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 حَيِّي before [and to the exclusion of] conversion of the quiescent Hamza into ! [661, 684 (condition 10, b, b, χ)] (R); and, when the final ، is converted into ا, the motive for incorporation does not remain (Jrb): (2) because قَرْيَه with conversion of the [second] ، into ا is lighter than [قَرْ] with incorporation of one ، 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 رضى [685 (case 1, a), 724] is absolutely disallowed, whereas dissolution [of incorporation] in the cat. of حبى is allowable (Jrb). And [similarly (R), or, in some MSS (MAR),] therefore, they say يَبَرِى [719, 730. A] (SH); not بَرِى [above], although they incorporate in the pret. [ حى ], nor يَقَرِى (R): (1) because transformation comes before incorporation (R, Jrb); and, when the [final] يَبَرِى is converted into ٰ, 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 قرى [728] and its likes, vid. those [vs.] whose ع and ج are، so far as concerns transformation and incorporation, IH [now] points out that double ع، is peculiar to فعل with Kasr of
the ع (Jrb). They do not form from the cat. of قوري نّه (with Fath (R),) like ضرَب [482], nor any نْعَلَ with دامم (R),] like شرف was noble [482], from dislike to [the combination of two، s in (R)] قَوْعُّ و [730. A] (SH), when the nom. pron. is attached to the pret. [قَوْعُّ ء] (R), because they dislike the combination of two، s more than the combination of two ي s (Jrb). As for نْعَلَ with دامم, if it were formed therefrom, two، s would be produced without attachment of the pron., because the [first]، which is an ع، would not be converted [into ٍ], since the cause of [such] conversion would not exist in the J، as we mentioned in the case of طرَيَّ حبيٍّ [703, 728]; nor would the second [،] be converted into ي on account of the دامم before it, as in [423, 721], since that [conversion] is [found only] in the n، [not in the v،] as you see in such as سَرْعُ [721] (R). They therefore deviate to نْعَلَت، in order that the [second]، may be converted into ي، and the heaviness be removed by the difference of the two letters, on the principle of their action in حَيِّوُن [698, 730. A], orig. حَيِّيٍّ، and, since [in حَيِّوُن] they convert the lighter [letter] into the heavier, in order that the form may be lightened by removal of reduplication, a fortiori [in قوري] they convert ٰ
the heavier into the lighter for removal of reduplication. For that reason they say ْثُرِبَتْ I was strong [730. A], orig. ْثُرِبَتْ, the ج, which is a ج, being converted into ى, because [quiescent and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)]; and the ي being [treated as] sound [728], because the ج is transformed. This [avoidance of double ج] is when the ي is orig. mobile (IY). But [such as (IY, SH)] ْمِزْوَة [685 (case 1, a, a), 697, 698] (M, SH) and ْضُرَّ (SH) a mark [of stone (MASH)] on the way (Jrb, MASH), ْمَيَل [698] (M, SH) and ْقَرْوُل Kauv [698, 730. A, 734], a name of a place (IY), and ْجَوُر [685 (case 3, b, d, ٌ) (SH), and ْحُرُو [684 (condition 10, a, a, ٌ), 730. A] (M, Jrb), where the ي 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 ج] would not be allowable, as it is in the n., from the heaviness of two جs in the v., which is itself heavy (R).

