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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 presentation 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 AlMadābighi”, [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 “AlBaʿª”, my meaning is “YH” (Sn. I. 3).

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

AHD. Abū Ḥanīfa Ahmad Ibn Dāwūd addīnawârî, the Grammarian, Lexicologist, Arithmetician, Astronomer, Botanist, and Historian (d. 281 or 282 or before 290), author of the Kitāb anNabât and the Kitāb alAkhbâr atTiwâl.

Am. Add

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

ANI. The celebrated Ḥāfiz; and the Traditionist of the Age, Abū Nuʿaim Ahmad Ibn ʿAbd Allāh alMihrânī alIşbaḥānī aṣṢâfī (b. 334 or 336, d. 430), author of the Ḥilyat alAuliya (Portraiture of the Saints) and the Târikh Işbahân (History of Işbahân).

* ANj. The Gloss (c. 1293) of Abu -nNajâ upon the CAj, printed in Egypt in 1303.

AW. Read “Abu -lKâsim ʿAbd AlWârîth Ibn Sufyân Ibn Jubrûn, known as AlḤâbîb, of the people of Kurtuba, the Lexicologist (b. 317, d. 395), one of the Masters of IAB”.

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

*
Bgh. The Ḥāfiz Muḥyī-ʾs Sunna, or Rūkn ad-Dīn, or Zākī Allāh, Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī Ḥusayn Ibn Masʿūd, known as AlFarrā, or Ibn AlFarrā, AlBaghawī (from Baghā or Baghshūr, a town in Khurāsān between Marv and Harāt), šaṣ-Shāfī, the Jurist, Traditionist, and Commentator (d. 516, at, or past, 80 years of age), author of the Maṣābīḥ as-Sunna and other works.

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

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

CHd. The celebrated Commentary, entitled the Kāfī (c. 654), on the Hd, by the author of the Text (see 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. 360 (No. 11302) to AlHāḍī, a Commentary by the same author on another grammar of his, the Maḥāḍī fi-Taṣrīf; but it properly belongs to the CHd mentioned in HKh. VI. 470-1 (No. 14334), as is clear from the description of the work in the Jrb and BW as “Sharḥ alHāḍī” (not Sharḥ alMaḥāḍī).

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

DK. The Shaikh al-Islām Abu-Ḥasan ʿAlī Ibn ʿUmar al-Baḥdādī, known as AdDāraqūṭnī (from Dāraḵūṭn or Dār al-Kuṭn, a large Ward in Baghdād), the celebrated Ḥāfiz and Shāfī Jurist (b. 806, d. 385).

*Dm. For the second paragraph read “Also the Commentary entitled Taʿlīk alFaraʿīd ʿalā Tashīl alFawāʾid (c. 820), by the same author upon the Tashīl of IM, cited from extracts quoted in the Sn, and latterly from an incomplete MS (copied in 1059) belonging to the India Office, Whitehall, London.”
[This MS (No. 964 of Loth's Catalogue) contains an interesting passage in folios 8, 6, "The Shaikh TDT mentions, at the end of his Commentary on the syntactical Ḥājibīya that IM sat in IH's class, and learnt from him, and profited by him; but I have not come upon this statement from any one else, nor do I know whence he took it, and God best knows the truth of the case". In the MS folios 8 and 5 are transposed, the proper order being 4, 8, 6, 7, 5, 9. The "syntactical Ḥājibīya" is the Kāfiya of IH, on which TDT is said in HKh. V. 17 to have written "a great Commentary, like that of R".]

Dn. The Shaikh all-Islām Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān Ibn Sa‘īd alUmawī (their freedman) alKurtubi, known as ADDANĪ (from his residence at Dāniya, a city in Spain, one of the governments of Balansiya), the Ḥāfiz, Reader, and Traditionist (b. 371, d. 441).

* Dw. After the additions made in Part I, Fasciculus III, and before "and of Abū Nuwās", insert "of 'Ubaid Allāh Ibn Kais arRuḥayyāt, edited by Rhodokanakis; of Ma‘n Ibn Aus, edited by Schwartz; of Aus Ibn Ḥajar, edited by Geyer; of AlKumait Ibn Zaid alAsadi (his Hāšimiyāt only) edited by Horovitz, with the Exposition of Abū Riyāsh Aḥmad Ibn Ibrāhīm alKāsi, the Philologist (d. 339)").

[On Abū Riyāsh see YR. I. 74.]

FB. The Fath alBārī, a great Commentary by IHjr upon the SB.

* Fhr. The Fihrisa (Catalogue) of Books studied by its compiler, the Ḥāfiz Abū Bakr Muḥammad Ibn Khair alAmawi (with Fath of the Hamza) alIshbili, the Reader, Grammarian, and Lexicologist (b. 502, d. 575 at age of 73), contemporary with IBshk, edited by Codera and Ribera from a MS written in 712.
[Pupil of IArb, IA, IT, and others. BM. 65 calls him "a Kurtubi", apparently because he conducted the service at the Cathedral of that city from 573 till his death there in 575.]

Em. The Shaikh Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn 'Ali alFayyumi, the Reader and Lexicologist (d. 770), author of the Msb.

Frh. Abū Ibrahim Isḥak Ibn Ibrahim alFārābī, the Lexicologist and Philologist (d. about 350, under 70 years of age), maternal uncle of Jh.

Frh. AlFāriḍī, about whom I have no information.

Hd. The Grammar entitled AlHāḍī fi NNaḥw wa-ṣṢarf, by 'Izz adDīn 'Abd AlWahhāb Ibn Ibrahim alKhazrajī azZanjānī, author of the CHd.

IAB. The Ḥāfiz of the West, Abū 'Umar Yūsuf Ibn 'Abd Allāh, known as Ibn 'Abd AlBarr, anNamāri (from AnNamīr Ibn Kāsīt, a well-known clan) alKurtūbī, the Jurist and Traditionist, the Doctor of Spain, and the Master of his Age in Tradition and Memories of Antiquity (b. 363, d. 460 or 463, at the age of 95), author of the Istīlāb fi Ma'rifat alAṣhāb.

[Pupil of AW.]

IAS. The Ḥāfiz of Syria, nay, of the World, Thikāt adDīn, or Nūr adDīn, Abu-IlKāsim 'Alī Ibn Abī Muḥammad AlḤasan adDimashkī ashShāfī‘ī, known as Ibn 'Asākir, the Traditionist of Syria in his time (b. 499, d. 571), author of the History of Damascus.

IAz. The learned Jamāl adDīn Abū Muḥammad AlḤusayn Ibn Bādr Ibn Ayyāz Ibn 'Abd Allāh, the Grammarian (d. 681), author of a Commentary on the Taṣrīf of IM.

IJzr. The Ḥāfiz Shams adDīn Abu-IlKhāir Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad alKurashi adDimashkī ashShāfī‘ī, known as Ibn AlJazarī, the Reader and Traditionist (b. 751, d. 833).
IMH. Ahmad Ibn Muhammad, known as Ibn AlMullâ Al-Hâlî (d. about 990), author of a Commentary on the ML.


Jha. Abû 'Uthman 'Amr Ibn Bahr al-Kinâni al-Laithî (from Laith Ibn Bakr Ibn 'Abd Manât Ibn Kinâna Ibn Khuzâîma) al-Bâṣrî, the celebrated Philologist of the Bâṣrî school, and one of the Masters of the Mu'tazilîs, known as AlJâhiz, because his eyes were prominent, and also called AlHâdâkî, for the same reason (d. 255 at Al-Bâṣrâ, over 90 years old).

Kfî. The Shaikh Muhyi-d-Dîn Abû 'Abd Allâh Muhammâd Ibn Sulaimân ar-Rûmî AlKâfiyâî (so called from the frequency of his reading and teaching the Kâfiyâ of IH) al-Hanâfi, the Jurist, Theologian, Commentator, Traditionist, Grammarian, Logician, and Philosopher (b. 788 or 790 or before 800, d. 879), one of Syt's Masters.

Khz. Abu-I-Fâl Ha'mâm Muhammad Ibn Ja'far Al-Khuzâî (d. 408).

KIM. The Hâfiz and Kâdi Abû 'Abd Allâh AlKâsim Ibn Ma'n Ibn 'Abd Ar-Rahmân al-Mas'ûdî al-Kûfî, the Traditionist (d. 175).

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

Lth. Al-Laith Ibn Al-Mu'azzâfâr (so named by Az), or Ibn Naṣr (as the author of the KF says in the Bulgha), or Ibn Râfî (as others say), or Ibn Al-Mu'azzâfar Ibn Naṣr (as in Mr. I. 46), Ibn Sayyâr al-Laithî al-Khurâsâni, the Philologist, Lexicologist, and Grammarian, who was Secretary to the Baramîka.

* MAZ. The Muḥaddimât al-Adab, an Arabico-Persian Lexicon, by Zâ, edited by Wetstein.

* MDh. After "al-Mu'âhar" insert "(c. 833-6)."
Mhd. Abu-l'Abbās Aḥmad Ibn 'Ammār atTamīmī alMahdawī (originally of AlMahdiya in the territories of AlKairawān), the Reader; Grammarian, and Commentator (d. 440).

[This is the year given in the BW. The TM (No. 9) has “about 493”, which must be wrong, because IBshk. 89 says that he entered Spain “about 430”, while HKh. II. 330, 384, 488 says, that he died “after 430”.

Msb. The Glossary entitled ALMISBAH ALMUNIR (c. 734), by Fm.

SBd. AsSayyid ashSharīf Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad alḤasanī alMaghribī, the denizen of Egypt, alMālikī, known as ASAYYID ALBULAIĐI, the Reader, Commentator, and Grammarian (b. 1096, d. 1176) author of a Gloss on the A.

[Saidy under the designation of “Our Master the Sayyid”.

SIM. The Ḥāfiẓ Abū 'Uthmān Saṭīd Ibn Mansūr alKhurāsānī, resident of Makka, the Traditionist (d. in, or after, 227), author of the Kitāb asSunan.

SJj. The Sayyid Zain adDīn Abu-lḤasan 'Ali Ibn Muḥammad alḤussainī alJurjānī alḤanafī, known as ASAYYID ASHSHARĪF nnd ASAYYID ALJURJĀNĪ, the Doctor of the East (b. 740, d. 814 or 816).

* Sn. After “AṢṢABBĀN” insert “(d. 1206)”.

* TSh (as amended in Part I, Fasciculus III). After “Ritterhausen” 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 Khalifas), by Syt, edited by Lees.

Wkd. The Kādi Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn 'Umar Ibn Wākid alWA'kidī alAslamī alMadani, freedman of the Banū Ḥāshim, or, as is said, of the Banū Sahm of Aslam, author of works on the Maghāzī (Campaigns) and other subjects (b. 130, d. 206 or 207 or 209).

[He moved from AlMadīna, and settled in Baghdād, where he served as Kādi for four years under AlMa'mūn, dying in office.]

YH. The Shaikh Jamāl adDīn Abu-lMufaddal Yūsuf Ibn Sālim ashShāfī alKāhirī, known as ALḤANAFĪ, the Philologist (d. 1176), author of a Gloss on the A.

[He moved from AlMadina, and settled in Baghdad, where he served as Kadi for four years under AlMa'mun, dying in office.]

YH. The Shaikh Jamāl adDīn Abu-lMufaddal Yūsuf Ibn Sālim ashShāfī alKāhirī, known as ALḤANAFĪ, the Philologist (d. 1176), author of a Gloss on the A.

[YIM. The celebrated Ḥāfīz Abū Zakariyā YAHYĀ IBN MA'IN alMurri alGhatafānī (of the Murra of Ghatafan, their freedman) alBaghdādī, the Master of Tradition in his time (b. 158, d. 233 at age of 75, or 77, or 70 and odd, years).]

YIM. The celebrated Ḥāfīz Abū Zakariyā YAHYĀ IBN MA'IN alMurri alGhatafānī (of the Murra of Ghatafan, their freedman) alBaghdādī, the Master of Tradition in his time (b. 158, d. 233 at age of 75, or 77, or 70 and odd, years).

* YR. The Irshād alArīb ilā Ma'rīsaf alAdīb, commonly known as the Mu'jam, or Ṭabakāt, alUdābā, by YĀKŪṬ ARRŪMĪ, also called ALḤAMAWĪ (see Mk), edited by Margoliouth.
**CHAPTER XXVI.**—THE **ب** AND **ش** OF PAUSE.

§ 617. Affixed to the **ك** of the **فم.** in pause—**ش** substituted for the **ك** of the **فم.** in pause and continuity.

**CHAPTER XXVII.**—THE PARTICLE OF DISAPPROVAL.

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

§ 619. Its meanings ... 730

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

§ 621. Its position in the sentence ... 732-733

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

**PART IV.**—The Common Processes.

**CHAPTER I.**—COMMON PROCESSES IN GENERAL.

§ 625. Last part of book—meaning of "common"—common processes—**فم.**—etymology—definition—conventional applications—syntax excluded—reason for exclusion.
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| § 625 | Last part of book—meaning of "common"—common processes—**فم.**—etymology—definition—conventional applications—syntax excluded—reason for exclusion. | 736-737 |
CHAPTER II.—IMĀLA.

§ 626. Common to n. and v.—colloquial meaning—conventional meaning—an affection of Fatḥa with or without |—classification—a dialectic peculiarity—not practised by Hijāzīs—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— 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 ... ... 751

§ 632. Imāla prevented by letters of elevation and by ی not pronounced with Kasr—reason for such prevention—preventives enumerated—effective 751-756
in restraining expressed Kasra—and, according to IM, expressed ی—but, according to others, Kasra alone—ی—why added by IM—not supplied Kasra or ی—theory that letter of elevation is not preventive in vs.—criticism on exs. cited—or in certain vs.—خاتم—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.

§ 634. Conditions of prevention by ی—condition of contiguity to ی relaxed by some—preventive of preventive—its contiguity to ی—this condition relaxed by some—بًبًبًبًبًبًبً بًb

§ 635. Two other causes of Imāla—such Imāla anomalous—اعشًا باب هذَا مال أَتْحَبَتْج ٧ ٩ etc.—أَلْوَايًا.

§ 636. Properly no Imāla in فَاتِل from reduplicated—جُوُادُ جَاجٌ.
§ 637. Imāla for conformity  

§ 638. Fatha pronounced with Imāla before (1)  
|—conditions and predicaments of such Imāla  
|—(3) 8 of feminization in pause—quality of such Imāla— 8 of intensiveness included, but  
|not 8 of silence—no Imāla of  before 8—this  
|exception why inserted by IM—"8", not 8,  
|"of feminization" why said—dispute as to  
|Imāla of Fatha before 8 of silence.  

§ 639. Imāla peculiar to v. and decl. n.—irregular in  
indeel. n., except  and 8—heard in ।  
|some ps. pronounced with Imāla— 8 and 8—Imāla not forbidden in  
n. accidentally uninfl.—allowable in pret. v.,  
|and excellent in 8—reason for not pro-  
|nouncing ps. with Imāla—their aplasticity a  
|reason—Imāla in ps. used as proper names—  
in letters of monograms prefixed to chapters  
of Kur—various reasons given—and in letters  
of alphabet.  

CHAPTER III.—PAUSE.  

§ 640. Definition—criticism—another definition—the  
latter preferable — classification — tentative  
pause in 8—took 8 to stand 8 to stand 8—and  
in 8—that 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 Tanwîn—pause upon word quiescent in final—upon n. pronounced with Tanwîn, and not fem. with ñ—most frequent dial.—upon ñ—dispute about it—upon n. mobile in final—modes allowed when final is not ñ 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) Ishmâm—peculiar to Damma—explained—its name applied by some to Raum—alleged to be allowable with Kasra—its sign—its derivation—its object—question as to allowability of Raum or Ishmâm with the ñ of feminization, the ð of the pl., and the
accidental vowel—reason for disallowance with the ɔ of femininization—with the ʊ of the pl.—
with the accidental vowel—(4) reduplication—
explained—its object—letter added—sign of
reduplication—its rarity—its dialectic pecul-
arity—its conditions—extent of its occurrence
in nom., gen., and acc.—and with Damma,
Kasra, or Fatḥa—أ نقص (4) anomalous—or merely
rare—reduplication not properly applicable to
acc. pronounced with Tanwīn—(5) transfer of
vowel—this also rare—its object—its sign.

§ 641. Its conditions—cases where transfer is not allow-
able—two of these conditions peculiar to n.
whose final is not Hamza—transfer of Fatḥa—
of Kasra in ١ فع — dial. of many of the Arabs
in case of n. whose final is Hamza—dial. of
some of Tamīm—their treatment of n. whose
final is not Hamza—dial. of Ḥijāzīs—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—Damma transferable from
ɔ of pron.—exs.—قأس and ْقَرْبَة —transfer
to mobile—قَرْبَة — 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 Damma or Kasra—foregoing modes practised by those who sound Hamza true—modes adopted by those who alleviate—by people of AlHijāz.

§ 643. Unsound n.—pause upon unsound n. whose penultimate is (1) quiescent—substitution of ǧ for double ș—(2) mobile—expression of ș of defective when necessary—pause upon
defective in *acc.*—in *nom.* or *gen.*—elision of its $\text{ṣ}$ preferable in *nom.* or *gen.* pronounced with Tanwin—opinion of *S* and moderns—but expression 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—abbreviated triptote or diptote—pause upon (1) triptote pronounced with Tanwin—expressed in all three cases—dispute about this §—analysis of opinions upon it—language of *S*—*Sf's* comment upon it—its meaning explained by R—fruit of this dispute—(2) triptote not pronounced with Tanwin, and diptote—their retained—*dialect. vars.* of pausal §—nature of §

converted in some of these *dials.*—$\text{ṣ}$ and $\text{ṣ}$—$\text{ḥāmza in ʿ}$ a subst. for $\text{ṣ}$, not for Tanwin—conversion of $\text{ṣ}$ into *Ḥamza* of weak authority—as also into $\text{ṣ}$ or $\text{ṣ}$—such conversion 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 $\text{ṣ}$ of silence—or without—
importation of ς of silence—this ς why so named—its positions—first position—ς allowable here, not necessary—except in one case—another case added by LM—remaining positions to be found in § 648.

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

§ 646. Pause upon י of feminization י—(1) kept in (a) p. י לָ峄י י "קּוֹז , יָעָז—לָ峄י—(b) v. י why kept in p. and v.—pause upon י—(c) n., after sound quiescent—(2)
retracted or changed into  in n., after (a) vowel—(b) unsound quiescent—o.f. of verbal
of feminization—of nominal  —opinion of S, Fr, Ik., and most Gg—of Th—Tanwin in
acc. of n. made fem. by why not converted
into l—pause with preferable in sound pl.
and what resembles it—why preferable—pause
with  here—as dial. var. or anomaly—dial.
vars. of  its number and pausal form in
each dial.—opinion of Ks—of Gg—of Ih—
mentioned among verbal ns.—opinion of
R—  or  as proper name—
 or  —analysis of this word—pause
with  preferable in other formations—pause
with  in such as
opinion of IJ—t for  sometimes found in
Codex—  —pause in such cases—pause
upon  how affected by orthography of Codex—
pause with  in such as
—sometimes  —pause upon  —pause upon  when not for feminization.

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

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

\[ \text{positions of pause with } \tilde{a} \]

mostly \( \tilde{a} \) and \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \)—seldom \( \tilde{a} \) and \( \tilde{a} \)—but never for \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \)—(3) \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \), and \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \)—this \( \tilde{a} \)—pause upon \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{a} \) followed by this \( \tilde{a} \)—pause upon \( \tilde{a} \) of pron., masc. or fem.—

\[ \text{retention of } \tilde{a} \text{ better than elision—elision in acc. better than in gen.—practice of some } \]

Reader.(6) \( \tilde{a} \) and \( \tilde{a} \) and
xxxiv.
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§ 649. Pause upon single ن of corroboration after (1) Fat'a—exs.—additional exs.—(2) Damma or Kasra—this ن treated like Tanwin—restoration of ɔ of pl.—and of ن of ind.—practice of Ɂ—disallowed by S.

CHAPTER IV.—THE OATH.

§ 650. Common to n. and v.—definition—jurative prop., (1) verbal—its v. how attached to the sworn—by—quasi-jurative vs.—(2) nominal—أيمن | إِلَّا أُوْلَى | أتَيَال | إِلَّا | opinion of S—improbabilities in it—opinion of KK—their argument—قُلْ إِيَّاَنَّ مَعَكَ | عَلَى عَهْدٍ | إِمَانَة | إِلَّا | oath and correl. equivalent to one prop. —suppression of (1) the correl.—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.—عَرَضُ مَعَكَ quasi-jurative—sometimes not so—جَعَلَ also quasi-jurative—sometimes not so—pronunciation of its final—(3) the sworn-by—(4) the oath whose correl.
is corroborated by the \( \text{n} \) 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.

\( \S 651. \) Liberties taken with oath—(1) suppression of 
(a) jurative \( v. \)—(b) sworn-by—illustration—
(e) enunc in nominal jurative prop.—this suppression necessary or allowable—theory of Fr
—(d)ن and Hamza of \( \text{أيمن} \)—dispute as to whether elision of its Hamza be a liberty—
ج أو ت or \( \text{م} \) or \( \text{أيم الله} \) or \( \text{أيم الله} \) or \( \text{أيم الله} \)
—these contractions used only with 
Hamza of \( \text{أيم الله} \) or \( \text{أيم الله} \)—(e) ن of 
—(f) jurative p.—(2) substitution of \( \text{ت} \) for jurative \( \text{ي} \)—(3) preference of Fatla over 
Damma in —-, \text{dial. vars.} of this word—
only \( \text{عمر} \) used in oath.

\( \S 652. \) Oath adjuratory or not—correl. (1) of adjuratory—sometimes headed by \( \text{أين} \) or \( \text{نام} \)—or by 
red. \( \text{إن} \)—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 ז or ל or both—ז uncontracted or contracted—nature of ל—what it is prefixed to—ל in לודג תָּמ—(2) if neg., by ו or ז—this ז op. or inop.—ז exemptive—or by ל —verbal attended, (1) if aff., (a) when its v. is a pret., by ל with or without ת, or by ת alone—לכ ת best—except with aplastic vs.—ל alone, or ת alone, allowable—nature of ל prefixed to correl. separated from oath by condition headed by ל—(b) when its v. is an aor., by ל with or without נ of corroboration—omission of נ—or of ל—opinions of BB and KK—aor., in sense of present, allowable as correl. of oath—and then corroborated by ל without נ—(2) if neg., (a) when its v. is a pret., by מ or י—if pret. in sense, by מ—if future, by י or ז—(b) when its v. is an aor., by מ or י, the latter with or without נ of corroboration—or by ז—ex. of י—מ and ז disallowed by Mb—מ or ז not allowable—or very rare—subsidiary ל 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 ِذَلِكِ, 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 ِذَلِكِ, not ِذَلِكِ—IU and IUK on suppression 
of ِذَلِكِ—none of the four ps. suppressed except ِذَلِكِ.