§. 730. They say, (1) [in إِنْفَعَلَ (493. A) (M), like إِحْرَازِي (482) (IY),] (a) became blackish red (M, SH), إِحْرَازْ (R) from ْحُرَّة [672] (M, R), orig. إِحْرَازْ (IY, R), converting the second ج [at the end (IY)] into
(M), because mobile and preceded by Fatha [684, 719] (IY); (b) aor. (R) اِلَّاَسْتَوْرِي (M, SH): (2) similarly, in [493. A], like اِذْرَعَرَي (SH) refrained (from foul conduct), from رُعَا, forbore, aor. مَرَرُي (MASH), orig. اِذْرَعَرَي [730. A] (R); (b) [aor.] اِذْرَعَرَي (SH). They do not incorporate (M, SH), but transform (R), (1) because transformation comes before incorporation [728] (R, Jrb); and, when the [final] and is converted in and and into یِذْرَعَرَي and اِذْرَعَرَي into یِذْرَعَرَي and یِذْرَعَرَي, 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 اِذْرَعَرَي, would reduce them to that vocalization of یُزِعَرُر یِذْرَعَرَي and یِذْرَعَرَي [719—721] (M); but [IY asserts that] Z's saying "because incorporation . . . . یُسَرَور" is not correct, since vowels of inflection are not heavy upon double یِذْرَعَرَي and حَدَّا اَذْرَعَرَي This is an enemy [643, 720] and اِذْرَعَرَي [685 (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 اِذْرَعَرَي (M, R, Jrb)] you say (1) اِذْرَعَرَي (M, SH), according to some (IY),
like [332, 391] (R), without [conversion and (R)] incorporation [685 (case 7)] (IY, R, Jrb), because the \( \text{س} \) is adventitious in the inf. n., on account of the Kasra, being orig. the \( \text{س} \) in [685 (case 1, a)]; and, by reason of its adventitiousness, is not taken into account, as the \( \text{س} \) in [685 (case 7, b, b, \( \text{س} \), 716] is not taken into account, because it is a subst. for the \( \text{س} \) [in 

\( \text{س} \) and 

\( \text{س} \) ]: (a) properly, however, the \( \text{س} \) in the v. is a subst. for the \( \text{س} \) 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) \( \text{س} \) (M, SH), with incorporation (Jrb), the [only (R)] form mentioned by S (IY, R), orig. 

\( \text{س} \) [above] and \( \text{س} \) [685, 391, 667]: (a) they convert the middle \( \text{س} \) into \( \text{س} \), because \( \text{س} \) occurs quiescent before it, as in \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{س} \) [685 (case 7, a, a), 703, 716]; this \( \text{س} \) being substituted for the \( \text{س} \) [of \( \text{س} \)], because of the Kasra before it [685 (case 1, a)]: (b) the last \( \text{س} \) is converted into Hamza, because it occurs as a final after an aug. \( \text{س} \), according to the rule in such as \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{س} \) [685 (case 1), 723] (IY). But those who say \( \text{س} \) (R, Jrb), by eliding the \( \text{س} \) (IY, Jrb) for alleviation, because the n. is long (IY),] say \( \text{س} \) (M, SH) for \( \text{س} \) [above] (R, Jrb), by
eliding the \( \text{ی} \), because \( \text{ إحورآ} \) (Jrb); so that two \( \text{س} \) are combined, as two \( \text{ت} \) \( \text{s} \) are combined in [756], although \( \text{ إحورآ} \) is not of the same conjug. as [492] (R): and they do not incorporate (IY, Jrb), (1) because the two \( \text{s} \) are medial, as they do not incorporate in \( \text{ إفتتلال} \), because the two \( \text{ت} \) \( \text{s} \), though alike, are strong as being in the middle; and are not considered like the \( \text{د} \) \( \text{s} \) in \( \text{صد} \) and \( \text{مذ} \) [731], which are at the end (IY): (2) because the letter before the two likes is quiescent, as in \( \text{ إفتتلال} \) (Jrb). Those, however, who incorporate in \( \text{ إفتتلال} \), [not regarding the quiescence of the letter before the two likes in such a formation as this (Jrb), and say \( \text{ إفتتلال} \) (M, R, Jrb), ought by analogy to (Jrb)] say \( \text{جوآ} \) (M, SH), incorporating one \( \text{ح} \) into the other; and transferring the vowel of the first \( \text{ح} \) before it, so that they dispense with the conj. Hamza (IY). For two \( \text{s} \), 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 \( \text{حؤى} \), \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \), with Fath of the \( \text{ح} \) in both, and \( \text{حؤى} \), \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \), with Kasr of the two \( \text{ح} \) \( \text{s} \), \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \), \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \), \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \), \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \), \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \), \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \), (756). When from \( \text{حؤى} \) and \( \text{رمَى} \) you form a \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \) \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \) \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \) like \( \text{إحَمَّر} \) and \( \text{أور. يَكِوَى} \) [above], you
say إِحْيَيَّا and إِرمَيَا, and إِحيَّيَا and امْنِحُوْرَاتَ
(1645)

[above], because of the ī's being a subst. for the [in إِحْوَازِ], ought not to incorporate here also; but [without incorporation] it would be deemed heavy. Those, however, who incorporate in إِتْتَالُ, aor. يَتَتَالُ, inf. n. إِتْتَالُ [above], say حَيَا [730. A], aor. يَعْيَيْسَ, inf. n. حَيَا (R).