§ 653. Jurative instruments—five ps.—preps., but named 

"jurative ps."—(1) ب—original jurative p. 

—suppression of v. with it—substitution of 
the other four ps. for it—(2) م—its government 

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

§ 656. suppressed with compensation—أَيِّهَا ِاللَّهِ
—sworn-by then لله exclusively, and com-
pensation the premonitory ِاللَّهِ or interrog.
Hamza—different opinions on ٞ—or the disjunction of Hamza in ُلٍل]—suppressed p. why held to be ٞ|ٞ necessary after ُلٍل] when compensation is ٞ—this ٞ transferred from ٞ|ٞ—pronunciations of ُلٍل] ٞ(1) ُلٍل] ٞ(2) ٞ|ٞ ٞ(3) ٞ|ٞ(4) ٞ|ٞ ٞ|ٞ how parsed by Khl—and by Akh—sense of interrog. Hamza—treatment of Hamza in ُلٍل] on prefixion of interrog. Hamza—ex. of ُلٍل]—disjunction of Hamza peculiar to ُلٍل] after ٞ with or without interrog. Hamza—compensation here the disjunction of Hamza in ُلٍل]—not the preceding interrog. Hamza—ٞ said to be red.—proof that the ٞ, the interrog. Hamza, and the disjunction of Hamza in ُلٍل] are subs. for jurative p.

CHAPTER V.—THE ALLEVIATION OF HAMZA.

§ 658. Hamza heavy—produced with difficulty—alleviated by some—by most Hijāzis, especially ʿUraish—remarks of ʿAli—but sounded true by others—by Tamʿm and Ḋais—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 Ṭb from letters of alphabet—(2) elision—(3) betwixt-and-between—two kinds of last mode—"strange" kind confined to certain positions—Hamza of betwixt-and-between quiescent or nearly so—not found in beginning of sentence—condition of alleviation that Hamza be not inceptive—meaning of "inceptive"—inceptive Hamza too light for alleviation—but sometimes converted into—Hamza one or two—if one, quiescent or mobile—quiescent Hamza preceded only by mobile—in same word or another—in either case, quiescent Hamza alleviated by change—not by betwixt-and-between—nor by elision—exs.—mobile Hamza—preceded by quiescent or mobile—predicament of preceding quiescent—mobile Hamza preceded by quiescent alleviated, (1) when quiescent is a non-coordinative aug., or ʿ, by conversion—i. e., change—no other mode possible—its alleviation not obligatory—opinion of S on ʿ, and
and of IH—(2) when quiescent is \( \text{I} \), 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 \( \text{a} \), or a \( \text{s} \), or a coördinative \( \text{a} \), or \( \text{s} \), by elision after transfer of vowel to quiescent—not by betwixt-and-between or change—\( \text{r} \), or \( \text{f} \), and \( \text{r} \), or \( \text{f} \), and \( \text{r} \), or \( \text{f} \), and \( \text{r} \), or \( \text{f} \), and

\( \text{conjug. of } \text{exs. of alleviation where quiescent is not in same word as Hamza—} \)

\( \text{alleviation obligatory in cat. of } \text{and of pret. } \text{and aor. } \text{i.e., in certain derivs. of } \text{and frequ}

\( \text{ent in cat. of } \text{—more so in } \text{than in } \text{—cause of its frequency—consequent elision of } \text{conj. Hamza—} \)

\( \text{—distinguished from } \text{—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 } \text{—(2) preceded by } \text{—Hamza
usually converted into | in latter case—treatment of the two | 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 | or quiescent
; or ₯—this change confined to hearsay—
but regular in metric exigency—*es.
of it not explicable as dial. * vars. — * سلت ظ , aor.
وسأ، or فَسأ لان said to be dial.
* vars. — رأجى, for * رأجى cited by S at end of
verse as ex. of this change—but not really so—
though in continuity for | رأجى it would be—this change restricted to case where Hamza and preceding mobile are both pronounced with
Fatḥ, Damm, or Kasr, respectively—* or ₯
quiescent when thus substituted for Hamza—cases where this change is not allowable—anomalies in connection with initial Hamza—irregular elision of Hamza in or —elision of Hamza sometimes avoided by transposition.

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

- their rad. Hamza elided, and *conj.* Hamza then dispensed with—their measure—elision obligatory in and 

not in or —regular form of these three *impe.*—irregular form always used in and 

but either allowed in —i.e., when inceptive—in interior of sentence retention of Hamza more frequent—but elision allowable—this subject why discussed here.

§ 660. Transfer of vowel from initial mobile Hamza to preceding ل of *art.* — with *conj.* Hamza expressed — ل being constructively quiescent — with *conj.* Hamza elided — ل being actually mobile — more frequent than *السفا'* — ل treated like 'من لَفْتَوْي or *السفا'*
and explanation of second ل and الس or الس and الس  

and dis-allowed by IH—comparison between ل  

الحمد, الس, and س in respect of retention or elision of conj. Hamza—س how relevant here for comparison.

§ 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 Fatha—  

1st pers. sing. of aor. subj. from ينْزَر  

a mispronunciation — ينْزَر aor. allowed by some—but disallowed in KF—(2)  

ى after Kasra—  

ء after Damma—  

اوتوئن—if first quiescent, and second mobile, which never occurs in position of ف, then, (1) in position of ع, first incorporated into second —(2) in position of ل, second changed into  

—incorporation why not adopted here—  

قأ يا—if both mobile, then second changed, (1)
if final, or non-final but pronounced with Kasr, into ی — (2) if non-final and pronounced with Damm, into ی — (3) if non-final and pronounced with Fath, into ی; if first be pronounced with Fath or Damm, and into ی if first be pronounced with Kasr—thus second mobile Hamza either final or not—final of three sorts, and non-final of nine—final changed into ی in all three sorts—non-final into ی in four; and ی in five sorts—exs. of (1) final—(2) non-final pronounced with (a) Kasr—prescribed action necessary— ی pl. of ی in IX. 12—or its second Hamza converted into ی or sounded true—how pronounced by Readers—softening or sounding true allowed in reading the Kur, but not conversion into ی—two former pronunciations not peculiar to ی—conversion best according to GG—(b) Damm—(c) Fath, when first is pronounced with (a) Fat, or Damm—pl. and dim. of ی—doubt as to whether ی be Arabic—(b) Kasr—opinion of Akh on two of the nine sorts— ی or ی—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
~<i>ج</i> orig <i>ج</i> its second Hamza not put
betwixt and between ~<i>ج</i> not a case of two
Hamzas according to Khl ~<i>خ</i> a case of
two Hamzas according to S—and therefore
mentioned here by IH—but not according to
Kh—opinion of S approved—occurrence of
sounding true and softening—interpolation of
between the two Hamzas—no conversion
when Hamzas are separated by original
alleviation preventible by interpolated
and therefore prevented by existing—
combination of two separate Hamzas ineffective in
causing alleviation —<i>د أ ب</i> —Hamza of
elided in cat. of <i>أ</i> —o.f. of <i>م</i> —
elision adopted here instead of conversion—and
extended to its variations—Hamza converted
into <i>ي</i> pronounced with Fath in cat. of <i>م</i>
—and ~<i>خ</i> —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
exs.—treatment of two Hamzas after entry of
—treatment of conj. Hamza after interrog.
Hamza—(2) not inceptive—unusual to sound two consecutive Hamzas true—treatment of two Hamzas if both be mobile—mode of alleviating (a) first alone—(b) second alone—ex.—(c) one of two Hamzas whose vowels are of the same kind—(d) both Hamzas together.

§ 662. Treatment of two Hamzas (1) if first be quiescent—additional method transmitted by 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., v., 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 ⟨⟩—less light when first is ⟨⟩ or ⟨⟩ preceded by Damma or Kasra, respectively—least light when first is ⟨⟩ or ⟨⟩ preceded by Fatha—last combination peculiar to dim.— incorporation or pause prescribed for second
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 soft-
ess, provided that both be in one word—mean-
ing 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 ns. uninfl. from
want of construction—not from existence of
preventive of inflection—theory that quiescence
of their finals, even in continuity, is pausal—
classification of such ns.—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. acci-
dentially, 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 Fat:,
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 concurrence—1 converted from Hamza why not elided—(5) in such as *بَسْتُ بَيَتَانُ* and *اللَّهِ لاَ هُوَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ* combination of two quiescents optional here, necessary in preceding cases—concurrency of two quiescents not pardonable in other cases—"*حَلُّنَا وَإِبْطَالِيَنَّ*" 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—"نَسْرِينَ " and "يُسْلِمُونَ " and "يُسْلَمَانَ" (2) first is elided if its elision do not lead to confusion—concurrency avoided by elision or mobilization of first rather than second—letter of prolongation not mobilized when ِ or َ—nor when ُ—elided in ْعَزِن and َإِرْسَن—*bَاْسَن* but not in ل of *apoc.* and *imp.* in defective v. how treated upon affixion of *nom.* *prons.*—why not converted into ل in أَفْضَيَا and أَفْضَايْأَا—elided خُفْصُ and خِفْصُ ل of خُفْصُ, and elided ل of ل and ل how treated upon mobilization of فَ، وَ، وَ،
respectively—\( L \) why treated differently in
\( J \) and \( C \), respectively

why not elided—vowel of \( L \) in
\( J \), \( C \), and also in
\( J \) and \( C \), quasi-original—and permanent—hence return of their \( J \)s inevitable—\( L \)s why retained
in \( J \) and \( C \), and first quiescent
why converted into or \( i \), and mobilized, in
\( J \) and \( C \), elided of
and \( J \), and not restored in \( J \) and \( C \)—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 \textit{corrob.} \( N \) of

but not \( N \) of \( L \)—(2) \( N \) and \( N \) of \( C \)—(3) Tanwin of proper name qualified by \( J \) \textit{pre.} to proper name—elision of Tanwin, on account of concurrence of two quiescents, anomalous in other cases—
\( J \) \textit{and} \( C \) of determination mobilized with Kasr when prefixed to \textit{conj.} Hamza—transfer of vowel from \textit{conj.} Hamza to preceding quiescent—\textit{exs.} with Fat\( h \)a—and Kasra—and Damma—transfer disapproved—second quiescent mobilized (1) when
mobilization of first is avoided for alleviation—
—and second then pronounced with Fath, not Kasr—Damm not used, with some exceptions, for avverting concurrence of two quiescents—incorporation practised by some in apoc. and imp. of reduplicated v.—omitted by all in when a v. of wonder—
(2) sometimes when second is final of uninfl. word—, and not a case in point—opinion of Z—its refutation.

§ 664. General rule for mobilization in concurrence of two quiescents—original vowel Kasra—reasons for choosing it—variations from it—(1) Damma necessary in (a) of pl.—vowel of this after (a) Kasra on (b) Damma on any letter—(b) Damma here not necessary, but usual—(c) —2) Fatha preferable in —Kasra not accepted by

Readers—question whether is relevant here—Fatha 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 الید 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 Fatha, in explicit n.—in other cases, pronounced with Kasr after Fat'a—ُ of pl., sometimes pronounced with Kasr—and ُ 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 ر and ُ—Kasra preferred in ر ُ—Fat'a sometimes found—Damma rarely—all of this applicable when aor. is pronounced with Damm of ُ—Kasra or Fat'a allowable when aor. is pronounced with Fat'a or Kasr—three methods of mobilizing second quiescent in such imps. and apocs.—(a) Fat'a—(b) alliteration—(c) Kasr ُ—Kasra adopted by most in apoc. or imp. before quiescent—Fat'a by some—Damma by none—IH and Jrb mistaken in allowing it—
(6) Fathā needed before fem. pron. and Damma before masc. pron. — Kasra, in latter position, a weak dial. var.—Fathā considered erroneous—reason for Damma—this vowel chastest here—Kasra explicable—Fathā not forbidden by analogy—Fathā 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 of masc.—(2) where second is incorporated, and first an ل—exs. of this case not accepted by Māz as precedents—opinion of Z and IH on reason for conversion of ل into Hamza pronounced with Fathā—alternative theory—vowel of Hamza if م. of ل be mobile—، or ع. not converted into Hamza—reason for not altering ،—modes of avoiding concurrence of two quiescents in ﺖاز ﺮز. ﺖاز ﺮز.

§ 666. Vowel of final in (1) ﺖاز، (a) before ل of art.
—Fathā not caused by transfer from conj. Hamza—opinion of Kā—(b) before any other quiescent—Fathā sometimes used in latter case—and Kasra in forms.—(2) ﺖاز
and *reasonable* — reasons for *Damma*
and Kasra here—(4) — *Damma* bad—
feeably explained—and, if correct, restricted
to certain positions—*Fatha* not allowable.

CHAPTER VII.—THE PREDICAMENT OF
THE INITIALS OF WORDS.

§ 607. 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
(2) *vs.*, (a) *pret.* and *imp.* in *vs.* of
*inf.* *ns.* before mentioned—(b) *imp.* of 2nd *pers.*
in unaugmented *tril.* sound in ب and خ —(3)
*ps.*, ج and م 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 ج
and م of *art.*—Hamza in these ten *ns.* a com-
ensation for actual or virtual elision of ج—
not found in all trils. whose lá is elided—
why prefixed to these nds.—finals not actually
elided in ایمی، امرز، ایدم and —but virtually
in ایمی ایدم — actually in ایدم if م be con-
considered aug.—and virtually in ایمی also—o.f.
of (1) — proof of Fath of (a) its بنو — (b) its ع — evolution from o.f.—elided ل — no
evidence in ایمی بنو — opinion of Zj—(2) —
(3) — not to be copied—its م — (4) — نتایی
— evolution—(5) — (6, 7) — and امرزتایی
— ل not elided from امرز — or امرز — their
evolution— conj. Hamza why combined with
ل — fems. of بنو ایمی، این، and اسم — (8) — اسم
according to (a) BB—vowel of س in o. f.
— derivation—measure—evolution— اسم — (b)
KK—evolution—objections to their opinion—
BB’s opinion preferable—(9) — evolution-
— dial. vars.—proof of Fath of ی in o.f.—(10)
— held by BB to be sing.
— Hamza why prefixed—dial. vars.—vowel of
— 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 \( \mathcal{J} \) —

Hamza in their *dus.*—Hamza of \( \mathcal{J} \) — according to S, *aug.*—but, according to *Khl,* *rad.*—

and *orig. disj.*—opinion of IM—\( \mathcal{O} \) — these initials quiescent—and therefore proceeded by mobile *aug.* Hamzas in inceptive positions—impracticability of beginning with quiescent not peculiar to Arabic.

§ 668. These Hamzas named "*conj.*" — initial Hamzas *disj.* and *conj.*—also called "*disj.* and *conj.* \( \mathcal{J} \) s"—*disj.* Hamza — why so named—*conj.* Hamza—why so named—definition of *conj.* Hamza—and of *disj.*—*conj.* Hamza *orig.* a Hamza—possibly an \( \mathcal{J} \) — always prosthetic—its property—not expressed in interior of sentence, except by poetic license—how defined by IHsh and Fk—dispute about cause of its name "*conj. Hamza*"—causes variously assigned—its positions—prefixed to *n.*, *v.*, and *p.*—not found in (1) *aor.* — \( \text{تُذَكُر} \) — (2) *p.* other than determinative or *red* \( \text{ذَل} \) — with determinative \( \mathcal{M} \) and conjunct \( \text{ذَل} \)—but conjunct \( \text{ذَل} \) properly a *n.*—

*Khl* on Hamza of \( \text{ذَل} \)—(3) *tril.* or numerically *quad. pret.*—but found in *quin.* or *sex. pret*—

and in their *imps.*—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) ten ns. mentioned in § 667—with conjunct ٌ and ٍ — distinction between them possible—but immaterial — ٌ, not specified here—ٌ, dial. var. of ٌ, should be mentioned—rule in case of doubt—conjunct ٌ — conj. Hamza why put—dispensed with when quiescent initial becomes mobile—but ٍ ٍ for ٍٍ ٍ. rather than ٍٍ ٍ, for ٍٍ ٍ—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) Fat'a necessary in ٌ — (2) Damma necessary in (a) pret. pass.—(b) imp. of tril. when such imp. is orig. pronounced with دamma of - Kasra sometimes found before original دamma—causes of these two var. - Kasra said to be corrupt—(3) دamma preponderant over Kasra in 2nd pers. sing. fem. of imp. of tril. when دamma of ج is accidentally replaced by Kasra—opinion of F on Ishmām of first and third letters here—and of IM—(4) Fat'a
preponderant over Kasra in {مُبَارَك} and {مُبَارَكَة}

(5) Kasra preponderant over Damma in { اسم}

(6) Damma, Kasra, or Ishmām allowable in pass. of such prets. as { دَاعِي} and { صَبِّ رَبَّ}

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

§ 669. Expression of conj. Hamza, in interior of sentence, a gross solecism—except in poetry—elision necessary, in case of choice, except after pause or interruption—stop at beginning of hemistich—{ لا تنطلق}{ اسم} etc., not said—{ لَهَا} a poetic license—at beginning of second hemistich—Hamza of art., after interrog. Hamza, not elided, but (1) converted into { }—and thus retained, though in modified form—contrary to general rule—(2) softened betwixt and between—this treatment extended to every conj. Hamza pronounced with Fath—change into { } the only method mentioned by F and many—dispute about this—softening agreeable with analogy—used by Readers, though less approved—easy in comparison with change—no difference here between Hamzas
of ل and ل* — both methods used
among the Seven—conj. Hamza not elided
when pronounced with Fat;*, as when pro-
nounced with Kasr or Damm—nor sounded
true.

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

CHAPTER VIII.—THE AUGMENTATIVENESS
OF LETTERS.

§ 671. Common to n. and v.—no augmentation in ps—
meaning of augmentation—this process coordinative or non-coordinative—meaning of coordinative augmentation—coordinated—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"—re-duplicative augment, coordinative or non-coordinative— non-re-duplicative coordinative augment—aug. repetitive or non-repetitive—repetitive aug.—its condition—repetition (a)
of two out of three rads.—opinion of IM on —of KK on —of (b) of ٌ , or of ج 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.— in a שׁאָרָּם שׁ in omitted by Mb from letters of augmentation—these ten letters why peculiar to augmentation—י, ו, and then remaining seven letters—measurement or exemplification—its use—פּלָא constituted as measure—its crude-form, not its actual conformation, here intended—רָדֶפֶּו. how represented in measure—this representation explained—אָמָרָּה 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. 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—אָמָרָּה(ט)—(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 —& —language of IY and IM— — (2) rad., (a) when initial but followed by too rads., or by four—(b) when non-initial, unless irresistibly indicated as aug.—medial or final Hamza when judged to be aug.—exception to this rule—two conditions for augmentativeness of final Hamza—IM’s version of second condition—alternatives allowable in final Hamza after | separated from the ـ by a double letter, or by two letters one of which is a soft letter—exs.—alternative strengthened by indication to be adopted—correction of IM’s version—positions of aug. Hamza in n.

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

§ 674. ی when judged to be aug.—their three states—مدين—ایطال and مريم—آی یا لق Arabic—opinion of IAl on its measure—said to be foreign—یا فت or یا ری—its first ی—why decided to be aug.—both ی are not rad. or aug., nor second aug.—عزپیت—its 
rad., and ی and ی aug.—its ی is not imagined by any one to be rad.—ی aug. with (1) three rads.—(2) four or more rads., when it is (a) non-initial—(b) initial, if word be a v.—positions of aug. ی in n. and v.—additional exs.—ی how known to be aug. in these exs.—
both ی is rad. in صمصمة ی حاجت—also in 
ی فوشیت and ی عاعیت and not aug. in last two formations—nor ی —initial ی when aug., and when rad.—ی يستغور یا ی جی in ی جی aug. in ی جی 

§ 675. ی not aug. when initial—opinion of majority—
of ی ورنابل always aug. when medial with three or more rads.—its positions in such cases —positions of aug. ی in n. and v.
§ 676. exactly like Hamza in augmentativeness—
aug. and Hamza mostly initial—non-
initial not aug., except when so indicated—
Hamza aug. in n. and v., but μ only in n.—
why not in v.—initial μ aug. oftener than
initial Hamza—universally aug. in certain
formations—derivation the test—

made
to accord with

μ ādīl
 and
μ muqāl

exceptional—derivation of
μ wuzūr—conditions of aug. μ—exs.—addi-
tional condition—μ fulfilling conditions judged
to be aug. in absence of contrary indication—
such indication decisive—μ hadj al—opinion of
AAMr—μ wuzūr—muf‘zūr—non-initial μ not
judged to be aug., except on plain indication—
μ dālmas—opinion of Mz—μ daf ars—
μ zarqam—μ mas—
μ—predicament of
μ before three letters, one of which may be
rad. or aug.—and before four or more rads.
μ—opinion of S and
Mz—and of others—positions of aug. μ.

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

---

derivation and declension of *حَسَن—مرَان*—and of

—predicament of *ن* when a double letter, or a sound and a soft letter, are interposed between the *ل* and the *ف*—another condition added by some— of *رَمَان*—(2) when medial, upon three conditions—for three reasons— *ن* *aug* in وَزْنَتُنَّ—but *rad.* in (a) {نَيُشُل}, though *aug.* in نَرُجَس—(b)

—though *aug.* in عَرْبَدُ عَنْسَل, عَنْبَس, قَذَرْل, قَنْطَار

and كَنْعَبِل, خَنْدِرِس, عَنْقُورُ, قَذَرْل, قَنْطَار

—(c) كَنْعَبِل, خَنْدِرِس, عَنْقُورُ, قَذَرْل, قَنْطَار

(d) عَجْجَس—explanation of its double *ن*—its measure—(3) when initial, in *aor.*— *ن* regularly *aug.* in certain formations omitted by *IM*—other *aug.* *ن* not mentioned by him—positions of *aug.* *ن*—in other cases *ن* *rad. *, with some exceptions.

§ 678. *ت* *aug.* in (1) *fem.*, (a) فَرِبة, فَرِبْتُ, فَرِيَبْتُ, فَرِبْتُ, فَرْبَتْ—but not فَرْبَتْ—"fem." explained

—*sing.* or *pl.*—quiescent *ت* of femininization
not reckoned by IHsh—not 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 derives.—and without—(4) quasi-pass.—— in other positions not judged to be aug., unless so indicated—تترجمان aug. when (1) initial —ثَعْلُوتُ and —ثَعْلَاء—تَعْلُوتُ—ثَعْلَاء—opinion of S on final ت after aug. ٨ preceded by three or more rads. —and after aug. ا preceded by three rads.—ن—تعلُوتُ—تَعْلُوتُ—ثَعْلَاء—(3) medial—ن—تعلُوتُ—تَعْلُوتُ—ثَعْلَاء—in other cases ت rad., unless otherwise indicated.

§ 679. 8 aug. in pause—§ and ل rarely aug.—exas. of أَمِهاتِ and أَمِهاتِ for أَمِهاتِ and أَمِهاتِ for أَمِهاتِ—exas. of ل—neither 8 of silence, nor ل of distance, really aug.—§ a letter of augmentation—regular only in pause—necessary there, or allowable—its augmentativeness denied by Mb—but genuine, though rare—proved by (1) for ماتِ pl.
verse combining both dial. vars.—distinction between مابما and مهات in use—ةمثبأ for مل —its measure—theory that its ن is rad. —ةمثبأ and مهات] then two different o. Player—weakness of this theory—no argument from transmission of نتا in the 'Ain—authority of the 'Ain not admitted by F (2) for نةأ —Mb's only answer to نةأ — ن in رأق and in گروه and گروه — in كواة rightly held to be aug.—similarly in نةأ — ن of silence not really a letter of augmentation.

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

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

CHAPTER IX.—THE SUBSTITUTION OF LETTERS.

§ 682. Found in all three parts of speech—definition given (1) in SH—incorporative substitution not meant—compensation excluded—and restoration—and conversion—(2) in IKn—difference between these two definitions —conversion included by IY—less comprehensive than substitution—peculiar to unsound letters and Hamza—compensation different from both—meaning of “original” and “substituted” or “subst.” —classification of substituted letters —IM’s object in this chapter—in 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—nor 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  рук in مام merely incorporative—but not in لام—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— ص and ذ added by Sf—and ش of س not reckoned by S—said to be substituted for ﺑ for ﻣ for ﺝ ﻣ—
for ل — ف for ق and ت for ق
for Hamza—these substitutions rare and anomalous—originals of substituted letters—substitution recognizable by reversion to original—
لَصْبَةٌ — أَفْلَطُ
and — conclusion to be drawn from absence of reversion—subst. said by IH to be recognizable by (1) "the paradigms of its derivation"—meaning of this phrase—
أَجُرِيَ — (2) "the paucity of its usage"—meaning of this phrase—
الْطَّالِيٍّ — substitution here recognizable by first test also—
this pl. not from ثُعَالَةٌ — (3) "the fact that it is a deriv., while the letter is an aug."—
أَشْرَبُ — (4) "the fact that it is a deriv., while it is a rad."— مَا — meaning of last two phrases—mode of determining whether subst. be in deriv. or in o.f.—obscurity of IH's expressions here—(5) "the fact that an unknown formation would be entailed"—
إِفْعَالٍ، إِفْعَالْ، إِفْعَالٍ — إِفْعَالٍ، إِفْعَالٍ — إِفْعَالٍ — إِفْعَالٍ — إِفْعَالٍ and not unknown—subst.
how recognizable in them—causes of substitution.

§ 683. Hamza substituted for seven letters—its substitution for letters of softness regular and
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irregular—regular necessary and allowable—necessary found in ل, ع, and ف—order of mention—substitution for و and ى necessary in four cases, where و or ى is (1) final after aug. ۶دَرَأً — ۶دَرَأً — ۶دَرَأً associated with و and ى—substitution retained with adventitious ى of femininization, but disallowed with un-adventitious—converse case—predicament of two augs. of du.—no substitution in curtailed form of voc. ۶قَارَى — or ۶قَارَى ۶قَارَى of ۶قَارَى ۶قَأَلَل ۶قَأَلَل not considered final—amendments suggested by A and IUK in IM's rule for this case, and objections to them—manner of substitution—(2) ع of act. part. from v. whose ع is transformed—this substitution extended to ۶قَأَلَل and ۶قَأَلَل when not act. parts.—dispute as to whether act. part. be subordinate to v. in transformation and sounding true—manner of substitution— و or ى disregarded in act. part. by Mb—Hamza in both ۶بَآَئَل: and ۶بَآَئَل written as ى—but not changed into pure ى in either—rad. ى not sounded true in ۶بَآَئَل, any more than rad. و in ۶بَآَئَل—dotting of ى in ۶قَأَلَل and ى disallowed—(3) after ۶حَمْل of ۶مَلَل in pl., when
such or is an aug. letter of prolongation third in sing.—1 associated with  and 
—IM's rule for third case—reason given by IJ for converting this letter of prolongation into Hamza—and by Khl—no conversion when  or  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  of between them—reason for changing soft letter after  of pl. into Hamza—dispute as to whether this substitution be peculiar to pl.—this Hamza also written as undotted —fifth case peculiar to —IHsh's rule for it—two cases included under this rule— substitution in these exs. not necessary, but allowable—rule given by Z and IY—by R—by A—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 —change of first necessary where condition is fulfilled, and allowable elsewhere—restriction as to initiality of first —theory of IM that conjunction of the two  s should
not be accidental—opinion of others—allowable substitution of Hamza for letter of softness when (1) a ي permanently pronounced with Damm—R’s formula for it—this substitution good, regular—no substitution when ي is (a) accidentally pronounced with Damm—(b) doubled—(2) a ه pronounced with Kasr between ي and double ه—irregular substitution of Hamza for letter of softness when (1) an ي, (a) to avoid concurrence of two quiescents—(b) from proximity of outlets—(2) a ي when (a) an initial, pronounced with (a) Kasr—cause of this substitution—its irregularity disputed—د of خریل not converted—(b) Fath—(b) a letter of prolongation—reason for substitution here—(3) a ه when (a) an initial pronounced with Fath—ا for دیا لأدی—dispute as to whether it is a dial. var.—ل لل for عل لل—(b) a letter of prolongation—substitution of Hamza for ع and ه rare, irregular—substitution for ه in (1) ۸ـه and ۸ـه |—evolution of ۸ـه—it’s pl. of paucity—and of multitude—substitution, though anomalous, obligatory in ۷ـه, not in ۷~و ه |—۷ـه—(2) ۸ـه and ۸ـه |—Hamza a subst. for ع in ۸ـع |—not in ۸ـع |—substitution for ع —
—these allowable and irregular substitutions why not mentioned here by IM—substitution of Hamza for خ and خ—very strange.

§ 684. substituted for four letters—or five—its substitution for ٍ 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 Fath—(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 s, and be not ل or double ى if they be ل s—this condition indicated by IM—e.x.s. of خ and ل sounded true on breach, and transformed on fulfilment, of this condition—ینخسون and ُخزروت رمودت and ُعصون ُیخسون—but, according to some, ُخزروت and ُعصون ُیخسون—reason for sounding ٍ or ى true before ل or double ى—(7, 8) that neither of them be خ of فعل whose qual. is فع۷ل، or of its inf. n.—these two conditions indicated by IM—reason for sounding خ true in such v. or inf. n.—خان—(9) that خ be not of فعال denoting reciprocity—this condition indicated by IM—
— this condition not applied to ی — (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—طَلَّيْةٌ — طَلَّيْةٌ ، and عَلِيَّ (for عَلِيَّ) — objections to statement that یَیِلَّ is for عَلِیَّ — or عَلِیَّ — or عَلِیَّ — six modes of accounting for عَلِیَّ — or eight—consequential transformation—two transformations allowable when separate, and not absolutely disallowed by IM when consecutive — (11) that neither of them be ی of word ending in augment peculiar to ین—this condition indicated by IM—مَا عَلِیَّ و دَارَان — conflict of opinion when word ends in ی and ن — or abbreviated ی of feminization—۶ of feminization disregarded—two other conditions—that ی be not a subst. for a letter not transformable—nor be in place of such a letter—reason for sounding ی true in ی، as explained by IM—and by some—another condition—not needed—طَلَّيْ — طَلَّيْ and
weakeness of two last— 살아 subsequable into |— substitution of | for Hamza (1) obligatory— meaning of "obligatory"— (2) regular, but not obligatory—its substitution for ن or Tanwin in pause upon (1) acc. pronounced with Tanwin— (2) v. to which single corrob. preceded by letter pronounced with Fath is affixed— for (a) تاتا جاجي and (b) تا جاجي —(3) why substituted for ن in these positions—its substitution for س — for أب — أه— explanation given in KF.

§. 685. ى 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— تيتال and 2) غياب why, then converted into ى—(2) ى of dim.—for ى in ten cases, where ى is (1) preceded by Kasra, and (a) final— ى why then converted into ى—(b) before ى of feminization— ى why then converted into ى— no distinction here between separable and inseparable ى—two anomalies— (a) سوسية its measure and other peculiarities— (b)
or, πι, ανομαλία—ισχυρά used as πλ. and
—IBr’s explanation of πλ. — (c)
before ι of feminization, abbreviated or pro-
longed—(d) before aug. ι and ι — (2) ξ of
inf. n. having the ξ of its v. transformed, and
its own ξ preceded by Kasra and followed
by ι — ι — and ι — 
— transformation rare
where ι is lacking—ι — anomalous to sound
true when conditions of transformation are
fulfilled — ι — no counterpart of it — ι
not an inf. n.—(3) ξ of πλ. having its ι
sound, and its ξ preceded by Kasra, and, in
sing., either (a) transformed—ι, then over-
powered by Kasra in πλ.—no necessity for ι
after it here—ι — or (b) quiescent, pro-
vided that in πλ. it be followed by ι — ι
then overpowered by Kasra in πλ.—five conditions
of conversion here—ι sounded true if ι be
missing—ι — explained as expanded from
— or contracted from ι — or trans-
formed from ι to distinguish πλ. of ι bull
from pl. of slab (of dried curd)—also sounded true if mobile in sing.—
—or if ل be unsound—(4) final, fourth
or upwards, and after Fatlأ—why changed into ى in pret. and pass. part.—pret. here conformable to aor., and pass. part. to act. part.—

(5) quiescent, single, and immediately after Kasra—أجلاذ and أوار

ل (6) of ep. ودنأ—فعل

ل أدنأ—فعل

ep. use of أدنأ as substantive—

أدنأ ل أقصي أقصي

not altered—conflict of opinion—(7) combined with ى in single, or virtually single, word, while first of them is quiescent, original in

nature and quiescence—ميت

and their measure فعال

not فعال

ل فعال

and

sounded true if ى and ى be in separate words—or if first of them be mobile—or adventitious in nature—or quiescence—

and نفو—dim. of n. whose third is a mobile

، and whose broken pl. is on measure of
treatment of this in *dim.* how accounted for—*dim.* of ٠اسید when an *ep.* of ٠عِمود and *pl.* and *dim.* of ٠ضْعْوَن—(8) ل of مفعول from v. whose ع is pronounced with Kasr in *pret.*—this ل why converted into ى— ٠مرضا—reason for either treatment of ٠—different versions of *ex.* cited in *Aud.*—(9) ل of *pl.* نعول، عصي—ناعول، and ٠نلًا—sounding ل true anomalous in *pl.*—necessary in sing.—٠عَقْى and تُسِى—IM's language in *Alfiya.*—(10) ع of *pl.* فعل sound in ٠تُم and ٠صُم and ٠ثُم more frequent—ل sounded true if ل be unsound—or be separated from ٠by ٠نِمام —٠anomalous—substitution of ى for ل and ى in *gen.* and *acc.* of *du.* and perf. *pl.* masc.—its substitution (1) for ل (a) regular—(b) anomalous or weak—(2) for ى (a) regular—(b) anomalous—dispute as to regularity of صم—and of ٠ضِمْل، ٠سْبَب٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠.
cats.—\(\mathfrak{c}\) anomalously 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 unaugmented tril.—substitution of \(\mathfrak{i}\) for (a) first duplicate in \(\mathfrak{f}\) when a non-inf. substantive—not ending in \(\mathfrak{i}\) of femininization —دیابیچ and دیامبس —\(\mathfrak{f}\) خبریاوط و جیرواند —شواردز (b) second duplicate or third triplicate in (a) املیت —dispute as to whether this form be deriv. or original—(b) (d) ورپیک (c) کنصیک (e) لم یتسن تظهیت (f) سریه تسرودت —یا تمی (g) نقصض تقصضی (h) یسمیت —its measure and formation—(i) مسیحیت —its formation—(j) مکاکی —their formation—(k) مسیحیت —(l) دیباچ، دیوان (m) خبریاوط، خبریاوط، and دیامبس (n) شواردز و -اناس (2) —ییتقل of for (o) س، ب، خ، and these four
substitutions weak—and for ج — ی substituted for eighteen letters in all.

§ 686. ی substituted for three letters—for | in one case, where preceding letter is pronounced with

Damm—ینب—ب in four cases, where

ی occurs (1) quiescent, single, in a sing., and after Damma—ین unchanged if mobile—or incorporated—or in a pl., preceding Damma being then converted into Kasra—(2) after Damma as ل of (a) فعال—(b) a n. ending in fundamental, inseparable, ی of feminization—

(1) as ل of فعال when a substantive—ساعیا، تفاصیا said to be anomalous—meaning of "anomalous"—spellings of طفیا—(4) as فعال of طویبی لک when (a) a substantive—طویبی لک—or (b) an ep. acting as a substantive—indication of its so acting—or. f. of | لکس، | طویبی، | فعالی Damma of فعالی, when a pure ep.,

said by GG to be converted into Kasra—ضریزی and حیکی—opinion of IM and his son—its differences from saying of GG—language of Shl—طویبی as a substantive—substitution of

(1) for | (a) obligatory in such as (a)
and —cause of conversion in *dim.—and
and in broken *pl.—(b) "ضُؤِرب" (c) "ضُؤِرب" (d) "ضُؤِرب" and
ودم (e) "ضُؤِرب" etc., and (f) "ضُؤِرب" etc.,
and —cause of conversion— is here assumed to be
orig. (b) weak in such as "stop and
—every final * converted by Fazāra and some
of *Kais into * in pause—reason for such
conversion—heaviness of * why tolerated in
pause—similar excuse for conversion of * into
Hamza— * retained by Tayyi in continuity—
* converted by some of Tayyi into * in pause—
* more frequent then * in dial. of Tayyi—*
retained in continuity—reason for conver-
sion of * into * or *(2) for * (a) obliga-
tory in such as * and * and *
and * نِسْسُر * مَيْيَنَص—بُطرُ and *
*/ضُؤِرب* — *بَيْض—ميِاسِر* (b) *قوي* and *
—(c) *قوي* —(b) anomalous, weak, in
such as (a) *مش woo* (b) *مش woo* —reason
for change of * into * here—(c) *جَباوة* —
dispute as to reality of change in * and *
—*جَبار* —*dim. of * and * and
| Page |
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- retention of م is not obligatory—opinion of IM—م شویم م بپیت ضریه—the last said to be a weak *dial. var.*—substitution of م for Hamza (1) allowable—م جوئن، *pl.* جوئن، not a satisfactory ex.—(2) necessary—substitution of م for م.

§ 687. م substituted for four letters, (1) م، necessarily, in م فم alone—evolution of م from م فم—vowel of its م فم generally restored in prefixion—م م فم said by Akh to be a *subst.* for م—م م فم (a) aprotethic—(b) *pre.* to م of 1st pers.—م م فم م فم م فم، and م زید م فم م فم م فم م فم م فم م فم م فم more correct than م م فم م فم م فم م فم م فم م فم م فم—(c) *pre.* to *explicit n., or to pron. other than م of 1st pers.—م combined with م in م م فم م فم م فم—explanation suggested by F—opinion of S—another explanation reported by F—opinion of IJ—*dial. vars.* of م م م م—(2) ل of *art.*, in *dial.* of some—(3) ن م، (a) regularly before ب، when ن is quiescent—language of IM—reason of conversion—immaterial whether ن and ب be in one word or two—ن م written as ن م، 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 ن for م —
(4) ب in (a) بُدَّات مُطْكَرُت —opinions of IS and IJ—sometimes pronounced with undotted ح —(b) زَرْم —opinions of AASh and IJ—(c) نُغَم —م why used as subst. for these four letters.

§ 688. ن substituted for four letters, (1) صَعَانِي — ر
and ی —opinion of S—of Mb—of others
—that of S preferable—ن here why not a subst. for Hamza of feminization—(2) ل —
لَعَن —or a separate dial. var.—لَعَن
and ی صَعَانِي — لَعَن characterized by
IH as anomalous, and لَعَن as weak—(3) م —
(4) Hamza—alleged substitution of ن in حُمْل، masc. of حُمْل، for Hamza of حُمْل —
“substitution” here merely alternation—this application of “alternation” tropical.

§ 689. ت substituted for seven letters, (1, 2) ت
and ی, when (a) a ن—such substitution
(a) regular in نَعَلَل and its variations—
meaning of IH’s language—this substitution how indicated by IM—reason for change of ن into ت —theory that substitution here is
always for یـ not included with ٰ and
dialectic peculiarities—(ب) irregular in numerous expressions—
and
(ج) irregular in numerous expressions—
and
and
and
and
—measure of last two—
ed necessary in default of

and

and

and

—its a subst. for یـ in
—its a subst. for یـ in
—its a subst. for یـ in
—its dial. var.—their یـ not a
 subst. for یـ —possible o. f. of یـ —its rel. n.
—(3) یـ said by Fr to be a dial. var.—its یـ why not original—regarded
by IH as sole instance of unincorporative sub-
stition for یـ —(ب) یـ —its formation—
8 substituted for six letters, (1) Hamza, (a).  

aug., in (a) (b) — (c) — (d) — (e) — aors.—all four 
exs. transmitted by ISk—(b) rad., in (a) 

—Hamza here 

why altered into 8 —(c) —(d) —(e) 

and (f) —Hamza in these cases 

why changed into 8 —substitution of 8 for 

Hamza confined to hearsay—(2) 1, in (a) 

—opinions on its 8 —(b) —opinions 

on its last 8 —(c) — and — i. q. 

or —opinions on its 8 in former case—
(d) — dispute about its last 𝑠 — opinion of BB — of Z and IH — of AZ, Akh, and KK — of others — substitution of 𝑠 for 𝑙 anomalous — (3)

, in — dispute as to whether its last 𝑠 be substituted for 𝑙 or for 𝑙 converted from — meaning of 𝑙 here — (4) in (a) for — its last 𝑠 a subst. for 𝑙 in pause — or in pause and continuity alike — such substitution not regular — subsidiary to introduction of conj. 𝑙 in continuity — conj. 𝑙 elided in pause — last 𝑠 of quiescent in pause, rarely in continuity — mostly pronounced with Kasr in continuity, with or without conj. 𝑙 — proof that 𝑠 is not for feminization — (b) — (5) in (a) طلحة , etc., in pause — continuity sometimes treated like pause, and pause like continuity — (b) and — (c) — regarded by many as a dial. var.— measure of — like that of — its o.f.— measure of — (d) — (e) — (6) in (a) — (b) from |

§ 691. 𝑙 substituted for two letters, (1) — 1367—1369

dim. of — or a sing. n. peculiar
to the *dim.*-effect of *dim.* formation on its sense—ةِ أَقَ اَمِّيِلَ لُ and أَقَ diptote when used as names—ةِ اَطْلَعُجُ—ضُ ضُ (2)—alternative forms.

§. 692. ١ substituted for two letters, (1) ت، (a) regularly in ١ فَعَلُ after a letter of covering—reason of substitution—(b) anomalously in attached *nom. pron.* of every *prot. v.* of 1st or 2nd *pers.* after a letter of covering—in *dial.* of Banū Tamīm—جُ of v., if ١، then incorporated into ١ of *pron.*—substitution why anomalous—(2) د ١ and دُ بَعْطَا إِ.

§. 693. ١ substituted for three letters, (1) ت in (a) ١ فَعَلُ، (a) regularly after ١، ١، or ١—١ and mostly ١ then incorporated into it—causes of conversion and incorporation—incorporative conversion not relevant here—after ١ conversion necessary, and incorporation usual—(b) anomalously after ج—conversion why anomalous—*exs.*—confined to hearsay—(b) some anomalous formations, (a) ١ قَذُ and ١ ١١١١١١١١١١١—(b) جُدُلُجُ—reason for supposing its ١ to be a *subst.* for ت—this substitution not to be copied—contrasted with cases (a, a) and
\[a, b\] — (2) 

§ 694. 

\(j\) substituted for 

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 — and vocalization of \(j\) — substitution more anomalous here than in cases (1, a), (1, b), and (2, a) — in possibly a subst. for \(j\) of Kudā'a.

§ 695. 

\(s\) substituted for \(s\) before \(\ddagger, \xi, \gamma, \zeta, \lambda, \kappa, \theta, \mu, \nu, \pi, \sigma, \tau, \phi, \chi, \psi, \omega\), and 

— substitution how accounted for — similar to Imāla — not allowable after these letters — but not prevented by separation from them — regular, but not necessary — 

§ 696. 