§ 730. A. This being the end of the chapter on Transformation, let us make such additions to it as are suitable. When two īs are combined, (1) if the last be not a ِ, then, (a) if the first be quiescent, it is incorporated, as بَيَّعُ ِبَيَّعُ [714 715]: (b) if the second be quiescent, or both be mobile, each of them is in the predicament of a single [ي ], as بَيِّتُ [274, 686, 721]; and similarly يَيَّانَ and يَيَّانَ, when you form words like بَيَّعَ [684, 703] and بَيَّعَ [686, 714] from بَيِّتُ [698]: (2) if the last be a ِ, then, (a) if the first be quiescent, it is incorporated into the second, as حَيْيَتُ [697, 698]: (b) if the last be quiescent, both are preserved, as حَيْيَتُ [698]: (c) if both be mobile, then, if conversion of the second into ِ be allowable, it is converted, as حَيَا [684, 728]: but, if such conversion be not allowable, then the vowel of the second is either inseparable or not:—(α) 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 \( \text{حَيْوَان} \) \[698\], where incorporation [of the first \( \text{ي} \) into the second] is not allowable, because \( \text{رَدَّان} \) is not subject to incorporation \[731\]; nor may the second be converted into \( \text{ل} \), for lack of commensurability with the \( \text{ن} \). \[712\]; but it is converted into \( \text{و} \), because the combination of two mobile \( \text{ي} \) s 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 \( \text{ل} \); the second, not the first, being converted [into \( \text{و} \)], because by it the sensation of heaviness in the combination is produced; while the \( \text{l} \), notwithstanding that the final ought to be a light letter, is convertible into \( \text{و} \), because the inseparability of the \( \text{l} \) and \( \text{ن} \) make it medial, as they say of [the \( \text{و} \) in] \( \text{غُنْفُرَان} \) and \( \text{عَنِصُّورَة} \) \[721\]: but S says that the regular form is \( \text{حَيْيَان} \), so that he does not convert the second [\( \text{ي} \) into \( \text{و} \)]; while \( \text{حَيْوَان} \), according to him, is anomalous: and so, in \( \text{قَوْرَان} \) from \( \text{قَوْ} \) \( \text{فَعَلَان} \) \[below\], as will be seen (R); for the first \( \text{و} \), is like the \( \text{و} \) of \( \text{كُرَر} \) \[707\]; while the last \( \text{و} \) is strong, like the \( \text{و} \) in \( \text{نُزَرَان} \) \[719\], and becomes equivalent to the sound; and they do not deem them heavy, when pronounced with Fath, as they say \( \text{لُرِّي} \) \[302\] and \( \text{أَحْرِي} \) \[300\] (S): and so you say \( \text{حَيْوَان} \), on the measure of \( \text{الَّسْبَعَان} \) \[236, 686 \text{(case 2, c)}\], from \( \text{حَيّي} \); and do not
incorporate, as you do in ڑдейن; where you say ڑдейن [731], because transformation comes before incorporation; but S makes the regular form ڪیٰٰ in with incorporation, because he does not convert [the second ] in such [formations]: (8) if incorporation be allowable, you may incorporate or not, as ڪیٰٰ [728, 747]; and [similarly, in ] with Kasr or ڪیٰٰ: but incorporation is more frequent, as before mentioned [728], since it is lighter: (b) if the vowel of the second be not inseparable, as in ڪیٰٰ [728, 731], both [ ] must be sounded true, [and] displayed; while the Kasra of the first is better made faint. When three ڪیٰا are combined, (1) if the last be a , then, (a) if the first be incorporated into the second, (a) when that is in a v. or part., the third is treated as though it were not preceded by ڪی , as ڪیٰٰ [281], aor. ڪیٰٰ, act. part. ڪیٰٰ, pass. part. ڪیٰٰ, like denuded, aor. ڪیٰٰ act. part. ڪیٰٰ, pass. part. ڪیٰٰ: (a) the reason why the third [ ] preceded by Kasra, notwithstanding that this [combination of ] and Kasra] is deemed heavy, is not elided, as forgotten, in the v., as ڪیٰٰ [for ڪیٰٰ], as it is in [below], is only that the vowel of the �� in the v. may be spared, since 183a