\(j\) substituted for two letters, \(s\) and \(c\), when quiescent before \(d\) — (1) for \(s\) and 

of what conjugs. — cause of substitution — simulation not allowable here — (2) for \(c\) — quiescent \(c\), before \(d\), pronounceable (1) as pure \(j\) — cause of change — (2) as \(c\) simulating
sound of Ʞ — simulation why not allowable in س — exs. — meaning of IH’s words on this subject — mobile ص before د not changed into pure Ʞ — but sometimes made to simulate Ʞ — though more rarely than quiescent ص — conversion into Ʞ allowable only when heard — simulation similarly restricted in ص separated from د by more than a vowel — mobile س converted into Ʞ before ق in dial. of Kalb — simulation by ج and ش — its cause — its rarity disputed — meaning put by Jrb upon “simulation” in case of ج and ش — these two letters not made into pure Ʞ — 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) Ʞ — (3) Ʞ — (4) ج for two letters, ج and Hamza — (5) خ for two letters, خ and خ — (6) ح for خ — (7) ح for خ — (8) ف for ك — (9) ك for two letters, (a) ف — reciprocity between them — (b) ش for three letters, (a) ك — (b) ج — observation by IU — (c) س — (13) ض
for ل — ص wrongly put here, instead of ض — جمد, not جمد, given by some MSS — جمد, not جمد, given by lexicologists for جمد — ل (14) ل — (15) جمد — (16) ن — د (17) ط — (18) ت (19) — (20) س — ز (21) — (22) ص — (23) جمدد — (24)

adduced by Z as evidence that س is a letter of substitution — (b) ش — (c) ل — (23) ط — (25) ث — (24) ذ — (26) ف — (25) ث — (27) ب — (28) م — (29) م

CHAPTER X.—TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNSOUND.

§. 697. Unsoundness — transformation — definition of it as a technical term — alleviation of Hamza and some cases of substitution excluded — degrees of dissimilarity between these two processes and transformation — alteration of Hamza not a transformation — nor substitution, elision, or quiescence, of sound letters other than Hamza — nor inflectional alteration of unsound letters — three modes of transformation — (1) conversion — (2) elision — (a) regular — (b) euphonic
—(c) curtailing or arbitrary—(3) transfer of vowel—subsequent treatment of unsound letter—transfer subsidiary to quiescence—letters of transformation—also named "unsound letters"—Hamza included by some—ل، م، and غ 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—ل، م، and غ found in نس، وس، and پس.—ل not rad. in delayed نس or in وس—rad. in پس، وینف. نس، imitative ejes., and foreign names—formations sound or unsound—quad. ن. or و.—قین.—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 جلرف not named "reduplicated"—seven divisions of unsound formations—their names.
§. 698. Positions of unsound letters—أ—ا—and ی—and agreement between unaug. أ and ی in (1) occurrence of either as (a) ف—(b) ع—(c) ل—(d) ع and ل—double؛ or ی as rare here as double guttural—double Hamza not used—double ظ extraordinary—(2) precedence of either before the other as ف and ع respectively—precedence of ظ more frequent—only instances of either—difference between them in (1) precedence of ظ before ی as ف or ع and ج respectively—converse precedence not found—؛ and ی as ع and ل، respectively, more frequent than double ظ in حروف و and ج and held by S to be a subst. for second ی—first ی in حروف why not converted into ی—or incorporated into second—؛ in حروف ج and ی held by Mz to be original—opinion of S correct—his remarks on حروف ج why substituted for its last ی—(2) occurrence of ی as (a) ف and ع—ة like و and ك and ج and ظ—ن not so used in either case, except in (a) ۱۰—opinion of R—homogeneity of ف and ع rare—less disagreeable with separation or incorporation—(b) ظ—its o. f.—its component letters—reasons for considering its ع a ُ—its dim.—ی a ُ more often than ی
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or rejected - similarity of ف and ل rare in *tril.* (3) occurrence of ف، ع، and ل، contrary to ظ with possible exception of 
-o.f. of باء - and of باء، باء، etc.- their 
orig. a ع - but, according to F، a ع - of ع، ع، دال، etc.- measure of حاء.

---

**THE AND INST.**

§. 699. 1 (1) retained unaltered - why so treated - وهب

(2) elided in (a) aors. - o.f. of ع - their ظ why elided - elision desirable for alleviation - their ع why not elided - or their Kasra - ع of ع为什么 not elided - theory of KK on reason for elision - retained if letter after it be pronounced with Fath - يقع and يم - يق - يبدع - يبدع - يبدع - يبدع - يبدع

elision extended to remaining variations of aor., and to imp. - (b) inf. ns. - o. f. of ع and ع said to be (a) ع - its ظ why elided - two qualifications necessary for elision - one not sufficient - no elision in simple substantive -

---
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transfer of vowel the intended mode of transformation in inf. n., and elision merely consequential—or elision intended, and transfer subsidiary—(b) ُعَدْ in ُعَدَتْ a compensation for elided ُمُ،—in ُعَجْرَ and ُعَفَّرُ why combined with ُمُ—elision of ُمُ—(c) ُعَدْ—its ُعُمْرُ why pronounced with Kasr in ُعَدَتْ ُعَجْرَ and ُعَدُتْ ُعَجْرُ or ُعَدُتْ ُعَجْرُ ُعَدُتْ ُعَجْرُ ُعَدُتْ ُعَجْرُ ُعَدُتْ ُعَجْرُ (3) converted—ّ like ّ, except in elision—not elided in aor.—exs.—why not elided—َيُسْ َيُسَ and َيُسُ َيُسُ—only instances of elision—conversion of ُو—, converted into Hamza, (1) necessarily, when initial and followed by a mobile ُمُ—or rather by ُمُ, 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 ُوُلَيْسِ ُوُلَيْسِ—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 ُمُ, why not converted into ُو—(2) allowably in such as ُهُجُرُ.
and, according to Mz, invariably in اُوری — (3) — (4) irregularly in اُرلی, etc.——rarity of initial pronounced with Kasr—initial sometimes converted into ت substitution of ت for not regular, except in افعل and in ا فعل regularly converted into ت, when not converted from Hamza—conversion of quiescent and ا into and ت respectively.

§. 700. Fatha of ا original in افعل ویقع and, but adventitious in افعیس and —antagonism of these two Fathas—latter likened to Kasra in تبجار —this Kasra adventitious — therefore not diptote—former likened to Kasra in تبجار

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

§. 702. Substitution of * for * of 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 Riya vulgar.

THE AND AS S.

§. 703. Transformed, elided, or preserved—transfor-
mation—three modes of transformation in
*—(1) conversion—into *—precluded in
and in - reasons for conversion into - its cause not very substantial—operative only on ل or ع, and easily restrained from action—principally effective in v.—this transformation original in pret. act. of unaugmented tril.—and conformable to original in aor., act. or pass., of unaugmented tril., and in pret. act., and aor. pass., of two augmented trils., أفعل and استفعل

—but not found in aor. whose ع is orig. pronounced with Damm or Kasr—classification of ns. subjected to this transformation—conversion into found in (a) tril. n.—(b) v.. (a) tril.—(b) conformable to tril.—

- يقال, يدحاب - (c) n. conformable to (b, a) or (b, b) — contrary to (a) تول and ياجل — anomalous—or regular, but weak — and

- بقي — condiotions of conversion in two last — بدت — (b) بادئة and ناصعة and تAmazing and تأول and نقوم and تابع and نتء — these formations disqualified for conversion of ع into — contrary to تأول and
—and to استعمال and استعمال qualification needed for such transformation in deriv.—additional disability in دروم and تقيم and دیان—omission of conversion anomalous—its anomalousness disputed in استعمال and when they have no tril. v.—transformation also heard in most of these anomalies—(2) quiescence by transfer of vowel—reason for such transformation—this quiescence principally in v.—in unaugmented tril.—and augmented—treatment of and ی after transfer of vowel—nature and extent of alteration—why not transformed in same way as their pret.—مفعول, متعلق and similar—classification of nas. conformable to v. in this respect—transfer adopted for observance of mode of formation—by mobilization of quiescent ن with vowel of ی—other exs.—confusion between cats. of ی and ی not heeded here—conditions of transfer—another added in Tashil—(3) elision, (a) necessary, (a) where quiescence of final is necessitated, by (∞) attachment of pron.—vowel of initial—لاس—(b) apocopation or quasi-apocopation—(b) in such as تا and تا—dispute as to ی elided here—this mention of
and not a superfluous repetition—

(b) allowable in such as (a) and Sīd not a superfluous repetition—

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

(c) rare in —preservation of and reasons for it in such as (1) and —additional reason in latter cat.—(3) and .

§ 704. *Tril. vs. whose X is unsound*——formations of vs. in cats. of and no in cat. of nor in cat. of and said to be (1) from (a) in cat. of —their pret.—and o. f. —(b) in cat. of (a) —(b) , anomalously—(2) intermixtures of two dial. vars.—refutation of (2)—and of (1, b, b, )—.
§. 705. Transmutation of 

when its \( \varepsilon \) is \( \text{ or } \text{ or } \text{ or } \), 

into \( \varepsilon \) on attachment of mobile nom. pron.—

and not orig.—but dispute on manner of transition from 

dispute —

theory (1) of many that 

into —this opinion adopted by Z and 

1M—(2) of IH that Damm and Kasr are for explanation of the \( \mathfrak{v} \) as a scion of \( \mathfrak{t} \) and 

\( \text{respectively—meaning of "scion"—his argument—reason given by earlier authorities for suggesting transmutation—his argument in reply—(3) of R—alleged transmutation of } \)

and 

and and 

no transmutation without mobile nom. pron., except in 

—explanation of these two.

§. 706. Vocalization of letter preceding unsound \( \varepsilon \) in 

pass. of pret., tril. or on measure of —

dial. vars. in cat. of (1) \( \text{ or } \text{ or } \) and 

—(a) pure \( \text{ or } \text{ or } \) —evolution of — and 

—opinion of S in §. 710 strengthened—

(b) Ishmām—this dial. var. chaste—(c) pure 

—evolution of — and —opinion of Akh in §. 710 strengthened—this dial. var. of
no account—fuller explanations—pure ف and
explained by IH—and by Jz—latter explana-
tion 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 Raum—its object
—بَعْثَ and تَلَّتَ (2)—vocalization of their
ب—ambiguous forms avoided—and replaced
by unambiguous—but not disallowed by West-
terns—nor noticed by S—ambiguity disre-gard-
ed by him—and pardoned by Sf—possible
meaning of "avoided"—avoidance prefer-
able—but not necessary with distinctive con-
text—إنَّقِيدَ (3)—vocalization of
their conj. Hamza.

§ 707. خ sounded true in (1) v. of wonder—(2) نِعَل
of superiority—two causes assigned by IH—
only second by S—no reason for first—(3)
إِنَّعَلَ and إِنَّتَأَذَ—تَفَاعَل
إِنْفَعَلَ (4)—نِعَلَ—إِنَّعَلَ
no reason for assigning
any cause—distinction between
إِنَّفَعَلَ (5)—إِنَّعَلَ
إِنَّفَعَلَ (6) such vs. as سُودٌ and صيدٌ
لْسُت، etc.—its خ orig. pronounced with Kasr
—(7) variations of vs. whose خ is sounded
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true—ع sometimes (1) transformed in فعل denoting defects—and in its derivs.—(2) anomalously sounded true in استفعل and فعل—to notify o.f. of conjug.

§. 708. Additional cause requisite for conversion of ۱ or ۴ into ۰ in penultimate after aug. — nature of such cause—no conversion in ante-penultimate—Hamza in ۰ and ۱ and ۳ كَبِيْرُ وَوْدَبَتْ ۴ and ۴ كَبِيْرُ وَوْدَبَتْ ۴ and ۴ كَبِيْرُ وَوْدَبَتْ ۴ and ۴ كَبِيْرُ وَوْدَبَتْ ۴ —why substituted for ۰ —first ۰ why not elided—Hamza in ۰ and ۴, and ۴, in act. part. of unaugmented tril., said to be converted into Hamza when transformed in v.—really converted into ۱, and from ۱ into Hamza—elision of ع impossible—cause of its conversion into ۱—and from ۱ into Hamza—this Hamza written as undotted ع —ع sounded true in act. part. when so sounded in v.—ع and ل sometimes transposed in act. part. of hollow v.—and always by Khl when its ل is Hamza—his argument—similar transposition by him in شوأ وَسَلَامَا وَسَلَامَا and شوأ وَسَلَامَا and شوأ وَسَلَامَا —answer to his argument—شاك ۷ ۷ and لاث ۷ ۷ and لاث ۷ ۷ and لاث ۷ ۷ and لاث ۷ ۷ and لاث ۷ ۷ anomalies—its derivation—and forms—شاك،
etc., said to be (1) فَعُلَ, (a) abbreviated from فَا عُلُو—(b) intensive form of فَعُلَ—(2) فَا عُلُو by elision of (a) its ع—whether as ج or ـ or Hamza—their measure in this case—(b) its aug. ـ—their measure in this case—A's procedure—جاه—تَعُو sounded true.

§ 709. Pass. part. of tril. v. whose ع is unsound—evolution of مِيِبِعَ—why not مَيِبِعٌ—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 مِسْتَو—(and on alleviation of مِسْرَة—anomalies in cat. of ج—and of إ—cat. of إ treated as sound by Banū Tamīm—exs. in poetry—مَدِيِبِعٌ and مِيِبِعٌ anomalous according to H—his opinion controverted—مِيِبِعٌ said—and مِيِبِعٌ complete form allowed by Mb as a poetic license—but regarded by A as a Tamīnī dial. var.—opinion of ISh on pass. part. in cat. of إ—and of ر—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 ٌ when a quiescent ٣ preceded by ٤— and of Akh—reason for treatment advocated by S—and by Akh—reply to letter—exs.—measure of ٌ and ٢— and of ٥—Akh's rule
(1) contravened by himself in pass. part.—measure of ٦ or ٣ for ٣ (2) inconsistent with hearsay—٤—its measure and derivation— and ١.

§ 711. Transformation a property of ٤— imparted to ٤. only by conformity to ٤—unaugmented ٤. (1) transformed when modelled on ٤., i.e. when on measure of ٣ or ٣ —conversion of ٣ necessary here—but sometimes omitted—such forms anomalous—no ٣ in hollow ٤.—(2) treated as sound when not modelled on ٤. —٤ —transformability of ٤. determined by that of ٤., —treatment of ٤.

§ 712. Condition of transformation in augmented ٤. n. not conformable to ٤. —difference from ٤. not prescribed in unaugmented ٤. —why prescribed in augmented, and not in unaugmented—meaning of "conformable"—
applicability of condition to ns. hitherto mentioned—nature of prescribed difference—peculiar difference in and exs. of augmented tril. with, and without, prescribed difference—rule as stated by A—two sorts of n. covered by it—مَقْامٌ (1) and

from بيع— venta of feminization no obstacle to agreement with v. in measure—anomalies—their object— and

—this sort of n. how distinguishable from v.—another condition prescribed by Mb— and مَهْلُ and تَبَعِبُ or تَبَعِبُ تَبَعِب—n. resembling, or differing from, aor. in both measure and augment—first sort like اَبِيضُ and

إِدِورُ تَبَعِبُ تَبَعِبُ and إِبِيعُ، إِبِيعُ، إِبِيعُ، إِبِعُ، إِدِورُ—

and and إِبِيَانَةٌ ٍ إِبِيَانَةٍ and إِبِيَانَةٍ and إِبِيَانَةٍ—transfer here anomalous—

—second sort like مَسْحَطأ—

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—† خروق، جذول، and علعب.

§. 713. Non-final mobile و and ی * generally impervious to conversion, by preceding Kasra and Damma, into ی and ، respectively—and still stronger when doubled—، sometimes so converted for conformity—but not ی—such conversion found in (1) the inf. n. whose ی is transformed in the v.—though not necessarily in this way—۰ لوان جول خیان and ۰ قیم عوض توأم—and ۰ قیم توأم (2) the pl. whose ی is transformed in the sing.— ی of ثیر — and of ۰ دیم — ۰ نوآ ر ار تیال — ۰ نوآ ر ار تیال and ۰ ر ار تیال — ۰ ر ار تیال — ۰ ر ار تیال — ۰ ر ار تیال (3) the pl. whose ی is quiescent in the sing., and followed by | in the pl.— ۰ وودة and ۰ ثیرة anomalous—| needed here—effective as element in cause of conversion—and powerful as auxiliary in (1) and (2)—۰ خوان allowable for conformity—۰ خوان and ۰ خوان—۰ خوان said to be contracted from ۰ بار. 

* See Note on p. 1525, l. 18.
§ 714. Augmented tril. ns., when not like، إِقْامَةٌ، and al، إِقْامَةٌ، debarred from transformation by quiescent before, or after, its، or، such ns. of three kinds—reason for absence of transformation in (1) these ns. generally—有时 and وَقَتُ السَّيْلِ and وَقَتُ السَّيْلِ sometimes said— إِقْامَةٌ and إِقْامَةٌ why transformed—(3) نُوالُ، طَوِيلُ، سِيَالُ، 6َتُسَيَّارُ تَقْوَالُ، طُوُرُ، تَقْوَالُ، طُوُرُ، تَقْوَالُ；ambiguous alleged as reason in تَقْوَالُ وَتْسَيَّارُ；nature of this ambiguity—true reason—(4) مَقْوَالُ；and مَتْخَيَّطُ；(5) مَقْوَالُ；—cause of transformation present here—excuse for non-transformation—(6) سَبِيعُ；and سَبِيعُ；so far as regards conversion of their خ into |— خَمْرُ； طَوِيلُ， جَوَادُ；(7) true reason.

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

§ 716. Treatment of ٍ and ٍ combined, when their first is quiescent—cause of incorporation—ٍ and ٍ treated as likes—incorporation encouraged by quiescence of their first—ٍ converted, whether first or second—no incorporation in (1) —nor in (2) — نَقُول — measure of (3) —دِيْوَان — conversion and incorporation sometimes found in (3)—never allowable in (1)—حُكْرَة, فَنْو — ّكَى — dispute about of ٍحَكْرَة — preceding Damma changed into 1542-1548
Kasra—either vowel allowable in 
\( \ddot{a} \), pl. of  
\( \dddot{a} \)  —and in some other forms—conversion  
\( \dddot{a} \), and \( \ddot{a} \) anomalous—for want of  
\( \ddot{a} \) in their o. j.—of finality in their  
double \( \ddot{a} \)—reason of its conversion—(2) in  
\( \dddot{a} \) more anomalous.

§ 717. Treatment of  and  after 1 of ultimate pl.  
not preceded by  or  
—opinion of S on last—of Jh—  
regular form—of Zj—of IH—confirmation  
of his opinion—Hamza in all three pls.  
anomalous.

§ 718.  when  of  (1) converted into  in  
substantive—  —virtually, when not  
actually, a substantive—  and  
treated as substantives—anarthrous  
not a qual.—but treated as a substantive—  
small sense of qualification in  of  
superiority—(2) not converted in ep.—but  
Damma before it converted into Kasra—so  
in pl.  its Damma converted  
to Kasra—but sometimes left, and  then  
converted into  .
More unsound than as the nearer to the end, the more subject to transformation—transformation lighter than use of o. f.—predicament of and as finals—modes of transformation—these letters (1) converted into ١ and ٢ and ٣ and ٤—measure of last two ٨ and ٩ and ١٠ and ١١ ١٢ and ١٣ and ١٤ and ١٥ and ١٦ and ١٧ and ١٨ and ١٩ and ٢٠ and ٢١ and ٢٢ and ٢٣ and ٢٤—objection to IH’s explanation of non-conversion in last—better opinion on last two—non-conversion of their ٢٥ not attributed to accidental character of its vowel—٢٦ and ٢٧ and ٢٨ and ٢٩—one condition of conversion that vowel of ٣٠ or ٣١ be permanent—conformability, or affinity, of ٣٢ to ٣٣ not a condition of conversion in its ١٠ and ١١—conversion not prevented by ١٤ of femininization after the ١٣ —nor by aug. ١ before it—restoration of ١ to its o. f., (a) from fear of ambiguity—exs. in ٣٤—and ٣٥— ١ elided in ٢٦ and ٢٧ how treated in rel. ٣٦—
restored and ٰ not reconverted into ] — (b) for conformity—restoration of ل to its place— ٰ then not converted into ] in

and — elision of ٰ in sing. masc. after Kasra or Fatha— ٰ and ٰ in ٰ and ٰ not converted—but: ٰ sometimes elided—in absence of ambiguity,

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

made quiescent — ٰ ٰ ٰ ٰ (nom.)—similarly ٰ ٰ (gen.)

and ٰ — (3) elided—sometimes arbitrarily—from frequency of usage— ل not elided in أُخْتَ — (4) preserved.

§ 720. Capacity of ٰ and ٰ for bearing inflectional vowels after (1) a quiescent—(2) a mobile —meaning of "mobile"—kind of vowel found before each— ٰ and ٰ sometimes quiescent in subj. and ace.—explanations of ٰ—such quiescence found in prose— ٰ and ٰ quiescent in ind. and nom.— ٰ sometimes mobile—catalogue of anomalies in treatment of unsound letter as seat of
inflection—\(\ddagger\) not found in gen.—predicament of sky sometimes mobile—this pronunciation said to be a poetic license—opinion of R—\(\ddagger\) and 3 elided in apoc.—sometimes retained—\(\ddagger\) retained, except in apoc.—and sometimes even there.

§ 721. No decl. n. ending in \(\ddagger\) preceded by a vowel—cause of that—treatment of \(\ddagger\) when a \(\ddagger\) final or virtually final, after original Damma, in decl. n.—exs.—\(\ddagger\) converted into \(\ddagger\), and then Damma into Kasra—\(\ddagger\) not so converted when (1) not a \(\ddagger\) —\(\ddagger\) followed by inseparable termination—exception when preceding Damma is upon another \(\ddagger\)—(3) after accidental Damma—(4) in a v.—(5) in a n., but invariably pronounced with Fath—\(\ddagger\) sole instance—reasons for retention of \(\ddagger\) here—corresponding predicament of \(\ddagger\) after Damma as respects conversion of Damma into Kasra—Fr and Sf on \(\ddagger\) instances of non-finality as preventive of conversion—analogous instances in other cats.—Khl on differentiation of \(\ddagger\) \(\ddagger\) and \(\ddagger\) \(\ddagger\) from \(\ddagger\) and \(\ddagger\).
§. 722. Similar treatment of final ٍ after Damma, in spite of intervening letter of prolongation, in ٍ - this ٍ converted into ی - and then preceding ـ - and Damma of ّ into Kasra - this process invariable in pl., but not in sing. - exs. of conversion and non-conversion in sing. - S on proper letter in sing. and pl. - final ٍ strong when doubled - conversion then necessary, proper, or improper - ـ not converted if not final - extraordinary cases of conversion - 

μعیدی or 

عطاء - cause of transformation in former - similar transformation in pass. part. whose ل is Hamza - ٍ - vowel of ٍ in ٍ - after conversion of ـ and Damma - ٍ and ِ تیل - conversion why allowable here - its regularity disputed - بیام anomalous.