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 \( \text{y} \) of such as \( \text{يَدُوْر} \) into \( \text{ي} \) [721]: (\( \beta \)) then the part., as \( \text{الْمُكْحَيْيِي} \), is treated like the \( v. \) in respect of omission to elide the third \( \text{ي} \) as forgotten: (\( b \)) when that is not in a \( v. \) or part., then, (\( \alpha \)) if conversion of the third [into \( ! \)] be allowable, vid. when the double [\( \text{ي} \)] is pronounced with Fath, and the last is final, it is converted, as \( \text{يَنْتَيْ} \), on the measure of \( \\text{زَرَّة} \) goose [here supposed to be for \( \\text{زاُرَّة} \)], from \( \\text{أَوْنَت} \) I betook myself, repaired, orig. \( \\text{مُرَّة} \) [on the measure of \( \\text{مَعْلَة} \)], then \( \\text{مُرَّة} \) [661], [then \( \\text{يِمَيْ} \) (685, case 7)], then \( \\text{يِبَا} \) [684]; (\( \beta \)) if that [conversion of the third] be not allowable, either because, though the double [\( \text{ي} \)] is pronounced with Fath, the last is intermediate, as being followed by a letter constitutionally inseparable in every position, like the non-dualistic \( ! \) and \( \\
\text{ن} \), or because, [though the last is final,] the double [\( \text{ي} \)] is pronounced with Damm or Kasr, then, in the first case, the third [\( \text{ي} \)] is converted into \( \\
\text{وَ} \), as \( \\
	ext{حَبْوَأَن} \), on [the measure of] \( \\
	ext{فُيِّعَلُان} \) from \( \\
	ext{جَيْبِي} \), because it is heavier than \( \\
	ext{حَبْوَأَن} \) [above] with a single \( \text{ي} \); but, according to S, \( \\
	ext{جِيْبِيَان} \), as [implied] above: and, in the second case, the Damm [of the double \( \text{ي} \), if it be pronounced with Damm,] is
converted into Kasra; while the third [ي, whether the double ي be pronounced with Kasr or Damm.] is elided as forgotten, because the [three] يs, together with Kasra of the double ي, are deemed heavy at the end; as [281], orig. [معيبة], then] حبيب٢ on the measure of حبيب٢ [394], from حبيب٢, orig. حبيب٢, then حبيب٢, and then حبيب٢: and so, in this second [case], the last [ي] is elided as forgotten, even though it be followed by an inseparable letter, as in the dim. of أشْرَيْك٢، on the measure of أشْرَيْك٢ [fermented dough (MAR)], from شَرَى [inf. n. of شَرَى he roasted meat (Jh, KF)], where you say أشْرَيْك٢, then أشْرَيْك٢, and then أشْرَيْك٢: 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 حْب٢ as dim. of حْب٢ [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 طَب٢ي٢ and تِرَي٢ [302] in the rel. n.; and رَم٢ي٢, on the measure of رَم٢ي٢ [long stone (MAR)], from رَم٢ي٢: (b) if the letter before the first be mobile, then, (α) if the first (و) be the second [letter] of the word, [all] the يs are preserved, as حْب٢.
like حيّي [375]; and حبي [below], like قُدّم [375, 724].

Orig. حبي with Damm of the ع; and حيّي shamefaced, bashful, modest, [like حني independent, wealthy (KF).]

From حيّي shame; because the word is light; (8) if the first [ي] be the third [letter] of the word, it is made ١, whether the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as when you form a [word] like حبصيّة [274, 308], [n. un. of حبصيّص (KF)] from زمنيّة, in which case you say زمنيّة, زمليّة, [orig. زمريّة (S)], like زمريّة, [orig. زمنيّة] in [the fem. of] the rel. n. (R) from زمنى [294, 300, 686] (S); and do not convert the first ١ into ١, either in the rel. n., because the vowel [of this ١] 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 intensely black [below] from زمني, you say زمني, زمرّي, [orig. زمني, زمرّي, زمري [685 (case 7)], then زمني, زمرّي, [like زمني, زمرّي (724) and حبي (above)], and then زمني: or with Kasr, as زمني [294, 301, 686], where you convert the Kasra into Fatha, in order that the ١ may be preserved; and, in these exs., one of the ١s is converted into ٧, because the [three] ١s are deemed heavy; but, although alteration is more appropriate in the final, the last is not
converted, as in ُحَيْرَانٍ [above], because it is strong through the doubling; and, for this reason, the third is not elided, as in مَعْيَة [above]; while, in the ی of relation, elision and conversion would be more extraordinary, because it is a sign [282, 294]: (γ) if the first [ی] be the fourth [letter] of the word, then, if it be before the ی of relation, it is elided, according to the soundest [opinion], as ُقَاضِی [282, 301], because of the combination of یs, together with the heaviness of the word, and the first's being the final of the word, since the ی of relation is adventitious; but ُقَاضِی is allowable, as before stated [301]: whereas, if it be not before the ی 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 رِمَّی, on the measure of خِتْبِیر [398] from رَمَی, orي. ُرِمَّی, the ٰ of which is converted into ی, and incorporated into the last ی; and the Ḍamma then converted into Kasra, and the ی [before the double ی] into ٰ: and similarly بَنْکُوْی [677], from بَنْکُوْی wept: (c) if none of them be incorporated, then, (α) if the third be entitled to conversion into ٰ, it is converted, as when a [υ] like ُحَرَب٢ is formed from هَب١, in which case you convert the third into ٰ, as ُحَبی٢.
and then, if you incorporate, as in جَّعَلَ [756], you say جَّيَّا [730]; but, if not, you convert the second into و, as فين, as in جَٰرَان [above]: (b) if the third be not entitled [to conversion into ٰ], as when you form a [n. حَيْيَّ , حَيْيَّ] like هَدْدِيدُ [contracted from َهَدْدِيدُ very thick milk (MAR)] or جَنْدِيَلَ [296, 392], from حَيْيَا, you may elide it as forgotten, because the heaviness is more than in حَمِّيَّ [above]; so that you say حَيْيَا or حَيّا, by converting the second into ٰ, 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 و, as in جَٰرَان [above]; so that the third is preserved, because the combination of ى is ceases; and the word then becomes حِبْرُ or حِبّرُ, حَيّرُ or حَمِّرُ [acc. حَمِّيّ], حَيّرُ or حَمِّرُ [401], you say قَفْصِيًا, by sliding the last [ى] as forgotten, and converting the second into ٰ; or قَفْصِيًا, by converting the second into و, [and preserving the third]: (α) the third is not converted into و, [like the second in جَٰرَان ,] because [و is heavy, while] the end of the word is worthier of alleviation [than the middle]; and also [because], if you converted it into و, the combination of the first two ىs would remain unaltered:
(β) as for the first [ي], it is not converted, because the heaviness arises from the second and third: while in [above], like جَبَتْل، the first is not converted, because its analogue is not converted into ١ in the v., as حَبِيَّٰٓٔ [728]; so that, α fortiori, it is not converted in a. not commensurable with the v. [708, 712]: (2) if the last ي be not a ج, [all] the يs remain unaltered, without conversion or elision, as ١سِبْر dim. of ١سِبْر (R), which is foreign, arabicized, the archer, or horseman, of the Persians (Jk). And, when four يs are combined, (1) if the two last do not denote relation, then, in forming [a word], (a) on the measure of حَبِيَّٰٓٔ جَحَتْرُش [401], you say حَبِيَّٰٓٔ ، incorporating the first into the second, so that they become like a single ي: and [then] (α) you convert the third into ، as we said of [the second in] the [n.] formed on the measure of جَبَتْل [above]; so that the fourth is preserved, as حَبِيَّٰٓٔ: or (β) you may elide the last as forgotten, because it is heavier than in مُعَبِيَّة [above]; so that the third is converted into ١, because mobile as a final, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as حَبِيَّٰٓٔ: as we said before [about حَبِيَّٰٓٔ and سَلَسْبِيل]: (b) like سَلَسْبِيل [368, 401, 674], you say حَبِيَّٰٓٔ، كَرْطِعَب [401], you say حَبِيَّٰٓٔ، the second double [ي] not being
converted into مَحْبُوَبٍ, as [the second single ي is] in مَحْبُوَبٍ [above], because it is the final of the word, and is therefore not changed into a heavier letter: nor being elided, as [the final single ي is] in مَعْمَيْةٍ [above], because its elision would be an elision of two letters: (α) the combination of the two [double ي s] is tolerated, because their doubling strengthens them; and, since such as تَلَّيْ [302] and فأَمَر [299] are allowable, according to one saying, notwithstanding that the two first [ي s] are the termination of the word [أَمْيَةٍ and مُعْمَيْةٍ], the ي of relation being adventitious, this is more excellent: (δ) like قُدْمَيْل [401], you say مَحْبُوَبٍ, incorporating the second into the third; and [then] elide the fourth, as [you elide the third] in مَعْمَيْةٍ [above], which [elision] is more appropriate here; and do not convert the double [ي ] into مَحْبُوَبٍ, because by the doubling it becomes strong, like a sound letter; so that مَحْبُوَبٍ remains: (b) from قُضَيْ نَجَّدَ, decreed, on the measure of قَدْمَيْل [401], you say قُضَيْ نَجَّدَ: (α) Mz allows only قَضَيْ نَجَّدَ, [with elision of the first ي, and conversion of the second into و , ] as in the rel. n. قُضَيْ نَجَّدَ (299): but others, together with قَضَيْ نَجَّدَ, allow قَضَيْ نَجَّدَ with two double [ي s] more often than فأَمَر [above]: (b) what I hold is that only قَضَيْ نَجَّدَ with two double ي s, is allowable, since the two last [ي s],
being strong through the doubling, are not elided, as
the third is elided in ُمَعَيْسَة [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
أَمَرٍى [299]: (c) from ُشَرَى [above], on the measure of
عُضْوَرَ [396], you say ُشَرَىُّرَ [above]; and then convert the two
،س into ی س, and incorporate them into the two ی س
[685 (case 7)]; so that it becomes ُشَرَىُّرَ, the ظَمْامَة of
the first double [ی ] being converted into كَسْرَا; and
كَسْرَ of the ف also being then allowable, as in ُشَرَىُّرَ
[685 (case 9, b, ُث), 728]: (α) S says ُشَرَىُّرَ, by analogy
to ُشَرَىُّرَ and ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ rel. ns. of ُشَرَى—حَبَى; and ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ or
ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ [302] is said: (d) from ُشَرَىُّرَ طَوْرَ [728], on the
measure of ُشَرَىُّرَ كَبَّرُر, you say ُشَرَىُّرَ كَبَّرُر: and then con-
vert (α) the first ی into ی, incorporating the quiescent
ی into it; and (b) the second ی into ی; incorporating it
into the last ی: and then change the ظَمْامَة of the
[second] ی into كَسْرَا; so that you say ُشَرَىُّرَ كَسْرَا, and
also, like the rel. ns. [ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ and ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ] of ُشَرَىُّرَ [302]: (2)
if the two last [ی س] do denote relation, as in the rel.