§. 723. Final ـ and ی after aug. ـ converted into ـ, and afterwards into Hamza - ـ ْرَآى and ـ ْلَى - cause of conversion into ـ - and then into Hamza - preceding ـ to be aug. - reasons for this - and also, says Mz, third - ـ ْزَایة - ـ ْرَآى and ـ ْلَى - ـ ْزَایة and ـ ْلَى - ـ ْزَاى and ـ ْلَاى and ی not converted before inseparable ـ.
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of femininization—inseparable termination
a preventive of conversion into اس.

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

§ 725. ل of علی, (1) when و, preserved—no dis-
tinction here between substantive and ep.—
cause of non-conversion—(2) if ی, pre-
served in ep., and converted into و, in sub-
stantive—substantive why selected for
transformation—moderation intended—this change made in most cases—alleged exceptions—change of ١ into ٢ 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—١ of ٢, (1) if ١, preserved—no distinction here between substantive and ep.—cause of non-conversion—(2) if ٢, preserved in substantive, and converted into ١ in ep.—IM's opinion contrary to that of most Etymologists—opinion expressed by R—١ و ٢ and ١ regarded by S as substantives—inconsistency of IH in treating ١ as a substantive, and ١ and ١ as eps.—S on ١—conversion the rule, according to him, in every ١ fem. of whose ١ is ٢—unless it be [actually used as] an ep.—SF's explanation of his meaning in latter case—١ of ٢, 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 حمأ—a—but not in ultimate
pl.—هداري anomalous—general rule con-
travened in (1) یاءل یاءل and
عللی —شارة (2) —شارة (1) —شارة (2) —شارة (1) —شارة (2) —شارة (1) —شارة (2)
هداري —شارة (3) —شارة (1) —شارة (2) —شارة (1) —شارة (2) —شارة (1) —شارة (2)
exceptonal—observations on (1) ی third in
all these pls.—(2) Hamza after ی in یاءل —
(3) ی second in sends. —شارة (1) —شارة (2) —شارة (1) —شارة (2) —شارة (1) —شارة (2)
(4) ی after ی in یاءل —(5) ی and ی in یاءل —
(6) ی and ی in یاءل —(7) ی and Hamza
in خطابیة—Khl on خطابیة—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, Z, and IHsh—meaning of "adventitious in pl."—(2) when ل is sound—Hamza here included among unsound letters—conflicting opinions on its soundness or unsoundness—formation of (1) خُطَايَة—opinion of S and majority of BB—and of Khl—objection to latter—(2) عَدِيدًا (4) أَهْرُوْدُي—Jj and ISd on pl. of عَدِيدًا—not justifiable by assuming its sing. to be عَدِيدًا—assertion of IAmb—anomalies in this cat.—

Akh on أَهْرُوْدُي—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 خُطَايَة.

§ 727. Final ι, fourth or upwards converted into ي when letter before it is not pronounced with دم—conditions of conversion when letter before it is pronounced with فث—two reasons assigned for conversion—يَبْنَیُوُتَی* and أَهْرُوْدُی—Akh on يَبْنَیُوُتَی*—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. خ in cat. of ُئ ٌ and treated as sound—reason for not transforming it—and so in

cat. of ُح ٌ and ُل ٌ —another reason in
case of ُح ٌ ، ُل ٌ ، and ُء ٌ —and in that
of ُح ٌ —and another in that of ُل ٌ and
ُع — خ treated as sound in ن. also— غاية , etc., anomalous—why so called— Como how explained by Fr—and by Ks—anomalous according to all three accounts—last two

explanations applicable to غاية , etc.—incor-
poration in cat. of ُح ٌ —more frequent than display— خ and ُح ٌ —incorporation

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 ى how pronounced in display—
Kasr of ف in حَلِي — 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 حَلِي

— Damm or Kasr of its ح — reason for each vowel — similar vocalization of في in فِلَّ — Sf on ل for لِبُ حِلِي — du. and pl. of حِلِي and of حَلِي — استحثا — and of استحثا

dial. vars. of استحثا — and of استحثا —

exs. of استحثا, aor. — استحثا — استحثا — حَلِي or حَلِي

— not said as aor. of حَلِي or حَلِي —

incorporation eschewed in aor. pass. of حَلِي — استحثا — and in aor. act. — even in subj. —

no incorporation in ext. of حَلِي — transformation preferred to incorporation —

§ 729. Double peculiar to فِلَّ — objection to forming فِلَّ or فِلَّ from cat. of تَوَلِّي — especially تَوَلِّي فِلَّ — this objection obviated in 1638—1640.
§ 730. Pret. and aor. of (1) لِفَعَلُ whose ع and ل are م، (2) لِفَعَلُ whose ل is م—reasons for not incorporating—infr. n. of لِفَعَلُ، aor. لِفَعَلُ، infr. n. لِفَعَلُ—pret. of لِفَعَلُ and whose ع and ل are م، or whose ل is م—their aor., act. part., and infr. n.—لِفَعَلُ، aor. لِفَعَلُ، infr. n. لِفَعَلُ.

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

CHAPTER XI.—INCORPORATION.

§ 731. Definition—مِدَاعم—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 separation—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— and —(3) both mobile—here incorporation (a) necessary—(b) allowable where homogeneous letters are (a) separate, and preceded by mobile, or by letter of prolongation or softness—first homogeneous made quiescent for incorporation—incorporation when good, and when best—why omissible—display of reduplication better after letter of prolongation than after mobile, and after letter of softness than after letter of prolongation—incorporation why allowable after letter of softness—(b) virtually separate—(c) disallowed, (a) where one homogeneous letter is coordinative, whether in v. or n.—(b) where incorporation would lead to confusion of paradigms—no such confusion in vs.—(c) where homogeneous letters are separate, and first
is preceded by quiescent other than a letter of prolongation or softness — نَصَسْ نَصَسُ — and incorporation not disallowed if preceding quiescent be a letter of prolongation or softness — incorporation of approximates — incorporation of two kinds — of likes and of approximates, in one word and in two — meaning of "approximates" — incorporation proper to etymology and to Readers, but latter kind ignored here by IM — incorporation of likes, whose first is quiescent and second mobile, necessary on three conditions, that first be not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>a א of silence — מָאָלְיָה הֵלְכָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>a Hamza separated from the נ — treatment of two consecutive Hamzas in one word — and in two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>a letter of prolongation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>at end of word — אֶחָשׁ יאָסָרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>substituted, not permanently, for another letter — בְּאָרְבָּא for אָרְבָּא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IM's mention of these conditions — incorporation of likes, both of which are mobile, necessary on eleven conditions, (1) that both be in one word — reduplication extremely heavy — no concurrence of likes in rads. of quad. or quin. — nor in ﬀ and ﬀ
of tril., except extraordinarily—nor in beginning or middle of augmented tril. n., not commensurable with v.—concurrency 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 ف of is approximate to its ت.—incorporation in pret. extended to aor., imp., inf. n., and act. and pass. parts.—(β) of aor.—(b) in middle—incorporation why allowable in inf. ns. of conjugs. mentioned—this the predicament of mobile likes combined in beginning or middle of word—their predicament at end, (a) if first have another letter incorporated into it—(b) if reduplication be co-ordinative—elision of ٌ in —(c) if first be unsound—or sound, (aa) in v.—(bb) in tril. n., unaugmented or augmented—(α) فعل (β) فعل (γ) فعل (δ) فعل and دين سر (ε) فعلان، فعلان، فعلان، فعلان (ζ) أدق (η) راد مدق مرن مستعد and أظلل أتشد—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 IAI in certain texts be mere stifling—or
pure incorporation—Readers safer guides
than 3G 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) فعل, (b) دمل, (c)
فعل, (d) فعل—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 فعل—
combination of two mobile likes possible in
four more measures of tril.—فعل not used
—فعل, and فعل used—incorporation
generally prescribed in فعل and فعل—and
dissolution in فعل—(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 —reasons for these alternatives——dissolution preferable —(b) —(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. ١
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 َنُعُلُلٌ of wonder, and incorporation in َنُعُلُلٌ—this proviso a correction of preceding rule as to "choice allowed in . . . imp."—َنُعُلٌ of wonder regarded, by majority of BB, as a pret. v.—and َنَعُلُلٍ, by Hijazis, as a verbal n.—vowel of its final—prominent nom. prons. attached to it—pause upon double letter—outlets of letters.

§ 732. Outlet defined—how recognizable—ex.—IY’s definition—outlets of letters sixteen—(1) of Hamza, ٰ, and | (2) of َ and ُ (3) of ه and َ—outlets in the throat—relative positions of (a) Hamza, ٰ, and |—opinion
of S—of Akh—disproof of latter—continuation of argument on his opinion—(b) خ and ح, and (c) ذ and خ—Hamza, ا, and ی said by Lth to be hollow—and by Khl to be airy—his opinion on relative positions of خ, ح, ی, ذ, and خ—these seven letters, from outlets (1-3), guttural—(4) of ق—(5) of ك—difference in their outlets how recognizable—both these letters uvular—ق how articulated by Arabs of the desert—this articulation hereditary—way to account for it—(6) of ح، ش، and ی—their relative positions—their outlet where placed by S—(7) of خ—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 خ 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 ت، س، د، and ت — (12) of ص، ز، and س — tip of tongue not in contact with central incisors— س prior in outlet to ز — (13) of ط، ث، خ، and ث — these eighteen letters, from outlets (4-13), lingual—(14) of ف—(15) of ب، م، and م and ن — nasal—these four letters, from outlets (14-15), labial—fifteen preceding outlets allotted to twenty-nine primary letters—relative positions of these outlets—(16) of single ن — Fr’s differences from S—latter’s opinion best—outlet of secondary letters other than single ن.

§ 733. Number of letters 43—primaries 29—Hamza —their number not complete in other languages—no Hamza in foreign speech, except in inception—nor any ض — م not an independent letter—but reckoned as a single letter in H’s “Speckled Epistle”—Hamza omitted by Mb—but rightly first letter of alphabet—under form of ل—proof of this —soft ل—distinct from Hamza—secondaries 6—all chaste—why called “secondary”—(1) quiescent ن—named “single” and “stifled” —its outlet—(2) م of Imāla—named م
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS.</th>
<th>PAGE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>meaning of تَرْجِيم</strong> — (3) broad</td>
<td>— broad َل mentioned by IH—not broad َل latter how pronounced—found in what dial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—how written in Codex and elsewhere—(4) َل like َج —same as َج like َش —approved by َس—(5) َض like َج —mentioned in §. 696—read in Kur. I. 5—(6) Hamza of betwixt-and-between—of three kinds, making chaste secondaries 8—hybrids 8—these also secondary—(1) َك like َج —(2) َج like َك —exs. of (1) and (2)—both the same—(3) َج like َش —IH’s assertion that (2) and (3) are not real—(4) weak َض —used by foreigners trying to speak Arabic—how exemplified by Mbn—most easily sounded from left side—(5) َس like َس —approximation of َس to َس not so good as substitution of َس for َس —(6) َت like َت —(7) َب 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) َك between َق and َك —(2) َج like َج —(3) َش like َج —(4) َي like َي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
—(5) like ی —explained by S—disallowed by Akh—his pronunciation impracticable—number of letters 48 or 50.

§. 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 ض —another definition—covering indispensable to these letters—name "covered" tropical—(7) open—this name also tropical—(8) elevated—number and specification—definition of elevation and depression—elevation possible without covering, but not covering without elevation—origin of name "elevated"—
this name tropical—but explicable in natural sense—(9) depressed—specification—also called "low"—(10) liquid—no quad. or quin. devoid of them, unless exotic or anomalous—liquidity defined—liquids lightest of letters—specification—why named "liquid"—best for mixing with others—(11) solid or muted—number and specification—meaning of "solid"—these letters why named "solid"—or "muted"—first name more appropriate—(12) resonant—number and specification—why so named—also called "movent"—difficulty in sounding them quiescent—(13) sibilant—(14) soft—specification—susceptible of prolongation—letters of prolongation and softness, or of softness only—so mentioned in §. 663—explanation of "soft" given in CHd—(15) swerving—its sound how produced—S's definition—and explanation—(16) reiterated—reckoned as two letters—(17) airy, or ascending or descending—why named (a) "airy"—from one meaning of —S's explanation of "airy"—faintness and expansiveness of ١ as compared with ٢ and ٣—(b) "ascending" or "descending"—from alternative meanings of ٢٢
this letter also called "sonant"—(18) gabbled—why so named—reason given by IH—said in CHd to be ١, not ٢—تروح and ٣تروح—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—٢٢٩ًاأ—cause of incorporation—pronunciation without it comparable to gait of shackled—manner of incorporation—preliminary conversion—incorporation really in two likes—exs.—operations requisite for incorporation—modes of conversion and incorporation—rule and obstacle—nature of obstacle—٤٤٤١ and ٢١٢٣.

§ 736. Incorporation regulated by closeness of approximation—concurrency of approximates in one word or two—(1) in one word—confusion not heeded—(a) if both approximates be mobile, incorporation neither necessary nor approved—(b) if first be quiescent, incorporation necessary in two cases—approved in others—(2) in one word
(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—\\

No paradigm containing quiescent ن before ل, or or_

(b) if it do not produce confusion, necessary-Khl on اب س في الجل and س on جل and another preventive of incorporation in

—pret. from not—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 دوم مشفر into approximates—special qualities of these letters—cause of disallowance—letters of 

not incorporated into approximates,
but approximates into them—سید and
incorporated, one into the other—سید
—IH’s explanation of incorporation
here—R’s criticism on it—incorporation of
ض into ش, of، into ل, and of ب into ب,
transmitted from Readers—meaning of “in-
corporation” 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
—exs.—(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), and ی—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 ٰ not incorporated—process
more suited to Hamza—Hamza not incor-
porated into its like, except in two cases—
nor into any other letter, except after alle-
viation—nor any other letter into it.
§ 739. Not incorporated into like or approximate—reason for its incapacity—alternative reason—nor incorporated into.

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

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

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

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

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

§ 745. ẓ incorporated into (1) its like—no difficulty in that—no concurrence of ẓ s in Kur—(2) ẓ—incorporation or separation good—no other letter mentioned by ṯ—but ṭ by AlYazīdī—letters incorporated into ẓ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 746</td>
<td>ش، ی، and ض not mentioned by IH—ش incorporated only into its like—no concurrence of ش's in Kur—not into any of its approximates—reported incorporation of ش into س، and س into ش—not practised by BB—who disallow both—letters incorporated into it.</td>
<td>1771-1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 747</td>
<td>ی incorporated into its like, (1) attached—(2) quasi-attached—(3) detached, when first ی is preceded by Fatḥa—not Kasra—difference between the two cases—three letters incorporated into it—(1) its like—(2) ۰—۰ and ی adjacent—incorporated, one into the other, whether ۰ be first—or second—exs. of latter—(3) ۰—because treated like letters of prolongation and softness.</td>
<td>1772-1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 748</td>
<td>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 Kur—IY's opinion of it—letters incorporated into ض—why these—and not ۰.</td>
<td>1775-1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 749</td>
<td>۰ incorporated, (1) if determinative, necessarily into (a) its like—(b) thirteen other letters—their characteristics—causes of its</td>
<td>1777-1781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
incorporation into them—(2) if not determinative, necessarily into ـ—allowably into remaining twelve—or allowably into all thirteen, its incorporation being good into ـ, bad into ُنـ, and middling into remainder—exs. in verse—and in readings of Kur—such incorporation how graduated by R—only its like and ـو incorporated into it—not ــ and َبـلـ—why so written.

§. 750. ـ, not mentioned by IH—incorporated only into its like—not into any other letter—its incorporation into ـل 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—ـل and ـو incorporated into ـ.

§. 751. Quiescent ـو, including Tanwin, (1) incorporated into letters of ـيـرُمـلـوـنـ—necessarily—with some exceptions—cause of incorporation—ـهـرـوـنـ—or only preferably into all but ـو—(a) with nasality into letters of ـيـرـُمـلـوـنـ—restriction on incorporation into ـمـو،ـو،ـو، and ـو—(b) without nasality into ـل and ـو—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) ﱆ، ﱍ، ﱞ،، and ﱤ—(b) ﱢ—(c) other non-gutturals—(d) gutturals—retention of nasality with ﱍ and ﱤ chaster than removal—existence of nasality in م itself—retention of nasality by some Arabs with ﱆ and ﱍ, and omission by some with ﱍ and ﱤ—opinion of S 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 ﱰ and ﱳ—(3) converted into م before ﱢ—in one word or two—motive for conversion—(4) stifled with fifteen remaining letters—reason for stifling—mnemonic phrase م ﱥ—م ﱤ ﱣ why omitted—states of م with reference to approximativeness, 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 م allowable incor- porated into letters of م ﱥ—its pre- dicament 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 $\text{ت}, \text{ث}, \text{د}, \text{ط}, \text{ض}, \text{ز}$, and $\text{س}$ incorporated,

(1) one into another—(2) all into $\text{ص}$, $\text{س}$, $\text{ش}$, $\text{ز}$, and $\text{س}$—why mentioned before $\text{ص}$, $\text{ش}$, and $\text{س}$—restriction on incorporation of sibilants—what $\text{ث}$ meant here—incorporation of first six letters exemplified—covering more chastely retained on incorporation of covered into uncovered letter—IH's wavering as to whether incorporation be then genuine—his argument—analysis of his language—his conclusion—incorporation into $\text{س}$ when an attached nom. pron.—(3) all into $\text{ض}$ and $\text{ش}$—this incorporation why allowable—more valid into $\text{ض}$ than into $\text{ش}$—(4) $\text{ت}$ into $\text{چ}$ in reading—$\text{ض}$, $\text{ز}$, and $\text{س}$ incorporated, one into another—more often than $\text{ظ}$, $\text{ذ}$, and $\text{ث}$—covering properly retained on incorporation of $\text{ص}$ into either of its fellows—last three not incorporated into first six.

§ 753. $\text{ف}$ not mentioned by IH—incorporated only into its like—its incorporation into $\text{ب}$ anomalous—but $\text{ب}$ incorporated into it.

§ 754. $\text{ب}$ incorporated into (1) its like—(2) $\text{ف}$ and $\text{م}$—IAI's practice—his principle—allowability of incorporation not disputed after
mobile - disputed after quiescent - only its like incorporated into it.

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

§ 756. incorporation of 1) into it (2) it into how distinguishable from whose inf. n. is elision of vowel from first of two likes why not allowable in and — but allowable here—opinion of Fr — aor. and act. and pass. parts — vowels of their and — concurrence of two quiescents unheeded here — or vowel of first merely slurred — Kasr of not allowable — and — orig. — its evolution — Kasr
of ق — (3) it into approximate—allowable only with د or ص — but not forbidden by analogy with any approximate — (4) approximate, or ض , into it— ثم here converted into ف — but converse allowable with ت — incorporation omissible, except with ط and د — then ت (a) converted into ط after ض , and ط — and into د after ج and ذ — (b) unaltered after ض and — necessity for incorporation or conversion, except with ت and ض — incorporation by conversion of ط into ط, and ذ into د — and even ض into ض of of incorporated after nine letters — into (1) ط after ص , ط , and ط — reason for this substitution — then, (a) after ط, incorporation necessary — (b) after ط, 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 — anomalous — (2) د after د , ج ,
and ـ—reason for this substitution—then, (a) after ـ, incorporation necessary—(b) after ـ, display allowable—and incorporation by conversion of second into first—(c) after ـ, display allowable—and incorporation in both its modes—لذَکَرِ الرَّأَبِ rare—(1) and (2) the only changes of this ـ mentioned here by IM—(3) ـ after ـ or ـ converted into ـ—separation good—dispute about separation—(4) س after س—second why converted into first—separation good—most prevalent forms with ط، ص، ـ (1) —(2) ـ and ـ،، ـ، (3) ـ، and (4) س—change of ـ into ـ after ـ—and of ل into ـ—attached of ـ converted into (1) ط after ـ، ص، ـ، و ـ، (2) ـ after ـ، ـ، and ـ، ـ، ـ ـ of pron. here assimilated to ـ of ـ—reason for assimilation—consequent conversion—incorporation with ط، ـ، ـ، and ـ—incorporation of ـ، ـ، ـ، and ـ more frequent with attached than with detached ـ—and separation better with latter ـ than with former—conversion more frequent in ـ than in ـ of pron.—better not to convert the latter—its
conversion said to be anomalous— propósito
not incorporated into ف—even if ف be mobile—reason in latter case.

§ 757. Combination of aoristic ت with ت of
and تفعّل alleviable by (1) elision—its
cause—which ت elided—remaining ت not
incorporated into ف—this elision where found—similar elision in
aor. headed by two نs—(2) incorporation
—but not if first ت be (a) not preceded by
anything—(b) preceded by quiescent other
than letter of prolongation—language of IM
and BD—of other GG—this incorporation
found only in continuity, and after a letter
of prolongation or a vowel—elision requisite
for alleviation of aor. in inception—and
allowable in continuity—neither elision nor
incorporation allowable in aor. of pass.—
incorporation of ت into في in تفعّل
and تفعّل—conj. Hamza then imported in
inception— تفعّل and تفعّل here distinguish-
able from تفعّل—this incorporation applic-
cable to pret., aor., imp., inf. n., and act.
and pass. parts.—not found in conj. of
—even when ت is a propósito— propósito.
§ 758. Irregular incorporation—ست and ستة

for ست and ستة—د and س not convertible one into the other—nor congruous in quality—each therefore converted into ست for ستة—in incorporation the practice of Tamim—but not regular—عدان—its dial. vars.—عدان anomalous—عدان sometimes used instead.

§ 759. Deviation to elision when incorporation impossible—such elision classed as incorporation—euphonic and curtailing elisions previously mentioned—present kind of elision found in (1) aor. act. of تفاعل and تفاعل with aoristic ت—both ت's allowable—or elision of one—condition of this elision—which ت elided—rule for elision—مُست, and تللت —elision of خ—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.—تللت , تللت , and تللت used—elided variously said to be خ or ل—vowel of ف—similarly تللت , etc.—meaning of
this elision disputed—etc.—
—forms allowable in
aor. and imp.—no elision when ا is pro-
nounced with Fath— قُرَّانٌ rare—other expla-
nations of اغْضَضُ� for
(3)
—elision when approximates or likes
are in separate words—exs.—ن of بلُو elided
before ل of art.—after elision of unsound
letter—regularly in names of clans where
ل is not incorporated—
، مَلَعْبُ—بَلُمُ،
وعلى ل— علماء—ملكُبُ، مَلَعْبُ
here elided, after elision of ل، before ل of
art.—exs.—foregoing elisions due to impos-
sibility of incorporation—but all irregular—
يُسْعَى—سَلَامَةٌ regular—
مَلَعْبُ للمُرْضٍ،
and anomalous—reason for elision
here—نفَّذُ not of this class—first
elided in three words—from frequency of
usage—their act. *parts.*—and *pret.* —*aor.*—dispute about —*and* more anomalous—how explained by S—not *orig.* —*but*—why “more anomalous”—elision and retention of ن of protection.

**APPENDIX.**—Specimens of Parsing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Specimen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>of رب —hypocatalectic Tanwin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>سورة سنين pl. of سنة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conjunct n. and its gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Affixion of sign of pl. to v. when attribute of explicit n. in pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prop. and gen. made pro-ag. notwithstanding presence of direct obj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allowability of زيدًا ضربته for زيد نضربته, and particularity of فارسًا ما فارسة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suppression of pron. expressing obj. required by second of two <em>ops.</em> in case of contest in government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suppression of <em>op.</em> of unrestricted <em>obj.</em> necessary when <em>inf.</em> n. occurring as such <em>obj.</em> acts as substitute for its <em>op.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 9. Government of pron. in gen. by حَكَّٰثِيٌ.</td>
<td>PAGE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ 10. Analysis of فعل بَعْضُهُ in wonder. Proof that فعل is a v., and بعْضُهُ suppressible when indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ 11. Occurrence of ag. latent in نَعْم as vague pron. expounded by posterior indet. governed in acc. as sp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ 12. ة of silence affixed, by poetic license, to lamented in continuity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ 13. Mood of aor. in apod. when v. of prot. is a lit. or id. pret.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ 14. Treatment of Hamza of لَل after Hamza of interrogation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ 15. Transformation of مِّ into مَي (for مَيّام) pl. of مَّام (for مَّام).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L’Envoi.
§ 624. This augment is like the augment of disapprobation [620] in conforming to [the vowel of] what precedes it, if this be mobile [623]; and, when this is [a sound] quiescent, it is mobilized with Kasr, as it is mobilized there, and afterwards the augment conforms to it: S says “We have heard them say إنَّهُ تَذْيَى [497, 623] and for أَلَّا تَعَلَّمَ and the I and J when trying to remember أَلْصَارِطِ and the like;” and he says, “We have heard a trustworthy person say هَذَا سَيِفَنِي, 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 (IV). The common [processes] are such as Imāla, pause, alleviation of the Hamza, concurrence of two quiescents, and the like, in which the three kinds [of word], or two of them, appear together (M). For Imāla is found in the n. and v. [626], and sometimes in the p. also [639]; and similarly pause is found in the n., v., and p. [640]; and so are alleviation of the Hamza and concurrence of two quiescents, as will be related in its place [658, 663] (IV). Etymology is one of the elements of grammar, without dispute. The moderns hold that etymology is the science of the formations of words; and of the properties of their letters, such as radicalness or augmentatively, 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).
§. 626. It is common to the n. and v. [625, 639] (M). It is the inf. n. of اَمَالْ عَاشِي deflected the thing, inf. n. اَمَالْ deflection, when you make it deviate to another direction (Jrb, Tsr). And [in conventional language (Tsr)] it is your taking the Fatha towards Kasra (Aud), so that the Fatha imbibes something of the sound of Kasra, becoming intermediate between Fatha and Kasra (Tsr). Then, if the Fatha be followed by an I, the latter is taken towards ء, [becoming intermediate between I and ء (Tsr),] as in أَلْفِي [below] (Aud), with Imāla of the Fatha and I (Tsr); and if [the Fatha be (Tsr)] not [followed by an I (Tsr)], what is pronounced with Imāla is the Fatha alone, [whether the Fatha be before the s of feminization, or not (Tsr),] as in وَسْحَر LIV. 34. [64] (Aud). Imāla is of three sorts, deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra before (1) the I, which is then deflected towards ء [626–637]; (2) the s, as in رَحْمَة [638]; (3) the r, as in كَبْر [638]: so that “deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra” includes the three sorts; while the deflection of
the \( \ddot{\imath} \) towards \( \check{\imath} \) is necessitated by the deflection of the Fathā towards Kasra, because the pure \( \ddot{\imath} \) is found only after the pure Fathā, and the \( \ddot{\imath} \) is necessarily deflected towards \( \check{\imath} \) in proportion to the deflection of the Fathā towards Kasra. Imāla is not the *dial.* of all the Arabs (R). The people of AlHijāz [below] do not practise Imāla (R, Tsr), except in a few cases. Those who practise it are Tamīm, Kais, Asad, and the generality of Najd (Tsr); while the tribe most addicted to it are the Banū Tamīm (R). It is also named ٍ كَسْر pronouncing with Kasr, ﷺ ﺩُطُخ flattening, and ٍ ﻋِﺿَامَعَل 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, preventsives [632] that counteract those causes, and a preventive of these preventsives [634], that intervenes between it and prevention (Aud). Its causes are of two kinds, (1) *lit.*, vid. the \( \check{\imath} \) and Kasra; (2) *id.*, vid. indication of a \( \check{\imath} \) or Kasra (A). The causes are eight, (1) the \( \ddot{\imath} \)'s being substituted for a final \( \ddot{\imath} \), as in أَلْهُدَى [629] and أَفْتَى among ns., and أَتْرَى and أَتْرَى among vs.; while such as نَاتُ [630], though its \( \ddot{\imath} \) is [substituted (Tsr)] for a \( \check{\imath} \), as
is proved by [its broken pl. (Tsr)] ٣٤٢, is not pronounced with Imāla, for lack of finality: whereas such as [fem. of (Tsr)] is pronounced with Imāla, because the َ of feminization is constructively separate [266] (Aud); so that the ِ, if not literally, is constructively final (Tsr): (2) the ِ's being replaced by ى in some variations [of the word], like the ِ of مَلَهَى, [where the ِ is a subst. for اَرْطُبِيَانِ (Tsr)]; of اَرْطُبِيَانِ, [where it is an aug. added for co-ordination (Tsr)]; of حَبْليَانِ, [where it is an aug. added for feminization (Tsr)]; and of عَرْا, [where it is a subst. for أَرْطُبِيَانِ, in vs. (Tsr)]: so that these [exs. (Tsr)] and the like are pronounced with Imāla, [because the ِ in them is replaced by ى in some variations, like the du. and pl. among ns., and the pass. among vs. (Tsr),] as in the du. اَرْطُبِيَانِ [629], مَلَهَيْانِ, and حَبْليَانِ [229]; the pl. [اَرْطُبِيَاتِ, مَلَهَيْاتِ, and (Tsr)] حَبْليَاتِ [234]; and the pass. [أَرْطُبِيَاتِ, مَلَهَيْاتِ, غَرَيْ] [629, 719]: (a) according to this [last (Tsr)], the saying of IM [in the Alfiya and elsewhere (Tsr)] that the Imāla in the ِ of تَلاَهَا XCI. 2. [538] is for correspondence with the Imāla in the ِ of جَلَالَهَا 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 ِ of سَكَّي XCIII. 2. is for
correspondence with the Imāla in the of عَصَّا XcIII. 3. [63] are dubious; may, the Imāla in both cases is because of [the pass. (Tsr)] and سَكَعَ تُلِي: (b) those [words] in which the conversion of the I into ی is (a) peculiar to an anomalous dial., like the conversion of the I of عَصَّا and نَفَّا [629] into ی in the saying of Hudhail, when they prefix these ns. to the ی of the 1st pers., تَفَّى عَصَّا and [129], or (b) caused by amalgamation of the I with an aug. letter, like the conversion of the I of عَصَّا and نَفَّا [629] into ی in the dim., as تَفَّى عَصَّة and تَفَّى [280], or in the pl. on the measure of تَفَّى عَصَّة and تَفَّى [243], are excepted from [the operation of] that [cause] (Aud) mentioned, vid. "the I's being replaced by ی in some variations"; so that none of those [words] is pronounced with Imāla (Tsr): (3) the I's being substituted for the ی of that which, on being attributed to the ت [of the pron. (Tsr)], is reduced to فَلْتُ with Kasr of the ف [and elision of the ع (Tsr)], whether that I be converted from (a) a ی [pronounced with Fath or Kasr, the first (Tsr)] as in ی and ی, and [the second as in (Tsr)] -هاب -; or (b) a pronounced with Kasr, as in ی [630] and [in the dial. of all (Tsr),] and ی in the dial. of those who say مَتُّ with Kasr [482]: contrary to [the I converted
from a, pronounced with Fath or Damm, as in (Tsr) such as ماتُ and طالُ [in the dial. of all (Tsr),] and in the dial. of Damm (Aud); so that these are not pronounced with Imāla, because you say طلتُ and مُتُ, with Damm of the ت, by transfer in تلتُ, and according to the o. f. in طلتُ and متُ [403, 482, 484] (Tsr): (4) the t's occurring [immediately (Tsr)] before a ي [pronounced with Fath (Tsr)], as in بئتَة and سايرتُهُ: (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 t's occurring after a ي, (a) adjoining [it, with no barrier between them (Tsr)], as in بىان [with a single ي, and بِيَأَعُ 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 جاِدُتُ يِداُهُ (Tsr) and شباَبُانُ [628] and جاِدُتُ يِداُهُ 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 s, as in دَخَلتُ بِيْنَهَا She entered her house (Aud), provided that the ي and s be
not separated by a letter pronounced with دامم, as in انسع بيتها. *Her house was wide:* so says the author of the Aud in the Glosses (Tsr): separation by the ی is pardoned because the ی, by reason of its faintness, is not reckoned a barrier; but IM here, and likewise in the كافيya, does not impose the restriction that the ی should be second; and apparently ماالا is allowable in هاتان شويهتان These are thy two little sheep, because separation by the ی is like no separation, and, when the ی is dropped out of consideration, شويهتان is equal to شيان (A): (6) the ی’s occurring [immediately (Tsr)] before a [letter pronounced with] كاسرا as in عالٍ [628] and كاب: (7) the ی’s occurring after a كاسرا [627]: (8) desire for correspondence, [when no other cause exists (Tsr),] as in (a) رايت عبادا [631] (Aud), where the first ی is pronounced with ماالا because it occurs after a كاسرا separated from it by one letter, vid. the م; and the second ی, converted from the طنون, is pronounced with ماالا for correspondence with the first (Tsr): and (b) the reading بالسکی XCIII. 1. *By the forenoon,* where the ی, though [converted (Tsr)] from the , of فکرة, is pronounced with ماالا for correspondence with السکی XCIII. 2. تلی XCIII. 3. [above], and what follows them (Aud), because observance of correspondence
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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 [ ] (Sn) pronounced with Imāla"; and is mentioned last because of its weakness in comparison with the preceding causes: (b) the Imāla of the [ ] on account of correspondence has two phases, (a) that it should be on account of the vicinity of an [ ] so pronounced, like the Imāla of the second [ ] in [ ] [above], which is for correspondence with the first [ ]; (b) that it should be on account of the [ ]'s being the final of a phrase adjacent to a phrase whose final is pronounced with Imāla, like the Imāla of the [ ] of [ ] in XCI. 2. [above], which is for correspondence with what follows it, i.e., [ ] XCI. 3. [538] and [ ] XCI. 4. [637], according to the opinion of others than S, vid. Mb and a party (A); (c) the [ ] that has no cause [of Imāla] in it, (a) if preceded by the [ ] pronounced with Imāla on account of one of the causes aforesaid, is pronounced with Imāla, as in [ ] [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 ꞌ with Imāla on account of Kasra, while they and many of the Arabs do not pronounce [the ꞌ] with Imāla on account of the ی; [so that those who pronounce the ꞌ 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 ꞌ [626] takes effect only when it precedes the ꞌ by (1) one letter, as in ًضاد tent-pole: (2) two letters, the first of which is quiescent, as in ًضلا [385] (M), because the quiescent is not minded, and is not a strong barrier, so that ًضلا becomes like ًضلا; and similarly in ًنِّل لله واًنا إلیهِ رَحْمَانَ II. 151. Verily we belong to God, and verily unto Him are we returning, where Imāla is excellent (IY). But, when the Kasra precedes [the ꞌ] by two mobile letters, as in أَكِلْتُ عَبْنَا I ate grapes, or by three letters, as in فَتَنْتَلْتُ تَحْلَبًا I twisted hemp, it does not take effect (M); so that Imāla is not permissible, because of the distance
of the Kasra from the I (IY). And, as for their saying

He means to strike her [633]

He is with her and

He has two dirhams [or thy two dirhams], it is anomalous (M), rare (IY). What makes it permissible is that the s, being faint, is not taken into account (M); so that, the s being like the non-existent, يَضْرِبُهَا becomes like يَضْرِبَا (IY).

For, when the s drops out of consideration, يَضْرِبُهَا is equal to such as [above] (A). But the exemplification by such as دَرْعَمَانِ requires consideration, because its Imāla may be on account of the 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 ن. IH and others mention that the Imāla of such as دَرْعَمَانِ is anomalous: but F, in the Īdāh, does not mention that the Imāla of دَرْعَمَانِ is anomalous, notwithstanding his explicit attribution of the Imāla to the preceding Kasra, not to the Kasra of the ن of the du. (Tsr). When the letter before the s that is immediately followed by the I is pronounced with Damm, as in يَضْرِبُهَا, Imāla is allowed by no one, because, with the Damma, the s cannot be like the non-
existent, since the letter before the I is never pronounced with د (R).

§. 628. The condition of efficiency in the cause of Imāla is that it should be part of the word containing the I. But from that is excepted the I of the fem. pron. I أَدْرَجتْ جَبَبْهَا and I لَمْ يَبْتَرْبُهَا, which is pronounced with Imāla, though its cause is detached, i.e. part of another word. And others than IM mention that the I is sometimes pronounced with Imāla on account of the Kasra, when detached from the I, although this Kasra is weaker [in exacting Imāla (Sn)] than the Kasra that is in the same word with the I: S says “We have heard them say لَبِّيْتِ مَالُ Zaid 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 حا with Imāla on account of a detached I”, the Kasra being excluded because it is stronger, as before mentioned, than the I [626] (A). They treat the detached I, [which is converted from Tanwin (IY),] like the attached, [which is part of the word itself (IY),] as I studied science and I saw Zaid (M), with Imāla, like عَمَانُ [627]
and ٘شیبان [626] respectively (IY); and the accidental Kasra [of inflection after the I (IY)] like the original [Kasra of the ع of فاعل (IY)], as I passed by his door and ٘أخذت مَن مالِه. I took of his goods or camels (M): except that the Imāla in such as ٘عالم or سالم [626] and ٘عماد [627] is stronger than the Imāla here, because the Kasra there is inseparable; while in مالِه and ٘بابِه it is accidental, disappearing in the nom. and acc., where there is no Imāla, as there is none in آجر تابِل [247] (IY).

§. 629. The final I 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 ٍزمٍي and ٍتضٍي: and allowable, though inelegant, if it be converted from a َ, as in َدعَا غرًا and َدعٍا, because, when this formation is transported by the Hamza to ٍفعل [488], its َbecomes a ٍ, as in ٍأذٍي and ٍأذ١ي [685, 719, 727], so that you say ٍاذ١ي and ٍاذ١ي with Imāla; and also because, when it is turned into a pass., its َbecomes a ٍ, as ٍغرٍي and ٍدعٍي [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 Ḣimāla, which is good, as in ١٢٦٠٠ and ١٢٦٠٠ (IY), if not recognized as converted from a ى, is not pronounced with Ḣimāla when third (M), as in ١٢٦٠٠ (IY); but is [preferably (IY)] pronounced with Ḣimāla when fourth (M), whether it be (1) a ل, as in لَهَوْتُ مَلَهَّى, where the ى appears in the du. مَلَهَّى [١٢٦٠, ١٢٧٠]; or (2) an aug., added (a) for feminization, as in حُبْليٕا, where the ى is converted into ى in the du. حُبْليٕإ and sound pl. حُبْليٕاتٕ [١٢٦٠]; or (b) for co-ordination, as in أَرْطِيٕانٕ [١٢٦٠] (IY). But أَرْطِيٕانٕ [١٢٦٠] (IY), [which is a n. of three letters, from the ى (IY),] is pronounced with Ḣimāla only because of their saying [in the sing.] أَلْعِيْا [١٢٧٥] (M): for the ى in أَلْعِيٕ is that very ى which is in أَلْعِيٕ, but is converted into ٓ in the pl. on the measure of أَلْعِنٕ; so that it is like [the р in] أَلْكِبْرٕ from أَلْكِبْرٕ [١٢٤٨] (IY).

§. 630. The intermediate [ٓ (IY)], if it be [an ٓ (IY)] in a v. wherein جَافٜ طَابٜ is said, like مَاتٕ, aor. يِمَاتٕ (IY), is pronounced with Ḣimāla [١٢٦٠] (M), as in the reading لَمْ يَجَفٜ ٖطَابٜ مَاتٕ مَاتٕ XIV. 17. For him that feareth My judgment-seat, because the letter before the ى [in جَافٜ and مَاتٕ] is pronounced with Kasr in
and [طَبْنُ (IY)]; and what the ِ is converted from is not regarded (M), except that Imāla is better in that [v.] which belongs to the cat. of the ِ, [like طَابِ and ِ هَابِ] because it contains two causes, its being of the cat. of the ِ, and its [نٌ's] being pronounced with Kasr in [طَبْنُ and هِبْتُ] and بتَ; whereas those [vs.] 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 حَافُ and طَابِ: Sf and others say that it is because of the accidental Kasra of the ف [in some variations (Sn)] of the word; and this is apparently the language of F, who says "They pronounce حَافُ and طَابِ with Imāla, notwithstanding the elevated [letter, i.e. the خ] and the ط (632) (Sn)], from desire for [indication of (Sn)] the Kasra in حَافُ [and طَبْنُ (Sn)]": but IHKh says "The better opinion is that the Imāla in طَابِ is because the ِ in it is converted from a ِ, and in حَافُ because the is pronounced with Kasr: they wish for indication of the ِ and Kasra, respectively" (A). But, if the intermediate ِ be in a ِ, what it is converted from is regarded: so that ِ دَابُ [626] is said, [and عَابِ i.q. ِ هُبُ, because they belong to the cat. of the ِ (IY)]; but not ِ بَابِ.
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[635] (M), nor יָאָר, since the מ is a, (IY). The language of IM implies that the י substituted for the מ of the n. is not pronounced with Imāla, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether it be converted from a ו or a, (Sn)]: but the author of the M distinguishes between what is converted from a ו, as in נבָב and עַבָא, where he allows Imāla; and what is converted from a ג, as in בָבָא and גָר, where he does not allow it: while some distinctly declare that Imāla of the י converted from a ו, when an מ in a tril. n., is anomalous; and this is apparently the language of S (A).

§. 631. They sometimes pronounce the י with Imāla on account of a preceding מ so pronounced, saying רַאֵית I saw a tent-pole [626] and מָעַרְנָא 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 מ [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)] מ [below] (IM). For the letters of elevation are elevated towards the palate; so that, with them, the י is not pronounced with Imāla, from desire for homogeneity [of sound (Tsr)]: while the מ, [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 elevation [734] (Aud, A), vid. the خ, the غ, the ص, the ض, the ط, the ظ, and the ق (Aud), which are the initials of these [mnemonic] words