ns. of ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ [302], ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ [302, 684 (condition 6, b,
and g, ُث)] and ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ [299], ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ [299] and ُشَرَىُّرَ حَبَىُّرَ [301],
the predicament of the four ی س has been already
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explained in the chapter on the Relative Noun: (a) it has also been mentioned [in the chapter on the Diminutive] that the ی of the dim., if the rel. formation invade the dim., is elided, as یٰن (above); but, if the dim. formation invade the rel. n., is not elided, as یٰن, with two double ی s, dim. of یٰن [281]. All of this is the predicament of the ی s. And, as for the predicament of the ی s, we say that, when two ی 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 یَذُرَوْا They quenched not their thirst and یٰزْرِوَةَل یٰزْرِوَةَل quenchers of Zaid's thirst, because, at the end of the word, which is the seat of lightness, they deem two ی s without incorporation to be heavy, for which reason they do not form a [v. like یٰقْرَوْت or یٰقْرَوْت [729]; so that, if the two ی s were in one word, the first would unavoidably be pronounced with Kasr, in order that the second might be converted into ی, as یٰقْرَوْت [729]: (b) if the last be medial, their combination is allowable, as یٰقْرَوْل [714]: (2) if both be mobile, then, (a) if that be at the beginning of the word, the first is converted into Hamza, as یٰسْتَرْلَ [683, 699]; (b) if it be in the middle, then, (a) if incorporation be allowable, you incorporate, as when you form یٰفْلَدْنِی, with Damm of the ی, from یٰقْرَوْل, in
which case you say ُتَوَالُ، according to [S and] Mb: (α) the proper [course], however, is not to incorporate; but to convert the second into ی and the Damma before it into Kasra, as [ُتَوَالُ] already mentioned in this chapter [721], because transformation comes before incorporation: and this is the saying of Jr: (β) if incorporation be not allowable, as when you form ُتَعْلَالُ، with Fath of the ع, from ُتَوَالُ; S says that you say ُتَوَالُ [above], as he says ُهَبْطُانُ from ُهَبْطُانُ [below], because two ُسَ 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 ُحَيْوَانُ in ُحَيْوَانُ [above] from dislike of two یs, a fortiori the second [ ی ] in ُتَوَالُ is converted into ی, because ی is heavier [than ی]: (β) if you form ُتَعْلَالُ، with Kasr of the ع, [you say ُتَوَالُ، because (S) you convert the second [ ی ] into ی on account of the Kasra, since transformation comes before incorporation: (α') if that be at the end, then, (α) if the first be permanently pronounced with Fath, the second is converted into ی, as [Note on Part I, p. 908, ll. 15-17، ُيَقْوَى، ُيَقْوَى، ُيَقْوَى، ُيَقْوَى، ُيَقْوَى 719، 728، and ُيَقْوَى] stronger: (α) as for [the retention of the second ی in rel. n. of ُطَلِيْ]ر، it is because
the Fatha of the first is accidental [684 (condition 5)]; while in რიყ, rel. n. of ჯოქ, 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 ი, as ჯოქ [685 (case 1, a), 728, 729], and ჯოქ on the measure of ჯოქ [368], from ჯოქ: (3) if the first of the two, ს be quiescent, then, (a) if they be in the middle, both are preserved from conversion, as [ ჯ on and] ჯოქ He reported [such a one] as having said [703], except in such [pl.s.] as ჯოქ [722], as before stated: (b) if they be at the end, then, if the word be (a) tril., they are not converted, as ჯოქ and ჯოქ [729]; except when the letter before them is pronounced with Kasr, as ჯოქ desert, on the measure of ჯოქ ink: (b) of more than three letters, the [double ჯ, when] preceded by a letter pronounced (α) with Fatha, is sounded true, as ჯოქ [on the measure of ჯოქ]: (β) with Kasr, is necessarily converted into [double] ჯ, as ჯოქ, on the measure of ჯოქ [375]: (γ) with Damm, is converted into [double] ჯ, allowably in the sing., as ჯოქ or ჯოქ, like ჯოქ or ჯოქ [685 (case 9, b, α), 722]; and necessarily in the pl., as ჯოქ [243, 685 (case 9), 722]. When three ს are combined, (1) if the last be a ჯ, then (α) if the first be incorporated into the second, the