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 ر, 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
precede the \( \) (A); and similarly in \( \text{بْيَبَٰثُص} \) and \( \text{آَبِيَارُن} \). These are thy wells, where the letter of elevation and the \( \) follow the \( \) (Sn) : and \( \text{AH} \) says "We have not found that", meaning, restraint of the \( \) by the letter of elevation or the \( \) ; "but it prevents with the Kasra alone" (A). This necessarily implies that the \( \) is stronger than the Kasra; whereas the preferable opinion, as before stated [626], is the converse; and possibly it is this that induces \( \text{IM} \) to add the \( \) (Sn). The condition of the \( \text{Imāla} \) restrained by the preventive is that its cause should not be a supplied Kasra, [as in \( \text{خَاف} \), the \( \) of which is converted from a \( \) , pronounced with Kasr (Tsr)]; or a supplied \( \), [as in \( \text{طَابَ} \), the \( \) of which is converted from a \( \) (Tsr)]: for here the supplied cause, being present in the \( \) itself, is stronger than the expressed cause (Tsr), which either precedes the \( \), [as in \( \text{بَلْيَعَ} \) and \( \text{ثَيْبَان} \) (Tsr)]; or follows it, [as in \( \text{جَالِم} \) and \( \text{كَبَّان} \) (Tsr)]: and for this reason such as \( \text{خَافَ} \) and \( \text{طَابَ} \) and \( \) are pronounced with \( \text{Imāla} \) (Aud), notwithstanding that the letter of elevation precedes [the \( \) ] in \( \text{خَافَ} \) and \( \text{طَابَ} \), and follows [it] in \( \text{خَافَ} \) and \( \text{طَابَ} \) (Tsr). The elevated [letter] restrains the \( \text{Imāla} \) of only the \( \), exclusively: \( \text{Jz} \) says "The elevated [letter] prevents \( \text{Imāla} \) of the \( \) in the \( \), but not in the \( \), as \( \text{طَابَ} \) and
because Imāla in the ṣ. possesses a strength that it does not possess in the n., for which reason the circumstance that the ٍ of the ṣ. is [converted] from the ی or from the , is not regarded; but it is pronounced with Imāla unrestrictedly” [629, 630] (A). The cause [of Imāla], however, in طاب and َبُعِي is supplied; and the preventive does not prevent the Imāla produced by a supplied cause, either in the n. or in the ṣ.; so that what Jz mentions is not contrary to what IM says (Sn). These letters [of elevation] do not prevent Imāla when they are a ٍ pronounced with Fath, forming part of a ṣ. unsound in the ع, as in جاف طاب; or in the ل, whether a ی, as in طغی قلی; or a ٍ, as in غرا and عدا, where this ل becomes a ی, as we mentioned, in ٌغزی and ٌغزی ٌغزی [629]: for these ṣs. contain two inducements to Imāla, vid. conversion from the ی, and strength of plasticity in the ṣ.; so that the elevated [letter] is overpowered (IY). [But, in the case of جاف, Kasr of the ف in ِجَفْت (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 ٍ is that it should be (1) contiguous to the ٍ, as in صَالِخ: (2) separated [from it] by one letter, [because separation by one letter is like no separation
as in 'عَمْانِي'; unless the letter of elevation be (a) pronounced with Kasr, as in َخِبَام ُطَلَابُ and ُتَرْمِيَّة, 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 مَصِبَّع, [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 ُسَاحِرُ ُفَكْسِلُ [633]; (2) separated [from it (Tsr)] by (a) one letter, as in ُنَاعِقُ [633]; (b) two letters, as in ُمَئَأَشْيَطُ [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
§. 633. They treat the [preventive] detached [from the ‘], i. e., belonging to another word, like the attached, which belongs to the same word (IY). This detached [preventive] is (1) contiguous to the ‘, without any barrier, as in مَرَتْ بِفَاصِلٍ Kasim is one of us, like I passed by a learned man [632]: (2) separated from it by (a) one letter, as in يَمَالِ قَاسِم by the camels of Kasim [below], like by a croaker [632]; (b) two letters, as in مَنَاشِبْتُ In her hand is a whip, like [632] (Tsr). S says (M), We have heard them say أَرَادَ أَن يُضْرِبْهَا زَيدَ Zaid meant to strike her [627], pronouncing [the ‘ in her] with Imāla [because of the Kasra before it (IY)]; but أَرَادَ أَن يُضْرِبْهَا تَبْلُ He desired to strike her before, pronouncing with Fath, [notwithstanding the Kasra of the ز (IY),] because of [the preventive, vid. (IY)] the ق (S, M) in قَبْلَ (IY); and [similarly (M)] مَرَتْ بِمَالِ قَاسِم above] and مَنَاشِبْتُ يَمَالِ قَاسِم by the camels of Malik (S, M) and مَنَاشِبْتُ بِمَالِ يَمَالَ by the camels of Yankul, all with Fath, because of the ق, being assimilated to نَاعِقَ [632] (S). But some distinguish
between the attached and detached, saying بمال تاَسَم with ِبُمالًا ِتَاَسَمًا (S, IY), as though they did not mind the elevated [letter], since it belongs to another word (IY). The preventive of ِبُمالًا takes effect [even (Tsr)] if it be detached; but the cause of ِبُمالًا does not take effect except when attached (Aud), the distinction being that the preventive is stronger than the cause (Tsr). Therefore such as ِبِتَى تَسَمُّ ِعَلَّم ِكَسِم ِكَانَم ِعَلَّم ِكَسِم came is not pronounced with ِبُمالًا, because of the presence of the ق, [even though it is in another word (Tsr)]; nor لِبِتَى مَالُ ِزَيْد ِحَس ِكَمِلْس, because of the detachment of the cause (Aud), since the I 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 ِبِتَى تَسَمُّ [above], notwithstanding their acknowledgment that the preventive does not take effect on the supplied ِي [632], on which sort [of cause] the [letter of] elevation, if attached, would have no effect, [and a fortiori when detached (Tsr)]; while the good, [irreproachable (Tsr),] ex. is ِكِتَابُ تَسَمِّ ِكَسِم the book of ِكَسِم, [since the cause of ِبُمالًا 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 Mukarrab [fi-nNaḥw (HKh)], after mentioning the causes of Imāla, what is to this effect "whether the Kasra be attached or detached, as in لَرْيَتْ مَال [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 مَال قَاسِم [above]; or in such of the ́s appended to the pron. as are pronounced with Imāla [639], as in أَرَادَ أَن يَعْرَفَنَّهَا فَّتَبَلَ He meant to know her before" (Aud), where Imāla of the ́ [in هَا ] is prevented by the ق of تَبَلُ after it, though the ق is detached [from يَعْرَفَنَّهَا ] (Tsr).

§ 634. The condition of prevention by the ́r [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 نُرَاشُ and رَأْيَتْ (Aud), where the ́ 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 هُذَا جِبَارُ This is a he-ass and رَأْيَتْ جِبَارًا I saw a he-ass. But some treat the ́r posterior [to the
This is an unbeliever, like the contiguous (Aud) in prevention of Imāla (Tsr). The preventive of the preventive [626] is the ġ pronounced with Kasr [above], in the immediate vicinity of the l: for this prevents the elevated [letter (Tsr)] and the ġ from preventing (Aud) Imāla, because one characteristic of the ġ 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 ُعَلَى أَبْصَارِهِمْ

II. 6. And upon their eyes and إِذْ خَرَى فِي الْغَار IX. 40. [204, 599] are pronounced with Imāla, notwithstanding the presence of the ص [in the first (Tsr)] and the غ [in the second (Tsr)]; and لَمْ يَكُنَّ كِتَابَ الْبَيْنَار LXXXIII. 18. [236, 598], notwithstanding the presence of the ġ pronounced with Fath [before the l (Tsr)]; and دَارُ الْقَرَار XL. 42. The abode of stability, notwithstanding the presence of both (Aud) preventives, the elevated ق and the ġ pronounced with Fath. In all of that, the ġ pronounced with Kasr is contiguous [to the l] (Tsr). But some treat the ġ [when] separated [from the l (Tsr)] by one letter, like the contiguous [in prevention of the preventive (Tsr)]: S heard Imāla [of نَافِد (Tsr)] in the saying [of Hudba Ibn Khashram (S)]

72 a
May-be God will compensate me for the lands of Ibn Kadr with pouring rain, black in clouds, running over the surface of the ground (Aud), notwithstanding that theأpronounced with Kasr is separated from theلby theد(Tsr). But those who say مَرَّتُ يَكَافِرُ are more numerous than those who say مَرَّتُ يَاقَادِرُ, because theقis a letter of elevation [632](S). It is understood from the language of IM [and IHsh] that Imāla is [a fortiori (A)] allowable in such as حُجَابَرُ; for, since theلis pronounced with Imāla, on account of theأpronounced with Kasr, notwithstanding that the requirer of abandonment of Imāla, vid. the letter of elevation or theأnot 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 theل, (1) difference between theن. and theق.[639]; and that is in theأand similar letters in the initial monograms of the chapters [of theKur]: S says "And they sayأand يا and تا", i.e., with Imāla, "because they are names of what is uttered", [i.e., the letters(Sn)]; so that they are not likeإي andعand ىand otherps.uninfl. upon quiescence: (a) the
letters of the alphabet, that are at the beginnings of the chapters [of the Kur], if an l be at their end, are pronounced by some with Fath, [i.e., not with Imāla (Sn),] and by others with Imāla; but, if an l be in their middle, as in صَدَكُ and كَانُ, are pronounced with Fath, without dispute: (2) frequency of usage; and that is in (a) AlHajjaj [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 Al Ajjaj, in the nom. and acc.: so some of the GG mention: (b) النَّاسُ, in the nom. and acc.: IB says “'Abd Allāh Ibn Dā'ūd transmits from IAl the Imāla of النَّاسُ 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 Aḥmad 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 AlHajjaj 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 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 \text{مَالُ} and to the \text{بَابٌ} of \text{عَرَا} and \text{دَنا}, treating the \text{ع} like the \text{ل} : but such pronunciation of \text{مَالُ} and \text{بَابٌ} in the nom. and acc. is rare (IY). And they say \text{العَشَا} [blindness by night (IY)], \text{الْبِكا} [hole of the fox or hare (IY)], and \text{آلكبا} [sweepings of the house (IY)], though these are from the \text{و} (M) : the Imāla being introduced into them by assimilation to what is from the \text{ى}, because the \text{ل} is a \text{ل}; for alteration gains access to the \text{ل}, since you pronounce \text{عِرَا} with Imāla [629], but not \text{قَالُ} [626] (IY).

But, as for their saying \text{بِنْبَا} \text{gaɪn} [in selling, though it is from the \text{و}, since they say in the \text{دِبِّرُ} (IY)], it is on account of [their saying \text{رِبْيَانُ}, treating it as from the \text{ى}, together with the Kasra of (IY)] the \text{ر} (M).

§. 636. Properly \text{فَاعِلُ} from the reduplicated, such as \text{صَدِقُ} serious and \text{مَارُ} passer, pl. \text{جَوَادُ} and \text{مُوارُ}, should not be pronounced with Imāla, because the Kasra that was in it, necessitating Imāla, has been elided on account of the incorporation [731] (IY). But some pronounce [that (IY)] with Imāla, saying \text{جَانُ}, \text{جَوَادُ}, \text{جَانُ}, and \text{جَوَادُ}, as they pronounce \text{جَافِ} with Imāla.
because it is constructively خِفْتُ, or because it is reducible to خَفْتُ, though there is no Kasra in the actual expression; and similarly (IY)] as they pronounce مَاشَ This is a walker with Imāla in pause [643] (M), though there is no Kasra in it, because, when the speech is continued, it is pronounced with Kasr (IY).

§. 637. And ُلَشْمِس وَضُعْشَاعًا XCI. 1. [538], where analogy forbids Imāla, because (IY)] the [in الضَّكَّى (IY)] is [converted] from the و, is pronounced with Imāla for conformity with جَلَانَا XCI. 3. [538] and يَغْشَاهَا XCI. 4. It covereth it [626] (M), both of which are so pronounced because the ى in them is [converted] from the ي, since you say جَلَيتْة I displayed it and, in the du., يَغْشَياَنِ They two cover (IY).

§. 638. The Fatḥa is pronounced with Imāla before one of three letters, (1) the ى, which has been already discussed [626-637]: (2) the ر, on condition that it be pronounced with Kasr, that the Fatḥa be on a letter other than ى, and that they, [i.e., the Fatḥa and the ر (Tsr),] be (a) contiguous, [with no barrier between the letter pronounced with Fath and the ر (Tsr),] as in XIX. 9. Of old age (Aud): (a) there is no difference between the Fatha’s being on a letter of
elevation, as in لَيْتَ مَنْ أَلْسَنًا VI. 145. And of kine; or on
a َر، as in لَيْتَ مَنْ أَلْسَنًا LXXVII. 32. With sparks; or on any
other letter, as in XIX. 9. [above] (A, Tsr): (b) sepa-
rated by a quiescent other than َى، as in لَيْتَ مَنْ أَلْسَنًا from 'Amr; [or, adds IUK, by a letter pronounced with Kasr,
as in َأَمْؤُدَ بِاللَّهِ insolent (Tsr)]: contrary to such as َأَمْؤُدَ بِاللَّهِ
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] َمِنْ غَيْرَكَ 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 َر before it, as in ٌرَمَمَ decay-
ed 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 لَيْتَ مَنْ أَلْسَنًا 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 precede the َر، it does not prevent [Imāla] (A), because the َر
pronounced with Kasr overpowers the elevated [letter],
when that letter occurs before it; so that such as

5. from loss is pronounced with Imāla (A, Tsr)

IUK says "Accuracy requires one to say that every Fathā on a letter other than _VERTEX_ is pronounced with Imāla before a  _ or pronounced with Kasr contiguous to it, or separated [from it ] by a letter pronounced with Kasr, or by a quiescent other than  , when the  is not followed by a letter of elevation" (Tsr): (d) IM’s stipulation of finality in the  is refuted by the positive statement of S that they pronounce the Fathā of the  in  _I saw leaves blown off by winds with Imāla (Aud)_; while others mention that the Fathā of the  in  _hard_ may be pronounced with Imāla, though the  in that is not (A, Tsr) a  _ (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  ’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 Fathā on account of the Kasra of a  after it, that they should be in one word (Sn): (f) IM makes no restriction in his saying “Pronounce ............ with 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 \( \text{Imāla} \) in such as \( \text{Imāla} \). From the feared is forbidden when the Fatḥa of the \( \text{Imāla} \) is pronounced with Imāla: he says "But it is not strong enough to cause Imāla of the \( \text{Imāla} \)", meaning that the Imāla of the Fatḥa is not strong enough to cause Imāla of the \( \text{Imāla} \) on account of its Imāla [i.e., of the Imāla of the Fatḥa (Sn)]: but IKh asserts that those who pronounce the [second] \( \text{Imāla} \) with Imāla on account of the Imāla of the \( \text{Imāla} \) before it [631] pronounce the \( \text{Imāla} \) here with Imāla on account of the Imāla of the Fatḥa of the \( \text{Imāla} \); 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 \( \text{Imāla} \) on account of Imāla of the \( \text{Imāla} \) 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)] \( \text{Imāla} \) of feminization, on account of their agreement in outlet [181, 732], sense, [vid. indication of femininization (Tsr),] augmentativeness, finality, and peculiarity to ns. [263] (Aud): (a) it is good in such as \( \text{Imāla} \), [where the Fatḥa is neither on a
nor on an elevated letter (Jrb)]: and bad [when the Fatha is] on a 
, as in 

dinginess, [because the 
Imāla of its Fatha is like Êmāla of two Fathas, on account of the reiteration of the 
, so that the labour in pronouncing it with Imāla is more (R)]: and middling 
[when the Fatha is (MASH)] on a [letter of (MASH)] elevation, as in 

casket (SH), because, though the 
 is treated like the 
, it is not unrestrictedly like what it is assimilated to; so that the elevated letter does not prevent Imāla altogether here, as it does there; but, with it, Imāla is middling in goodness and badness (R): 
(b) the 
s of femininization here includes the 
s of intensiveness (A), because it is orig. the 
s of femininization [265] (Sn), as in 
 
[294, 312], which may be pronounced with Imāla; but excludes the 
s of silence [615], as in LXIX. 19. [below], the Fatha before which is not pronounced with Imāla, according to the correct [opinion]: 
(c) when there is an 
 before the 
s , it is not pronounced with Imāla, as in 
 
prayer and 
 
life; what is pronounced with Imāla, however, is the Fatha, not the consonant, that is immediately followed by the 
s of feminization; and, that being so, there is no reason for IM's excepting the 
, since the 
 is not included in the Fatha; but he does it here in order to dispel the notion that the 
s of feminization makes Imāla of the 
 permissible, as it makes Imāla of the Fatha: (d) "the 
s", and not "the 
s", " of ...
feminization" is said, in order that the ت which is not converted into س may be excluded, because the Fatha is not pronounced with Imala before it (A): this comprises the س of such as كَاتِبَةُ فَاطِمَةٍ رَحْمَةٌ [263], according to those who pause with the ت [646], in which case the Fatha is not pronounced with Imala, as is distinctly declared by others than IM; and the [quiescent] ت of feminization attached to the v. [607], as in باعت she sold (Sn): (e) Imala of [the Fatha before (Tsr)] the س of silence also, as in كِتَابِيّةُ LXIX. 19. [22, 647, 648, 679], is transmitted from KS, [because of its resemblance to the س of feminization in pause and writing (Tsr)]; but correctly should be disallowed, contrary to the opinion of Th and IAmb (Aud), who declare Imala to be allowable in what precedes it (Tsr).

§. 639. Imala is one of the peculiarities of vs. and decl. us.: and therefore Imala of the indecl. [n.], as إذا [204] and ما [180], is not regular; except in the case of and نَظَرَ إلَيْهَا He passed by her and نَظَرَ إلَيْهَا He looked towards her, مَرَّ بِهَا He passed by ns and نَظَرَ إلَيْهَا He looked towards us; for their Imala is regular, on account of the frequency of their usage. But Imala of the indecl. n. [197] has been heard in the case of the dem. ذَا [171, 293], and of [the advs.] مِنَ
[206] and [207]. And some ps. are pronounced with Imāla, vid. بَلِي [556], the voc. يَا [554], and [the neg.] لا in their saying لا إِمَا 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 حَتِّي [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 يا حَتِّي O youth and يا حَتِّي 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 عَسِي [403, 459] is excellent" (M, A) because it is a v., and its ل is converted from a ى [629], as is shown by عَسِيَّت and عَسِيَّت [462] (IY). The reason why the ps. are not pronounced with Imāla is only that their ل is not [converted] from a ى; nor is in the vicinity of a Kasra (A), in most cases, since the ل of عَسِي [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 ḥāṭṭī used as a name, because the fourth in the n. is converted into ی in the du. [229]; contrary to یلی used as a name, because you say in the du. یلی (Sn). And, according to this, the ی of یآ and یآر, and the ی and یا [of یطه and یح (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 ی [546] and ی [in being ps. (Sn)], the Imāla in them is intended to notify that they have become annexed to the ns., 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 یطیب two یtā's and یحبی یtwo یhā's. And similar is the Imāla of the letters of the alphabet,
[which are not in the initial monograms of the chapters (Sn),] as ب and ت and ث (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 [181] (Sn, MKh), [182] (Sn), and [183] (Sn), and [184], in the mode hereafter mentioned [648]; and upon such as XXVII. 25. [2,59,574] and [185] 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 أَمَا in the last [ex.] is not the cond. أَمَا [593]; but is [compounded of] the copulative أَمَّ [541] and the conjunct مَا [180], so that one pauses upon أَمَّ disjoined from مَا. And, as for ﷲ in XXVII. 25., according to the reading of Ks, with a single ي, it is an inceptive and premonitory p. [551]; while يَا is premonitory, or is a voc. p. whose voc. is suppressed [59]; and أَسْجَدُوا is an imp. v.; so that one pauses upon يَا disjoined from أَسْجَدُوا: 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 ي, it is the subjunctival أَنْ أَسْجَدُوا [571] incorporated into the red. لَا [566], for which reason the و of the aor. is dropped [405]; while the resultant inf. n. [497, 551] is the obj. of يَهْتَدُونَ, by suppression of the prep. [514], the sense being لَا يَهْتَدُونَ إِلَى أَسْجَدُوا 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 أَنْ, or upon لَا; not upon the و, 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 ن فِي الْدَارِيَّةُ [623], and تَقُولُوُ [Sn]; (2) quavering (A, Tsr, YS) as in أَقْلِيِّي الْفَوْمُ الْحَرُّ [608] (YS, Sn); (3) demanding precise information (A, YS); and asking for specification of a vague [indet.] (Sn), as in أَيْبِينَ [185] (YS, Sn), quiescent in the ن (Jh), and أَيْبِينَ; and in مَنُو [183, 497], مَنَا, and مَنُو (Sn); (4) disapproba-
tion (A, Tsr), as in أَرْبِدُّ مُنَيَّةً (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, conson-
ants 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 هَذَا زَيْدُ This is Zaid; the v., as يَصْبِرُ زَيْدُ Zaid strikes or ضَرَبُ struck; and the p., as يَجَرِ Yes [556] (IX). It has [eleven (Jrb, Tsr, Fk), or rather thirteen,] modes, [i.e., sorts of predicaments
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(R.,) (1) [bare (SH, Fk)] quiescence [below]: (2) Raum [below]: (3) Ishmām [below]: (4) substitution of the ! [640, 649]; (5) change of the [nominal (SH, Fk)] ʃ of femininization into s [646]: (6) addition of the ! [648]: (7) affixion of the s of silence [644, 648]: (8) [expression or (Tsr, Fk)] elision of the [ ʃ ] and (R, Tsr, Fk)] ʃ [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 Tanwîn into ʃ or ʃ [below]: (13) conversion of the ! into ʃ or ʃ 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 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

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 s of silence [No. 7], it is [only] to make the vowel plain 74a
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 ُالفتى the youth and ُحبلى pregnant; and [the defective not pronounced with Tanwīn (Sn),] as ُالقاضى 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 ı into ی or ی 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 ی of femininization into ی [646]. And each mode has a place, in which it is authorized; but sometimes two or more modes share in one place, as quiescence and Raum [below] share in the mobile (R). The modes will [now] be discussed in detail (A). The [word] paused upon is a n., v., or p.; and the n., when its final is a sound letter, and it is triptote, is in the nom., acc., or gen. (IY). Moreover the [n.] paused upon is sometimes pronounced, and sometimes not pronounced, with Tanwin (Tsr). If the final of the word be quiescent [below], as in كم [217] and من [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.] حُجَان [234, 246] and ۷َ۸۸ [234] (R). When you pause upon a [n.] pronounced with Tanwin [below] (Aud) and not made fem. with the ی [646], the Arabs have three dials., (1) elision of the Tanwin unrestrictedly, [i.e., in all three
cases,] which is the dial. of Rabi‘a [below] (Tsr); though apparently, says IA, this is not necessary in the dial. of Rabi‘a, since, in their poems, pause upon the acc. pronounced with Tanwin is often with ` (Sn): (2) change of the Tanwin unrestrictedly, into ` after Fatha, , after Damma, and ى after Kasra, which is the dial. of AlAzd [below]: (3) making a distinction between the [final] pronounced with] Fath and [the final pronounced with] any other [vowel] (Tsr). The most preponderant and frequent of the [three (Tsr)] dials. is that its Tanwin should be (1) elided after Damma and Kasra, [the letter before the Tanwin being made quiescent (Tsr),] as ُهُدَّا رَيْدَ This is Zaid and مُرْرَتْ بَرَيْدَ I passed by Zaid, [with quiescence of the ى in the two exs. (Tsr)]: and (2) changed into ` after Fatha, whether the Fatha be (a) inflectional, as in رَآيْتْ رَيْدَ I saw Zaid; or (b) un-inflectional, as in [i.q. إِنْكَفَّ مِنْيَا Desist (Tsr),] and زَبْعَا [187, 198] (Aud), i.q. آَمَّلَكْ I marvel (Tsr). And they assimilate ُنُذْنَ [594], with the ن , to the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, changing its ن into ` in pause. This is the saying of the majority: while some assert that pause upon it is with the ن , 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 ُضَلْنَ تُقْلِبْنا
XVIII. 19. And ye shall not ever prosper then with the I (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 t of femininization in the v. in إِنَّا أَبْدَا LIV. 1. The hour hath drawn nigh [607], and the ُنَ of ٌيَوْمَتِهِ 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 Tanwīn, according to those who change its Tanwīn into I [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 Tanwīn; and to the infl. 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 هذا حكم This is Hakam (M), and is made by S like this, خ (Tsr), meaning خيف It has become light (IY, R, A, Tsr), or خف imperceptibility, because the quiescent [letter] is lighter [and less perceptible] than any other (IY); but the author of the Aud finds fault with him, saying that it is only the head of a or م, either of which is abbreviated from Cut off [the vowel], or Make quiescent; and apparently it is the head of a abbreviated from إستريح 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 Tanwin, where the common dial. is conversion of the Tanwin into 1; though Rabi'a
[above] treat the acc. like the nom. and gen., as

by AlA‘sha Maimūn, praising kāis Ibn Ma‘dikarib, Unto the perfect man, Kāis, I prolong the nightly journeys; and I take from every tribe ties, i.e., safeconducts to another tribe, because in every tribe the poet had enemies whom he had satirized, or who hated the subject of his eulogy, properly عُصْبَة (AKB)] : and it is necessary in pause upon the s of femininization [646] (Aud), where the remaining modes are not practicable (Tsr) : (i) when the final of the word is Tanwīn [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 Tanwīn 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 Tanwīn 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 Tanwin, vid., by its conversion into l, since the l 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 ن alone (R): (2) Raum, which is stifling the sound of the vowel (Aud): (a) it is a feeble sound, as though you were desiring [to sound] the vowel (IY, Jrb); not completely achieving it, but slurring it over (IY, Jrb, Tsr); for a notification of the vowel in the o. f. (Jrb, Tsr), together with a realization of part of the object of the pause (Jrb): so says Jrb (Tsr); (b) it is not confined to any particular vowel; but (Tsr) is allowable in all the vowels, contrary to the opinion of Fr, who disallows it in the case of Fatḥa, and whose opinion is adopted by most of the [Seven (Tsr)] Readers (Aud), while AHm agrees with them in the disallowance (Tsr): (c) when the [final] pronounced with Fath has Tanwin, as in زِدَّاٰ and رَجْلاٰ, 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 رَأْخُدْ مِنْ آخٰمٰ [above]: but, when it has no Tanwin, as in أَحْمَدٰ and أَرْجْلٰ, the opinion of the Readers, and of Fr among the GG, is that Raum of the Fatḥa in it is not allowable, because Fath is impartible, on account of its lightness, its part being its whole; while, according to S and other GG, Raum is allowable in it, as in the nom. and gen. (R): (d) the sign of Raum is a line in front of [below] the letter (S, M, R, A, Tsr), like this،(Tsr), as Hُدُدٰ خَالٰدٰ
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 (Tsr): (b) it is really the indication of the vowel by the lips, after quiescence, without emission of any [audible (Tsr)] 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 (Tsr); 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 (Tsr): (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 Đamm: for the instrument of Đamm 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 Đamm] 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 ı, 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, • (A, Tsr), as جعفر 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 جَرَم sign of quiescence; as the sign of Raum [above] is not above it, to dispel the notion that is a نصبة sign of the acc. (Sn): (f) the derivation of Ishmām is from
smell, as though you made the consonant smell a whiff of the vowel, by preparing the organ to pronounce it (Tsr): (g) the object of it is to distinguish what [is mobile in continuity, but (Tsr)] is made quiescent in pause, from what is quiescent (A, Tsr) in every state (Tsr); (h) according to IH (R), the majority hold that there is no Raum or Ishmām in [three forms (Jrb),] the s of femininization [646], the m of the pl., and the accidental vowel (SH): but I have not seen one of the Readers or GG mention that Raum or Ishmām is allowable in any of the three [forms] mentioned: on the contrary, all of them disallow both [modes] in these [forms], unrestrictedly: and I believe that what makes IH fancy that Raum and Ishmām are allowed in them is that Sht, after saying