third is converted into (a) ٨, if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as تَقْوَى strengthened himself and the strengthened: (b) ٨, if the letter before it be pronounced with Kasr, as تَقْوَى strengthens and the strengthener; or Damm, as قَوْي, on the measure of ٨٩٩ [392], from قَوْي: (b) if the second be incorporated into the third, the double ٨ is converted into double ٨, whether the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as عِكَف on the measure of ٨٩٩ [375] or ٨٩٩ [245, 392]; or Kasr, as عِكَف, on the measure of ٨٩٩ [375]; or Damm, as عِكَف, on the measure of ٨٩٩ [375, 724], that Damm being converted into Kasr, and Kasr of the ٨ being then allowable, by imitation, as in عِكَف [722], from the heaviness of the ٨ preceded by a mobile, contrary to such as عِكَف [above], since ٨ is lighter than ٨: (a) [in the preceding ex. under case (b) the first of the three ٨ is the second letter of the word:] and similarly [the double ٨ is converted into double ٨], when the first of the ٨ is the third [letter] of the word, and the letter before it is mobile, as غَزْوَي, on the measure of ٨١٠[above]: whereas, if it be quiescent, then, if the first ٨ be pronounced with Fath, the whole are preserved, as ٨٩٩ [below], on the measure of ٨٩٩ [397] or ٨٩٩ [401]; but, if with Damm or
Kasr, the double [ٍ] is converted into [double] ی, and the Damma into Kasra, as ۶۵۵ (case 8), ٧۲۲ and ٧۲۸ : (c) if none of them be incorporated, you convert the last into (α) !, if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as ۶۸۵, orş. on the ni! ٧۳۰ : and then, (α) if you incorporate, you say ۷۳۰, ٧۵۶ : (β) if not, you convert the second [ٍ] into ی, on the analogy of "بیان [above]; which [conversion] is more appropriate here [at the end of the word]; so that you say ۷۳۰, aor. ی (b) ی: یقِربی، saying ۷۳۰, ٧۵۶, like ۷۳۰, ٧۵۶ [above], from ۷۳۰, because of the Kasra on the letter before it : (α) the first [ٍ in ۷۳۰] is not incorporated into the second, notwithstanding that the vowel of the second is inseparable ۷۲۸, in order that the form of co-ordination [with ۷۳۱] may be preserved, and also because resemblance to the v. is lacking ۷۳۱ : (β) it is better, however, not to form such augmented ns. unconnected with the v. ٧۳۱ as lead to heaviness like this : (2) if [the last of] the three [ٍ in ۷۳۱] be [not a ج ل because of their being] combined in the middle [of the word], they remain unaltered, as ۷۳۱, on the measure of ۸۴۲ ; and ۷۸۲, below], like ۴۸۲, ۴۸۳ : (a) Akh converts
the last [ ] in ٥، and therefore the second also [685 (case 7)]\(^{1}\) into ی; but S does not mind that [combination of ی, s], because they are in the middle: (b) Akh ought to say ٥ لی for ٥ لی; but excuses himself by the plea that the ی of prolongation is light: (c) Akh does not convert [the third ی in] ٥ لی، because the mi ...[ ] is like ی, for which it is a subst.: do you not see that, for a similar reason, the initial of ٥ لی pass. of ٥ لی [683, 699] is not necessarily converted into Hamza? And, when four ی s are combined, then, (1) if the third be incorporated into the fourth, the third and fourth must be converted into ی, as ٥ لی، on the measure of [401], from ٥ لی، because ٥ لی is heavier than such as ٥ لی [above]: (2) if the third be not incorporated into the fourth, the last is converted into ی, if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath; and into ی, if it be pronounced with Kasr: while the third (a) remains unaltered, according to S, as (a) ٥ لی [below], on the measure of ٥ لی، because it is then [in the middle,] like [the third ی in] ٥ لی، [above]; (b) ٥ لی، on the measure of ٥ لی، (c) ٥ لی، on the measure of ٥ لی، (d) is converted into ی by Akh, who says (a) ٥ لی، (b) ٥ لی، like ٥ لی، (c) ٥ لی، like ٥ لی، (d) ٥ لی، like ٥ لی، like ٥ لی، (e) ٥ لی، like ٥ لی، like ٥ لی، like ٥ لی.
for, deeming the [combination of] $s$ heavy, he converts the one near the end into $\alpha$: the third in $\text{[above]}$, like $\text{[orig.]}$, then $\text{[orig.]}$, and then $\text{[orig.]}$, is not converted into $\iota$, as the $\text{[orig.]}$ of $\text{[728]}$ is not converted. And God best knows the right! (R).