[And, in a s of femininization, and the m of the pl., and an accidental vowel, say, they (the pron. referring to Raum and Ishmām) are not to be applied. And, i the s 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 اَلْهَاءْ]
while, if قَبِلْهَا were said, it would be plainer) is Damm or Kasr formed, or their bases, aٰ, and aُ, as in عُقْلُةٌ II.70. They have understood it, ُتُ شَرْوَةٌ XII.20. And they sold him, and إِسْمَةٌ II.108. His Name, and in II.1. About it, ِٰلِلْ أِلْيَمٍ II.26. Unto Him, and ِٰمُنْ رَبّهُ فِي II.35. From his Lord (AAK), adds: َوَبَعْضُمُ يُرِى لَهَّامُ فِى كُلِّ حَالِ مُكَحَّلًا

[While some of them, like AdDani 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 ُ of feminization, and the ِ of the pl., and the accidental vowel, and the ُ 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 ُ of the [attached sing.] masc. [pron.] alone", as will be seen [648]: (i) the reason why Raum and Ishmām are not allowable in the ُ of feminization [642] is that on the ُ there is no vowel to be notified by Raum or Ishmām, the vowel being only on the ُ for which the ُ is a subst.; and, on that account, they are allowable according to those who pause upon the ُ without conversion, as in بَلْ جَوَّرَ تَبيِّهَةٌ الْحُجَّةٌ [183, 646]: (j) as for the ِ of the
the majority hold that it should be made quiescent in continuity [161], as مَلَكُهُمْ and مَلِكُكُمْ; 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 ا, the reason why they do not employ Raum or Ishmām, after elision of the ا or ا [in pause], as Raum of the Kasra in الْقُلُبِيُّ is employed after elision of its ا [643], is that this Kasra does sometimes occur at the end of the word in continuity, as in يومْ يَدْعُ الْذَاعُ. On the day when the summoner [Isrāfīl (K, B), or Gabriel (K),] shall summon, [which is read (K) with elision of the ا (K, B), for the sake of lightness (B)]; whereas مَلَكُهُمْ and مَلِكُكُمْ, when you conjoin them with a mobile after them, do not occur with Damma [and Kasr, respectively] of the م, [i.e.,] with the mobile, and the conj. elided; while Raum or Ishmām of a vowel, that is never a final in continuity, cannot be employed [in pause]: and, as for such as مَلِكُهُمْ الْكِتَابَ VI. 114. [77] and مَلِكُكُمْ الْبَلَاتِيْكَة VI.111. [585], the final of the word in their case is the ا and ا 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 مَلِكُهُمْ and مَلِكُكُمْ, according to the reading of Ibn Kathir [161]:
while, if we say that, before that, they were مِلْکُمْ and مِلْهِمْ, with quiescence of the م in both, then the Kasr and Damm are accidental, on account of the two quiescents; and there is no Raum or Ishmām in the accidental vowel [below], as مِنْ يَشَا ٱللَّهُ يُضْلِلْهُ VI. 39. Whomsoever God willeth [to lead astray (B)], him doth He lead astray, and وَلَقَدْ أُسْتَهَرَّى بِرَسُولِ ۖ مِنْ تُبْلِكَ VI. 10. And assuredly Apostles before thee have been mocked at, because Raum and Ishmām belong only to the vowel understood in pause; while the vowel supervening on account of the two quiescents occurs only in continuity; so that, not being understood in pause, it cannot be notified [by Raum or Ishmām] (R): (k) the accidental vowel is the vowel of the concurrence of two quiescents [664], as in XCVIII. 1. [450], وَعَصَّوا أَرْسُولَ IV. 45. And disobeyed the Apostle, and نَلَّيْنَىَّ ٱلْإِنسَانُ LXXX. 24. Then let man look; and in يُوُجِّمُلِ يَمَّٰلَى [above] (MAR): and the reason why there is no Raum or Ishmām 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. (Tsr),] as هَذَا خَالِدُ This is
Khalid and ُهُوَ يَبْعَلْ He makes (Aud), with reduplication of the ِد in خَالِدَ (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 a ُش (S, M, R, A) above the letter (IY, R, A), as ُهُدُ شَرْج ِشَدٌ. This is Faraj (M); this being the initial of strong (IY, R, A), or ُشَدَ It has become strong (IY), or ُشَدَ 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 ُمُسْتَطَر*LIV. 53. Recorded* [in the Tablet (K, B)], in the Chapter of the Moon (Tsr): (f) it is a Sa'di *dialect*; (g) its conditions are five matters, vid. that the [letter (Tsr)] paused upon should not be (a) a Hamza [642], as in ُحَطْاُ رَشْاُ young gazelle (Aud), because the Hamza in the position of the ِد is not incorporated, nor incorporated into [737] (Tsr); (b-d) a ِيِ, as in the judge, aُ , as in يُدْعَوُ calls, or an !
as in يَخْشَى dreads (Aud), because of the heaviness of the unsound letter [642] (Ts'r); (e) immediately after quiescence, as in زَيْد Zaid and عُمَرْ 'Amr (Aud), lest three quiescents be combined, the penultimate, the incorporated, and the [letter] paused upon (Ts'r); (h) reduplication occurs in the nom. and gen., unrestrictedly: and, as for the acc., if it be pronounced with Tanwîn, the only [mode] allowable in it is conversion of the Tanwîn into I [above], except according to the dial. of Rabî'a [above], who allow elision of the Tanwîn, in which case there is no disallowance of reduplication; but, if it be not pronounced with Tanwîn, as رَأَيتُ النَّجْد I saw the man, لْنِ يَجَعَلُ He shall not make; and رَأَيتُ أَحْمَد 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 Tanwîn and the [final] pronounced with Fath (R): (j) such as القَصَبَا [in the saying of the poet. أَوَّلَ كَنْ بَرْيِقَيْ آخَرُ (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 \( \text{I}, \text{J}, \text{A} \), and \( \text{A} \), 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

\[ \text{فَقَأَبِلَكَ مِنْ ذَكَرِي حَيْبِي رَ مَنْزِي} \]

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

\[ \text{آَذَتُنَّا يَبَعُبَيْنِهَا أَسْمَاءَوْ رَبَّ تَكُرُّ يَبَعَلُ مِنْهُ أَلْتَرَاءَوُ} \]

(R), by [Al Ḥarīth (EM)] Ibn Ḥillīza [al Yashkuri (EM), The beloved (N)] Asmā has announced to us her intention of departing. Many a sojourner there is, of whose sojourning one is wearied! (EM, N), whereas you do not say جَاءْتَنِي أَسْمَئْوُ Asmā has come to
me [642]; and you say in poetry لَجِلَضِي and لَجِلَضُو, whereas in prose that is not allowable in any of the dials.; 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 ی of the conj. after the ی of the pron., whereas in prose that is not allowable when the ی of the pron. is paused upon, as جَاءَنِي غَلَامَة 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 ی to be mobilized in such as

[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 أَوَ كَالْكِحَالِبِيْنِي آلِمْ [below] is orig. quiescent, but is mobilized for the sake of the letter of unbinding, as the د of آذَّرَبِينَ 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. خَمْرُ الْآنَدَرِينَ, where three s are combined, so that they are lightened by poetic license, or the wines of the Andarûn, said to be cities in Syria abounding in wines (EM),] ought to be quiescent, as in مَرْتُ بَالْسُلْسِلَتِينَ. 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 الشَكْرَتَي the tree, with the followed by the conj. ; but the شَكْرَة occurs, with the quiescent [646]; while the شَكْرَتَي is frequent only in the poems of post-classical [poets]: and, according to this theory, the saying the القصبًا [below] is not “an anomalous poetic license” [above]; as the mobilization of the in the saying رُفَانَ [above] and the mobilization of the in the saying

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

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 لَقَصَبَא and عَيْبِهِلِ Jaʿfar came to me, and of يَجَعَلَ جَآءَنِي جَعَفَر [above]: (R) : but [J: b 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 Tanwîn in such as

تَتَرَكْ مَا أَبْقَى أَلْدَبَا سَبْسَبًا [above], because the letter of its inflection ought to be mobile in pause, its Tanwîn 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 Rabîʿa [above] (R) : (5) transfer of the vowel of the letter [paused upon] to that which is before it, as in the reading [of IAl (Tsr)] CIII. 3.
And enjoined, one upon another, patience, [with transfer of the Kasra to the ب(Tsr)]; and the saying [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 ع 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 concurrence of two quiescents is allowable in pause (MKh): (c) its sign is the absence of sign (A).

§. 641. Its conditions are five [or rather six (Tsr)] matters, (1) that the penultimate should be quiescent, [in order that it may receive the vowel transferred, because the mobile does not receive another vowel (Tsr)]: (2-3) that mobilization of that quiescent should not be impracticable, [as in the case of the † and the incorporated letter, which do not receive a vowel (Tsr)]; and should not sound heavy, [as in the case of the ، and ى, to which the vowel is not transferred, on account of the heaviness (Tsr)]: (4) that the vowel [intended to be transferred
(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 Fath was [orig.] accompanied by Tanwin, the transfer [of its Fatha] would entail elision of the ı 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 (1) This is Ja'far, because of the mobility of the penultimate [642]: (2) human being and ı is hard, because the ı [in (Tsr)] and the incorporated letter [in (Tsr)] do not receive a vowel, [since they are necessarily quiescent, except that the quiescence of the ı is constitutional, while the quiescence of the incorporated is accidental (Tsr)]: (3) says and sells, because a vowel would sound heavy upon the preceded by a [letter] pronounced with Damm [in (Tsr)], and upon the ı 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,
on account of their strength; while, Fatḥa being light, they pardon its elision: so says Jrb (Tsr): but that [transfer of Fatḥa (Tsr)] is allowed by the KK [below] (Aud, A), and, [according to the author of the Aud (Sn),] by Akh [below] (Aud, Sn), unrestrictedly (Sn), for the sake of uniformity in the cat. (Tsr); and it is reported of Jr that he allows it, [unrestrictedly; like the KK (Sn)]; and of Akh [above] that he allows it in the [n.] pronounced with Tanwīn, according to the dial. of those who say رَأَيَتْ بَكْر I saw Bakr (A), vid. Rabī‘a [640], because the preceding objection [as to its entailing elision of the] substituted for the Tanwīn] is absent, according to the dial. of these (Sn): (5) "能看出 عِلَمْ This is knowledge, because in Arabic there is no [368], with Kasr of its first [letter], and Damm of its second (Aud): (6) عَزْر and طَبْئِ (643), because the [final which the vowel is] transferred from is not sound (Tsr). The last two conditions [mentioned by IHsh, vid. that the vowel should not be Fatḥa, and that the transfer should not lead to an unprecedented formation (Tsr),] are peculiar to [the n. whose final is] other than Hamza: so that transfer is allowable in such as (1) آلْذِي يُخْرِجُ الْخَبَى XXVII. 25. Who bringeth forth the hidden, [where you say (Tsr),] though the vowel is Fatḥa, [because, if you said with quiescence, without transfer, you
would find it sound manifestly heavy (Tsr)]: (2) 

This is a buttress, [where you say ممکنًا with Kasr of the 
, and Damm of the (Tsr),] although the transfer leads to the formation فَعَلٌ [above] (Aud), because the Hamza is heavy; and, when the preceding [letter] is quiescent, the utterance of the [quiescent (A)] Hamza is difficult (Tsr). The opinion of the KK [above] is that pause with transfer is allowable, whether the vowel be Fatha, Damma, or Kasra, and whether the final be Hamza or any other letter; so that, according to them, you say رَأَيتِ الْفَضْرَةَ I saw the striking and رَأَيتُ الْفَضْرَةَ I saw the buttress; while the opinion of the BB is that transfer is not allowable when the vowel is Fatha, except when the final is Hamza; so that, according to them, رَأَيتُ الْفَضْرَةَ is allowable, while رَأَيتِ الْفَضْرَةَ is disallowed: but the opinion of the KK is better, because they have transmitted it from the Arabs (IA). Those who do not authorize فَعَلٌ [368], with Damma [on its first (Tsr)], and then Kasra [on its second (Tsr)], but assert that دَلَلُ weasel is transferred from the v., do not allow transfer [of the vowel] in such as بَفَعَلُ by a lock, because, after the transfer, it becomes بَفَعَلُ with Damm of the ت, and Kasr of the ب: but allow it in such as بَفَعَلُ with slowness, because the final is Hamza (Aud); while
unprecedentedness [of formation] in transfer from the Hamza is pardonable, because of the heaviness of the Hamza (Tsr). This is the *dial.* of many of the Arabs, among them Asad and [most of] *Tamīm* (IY, A), who, in the case of [the *n.* whose final is] Hamza, make no distinction between Fathā, and Ḍamm or Kasr, of the initial; but say ُهَذَا الْبَطُور This is slowness and ُمِنَ الْبَطِيْرِ from slowness [*642*, ٌهَذَا الْبَطُور This is the buttress [*642*] and ُمَرَّتْ بِالْبُطِيرِ I passed by the buttress, as they say ُهَذَا الْبَخْبَر This is the hidden [and ُمَرَّتْ بِالْبُخْبِرِ I passed by the hidden (M)]: and do not avoid reduction to the formation ُفَعْل, which has no precedent in the language, or ُفَعْل, 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 Ḍanma (IY, Jrb), as ُهَذَا أَلْبِرْدُî with two Kasras,
and with two Ğammās [642] (M, Jrb, MASH): while some of them alliterate; but, after alliteration, change the Hamza [into a letter homogeneous with the alliterative vowel before it (Sn)], saying ّٰٓا ۡدٰی ۡمٰا ۡتٰر This is a buttress with another to match it (A). And similarly [they alliterate] in the case of the n. whose final is not Hamza (IY, R), though [Z or] IH does not mention it, the difference being that, in the case of the n. whose final is Hamza, the leading to a discarded formation is pardoned ; so that this is allowable, as alliteration is allowable. The pause of the people of 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 ّٰٓا ۡلٰخَب 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 Hijāzīs,
[when they transfer (Tsr),] do not elide the Hamza (A, Tsr), because they are eager to keep the inflection from disappearing (Tsr). Transfer is authorized in the nom. and gen., by common consent (R). The Rājiz says [498, 640], meaning (Mb); [and] the poet says

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

The strings of the bows and the hairy hands drove them, the arrows being sixty, as though they were live coals, meaning (M). As for the acc., (1) if the n. be pronounced with Tanwin, transfer is not authorized in it, except in the dial. of Rabra [above], because of their eliding the Fatha also: (2) if it be not pronounced with Tanwin, transfer is (a) disallowed by S, who says "They do not say رَأِبَةُ ٱللَّبَّكَرُ," [“because it is in the position of Tanwin” (S), which is
understood by R to mean] "on the ground that the art. is accidental, the o. f. being Tanwîn, so that the [n.] made det. by the art. is in the predicament of the [n.] pronounced with Tanwîn"; [and by IUK and others to mean that the acc. not pronounced with Tanwîn is made to accord with the acc. pronounced with Tanwîn, for the sake of uniformity]; (b) allowed by others than S, because the acc. not pronounced with Tanwîn 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 Tanwîn 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 Tanwîn is like the acc. not pronounced with Tanwîn 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 مَضِيْ أَمْسٍ [201] is not said, nor مِنْ بَعْدَ مَنْ قَبَلَ [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 pre-eminence 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
Damma to that quiescent is allowable, [as] in مَنْ and
َعَنَّ, for the sake of making the Damma plain (R). The
poet [Ziyād alA‘jam (S, IY)] says

(S, Mb, M, K on IV. 101, R, A) I marvelled (and
fortune, much is its marvelling!) at an ‘Anāzī that
reviled me, while I smote him not (N), meaning
َلَمْ أَضْرَبْ (Mb, A, N), with quiescence of the ب, and
Damm of the ١ (N); and Abu -nNajm says

\[\text{فَقَرَبَنَّ هَٰذَا وَهَذَا رَجَلُهُ} \]

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

\[\text{حَابِيِّسِي رَبَع وَقَفُتُ بِهِ لَّوْ أُطِبَعْ أَلْنَفْسَ لِمْ أَرُمَةُ} \]

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 ى [elided in أُرُمَ], when the م becomes mobile, because
its vowel does not really belong to it, but is only the
vowel of the ١ (Mb). And some of the Banū ‘Adī, of
Tamīm, mobilize the letter before the ١ with Kasr, on
account of the two quiescents, saying ضَرِّبَتْ 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 t, 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 لَخَمْ (A). And it is said in the Nihāya "For جَرَّةَ He struck him you say جَرَّةَ in poetry; and the vulgar use it in prose" (TsH). It is allowable to pause upon a single letter, like [the ف and (MAR)] the aoristic letter, which is then conjoined with a Hamza followed immediately by an ی; but sometimes is restricted to the ی: 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., إن شَرَا فَأَنْ تَأْنَيْنَا إِلاَّ أَنْ تَشَايْنَا: and it is sometimes related and نَأَنْ تَأْنَا : and though another ی were added to the ی, like the impletion of Fatha; and then the first, being mobilized because of the two quiescents, were converted into Hamza, as in دَآْبَة [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 ] in 'Amr and بكر 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 Fatha, Damma or Kasra; whereas they do not transfer the Fatha [641] of any other letter to what precedes it: (2) throw upon the preceding [letter] the Damma of the Hamza in the case of the tril. pronounced with Kasr of the ف , as هدا ألا ردو.
[641]; and its Kasra in the case of the tril. pronounced with Damm of the ف، as مِّنَ الْبُطَّرِ [641]; although, by this transfer, the two expressions are transformed into a discarded measure; nor do they mind that, because this measure is a temporary accident, not the original constitution of the word: whereas that is not done by them in the case of any [final] other than Hamza; so that they do not say مِّنَ الْبُطَّرِ هُدَا عَدْنِل This is a counterpoise, nor مِّنَ الْبُطَّرِ from the full-grown unripe dates. All of that [transfer of vowels] is because of their dislike that the Hamza should be quiescent when preceded by a quiescent. And, where the inflection is thus transferred to what precedes the Hamza, Raum and Ishmām do not occur, because they serve to make the vowel plain, while that is already realized by the transfer. But, even in the case of the Hamza, some of the Banū Tamīm avoid the two discarded measures, notwithstanding their being accidental; and therefore abandon transfer of the vowel in what leads to them, i.e., the tril. pronounced with Kasr or Damm of the ف; but, in both [formations], make [the vowel of] the ا imitate [that of] the ف، in the three cases, [nom., acc., and gen.] saying مَرْتُ بِالْبُطَّرِ هُدَا الْبُطَّرِ، and مَرْتُ بِالْبُطَّرِ هُدَا الْبُطَّرِ، and رَآيتُ الْبُطَّرِ [641]. For, since they see that, in the gen. of بُطَّر، and the nom. of رَذِ، transfer leads
to the two discarded measures, they make [the vowel of] the َاء imitate [that of] the َب in the gen. of َبَطُر, and in the nom. of َرُبّن; 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 َاء imitate [that of] the َب in the three cases. And, besides quiescence, in these two [formations], where [the vowel of] the َاء is made to imitate [that of] the َب, 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 َاء to [that of] the َب; so that it needs to be made plain. Some of the Arabs are not content with making the Hamza plain, by means of what we have mentioned; but seek more than that. They are of two kinds:—(1) some elide, and do not transfer, the vowel of the Hamza; and afterwards convert the Hamza into an unsound letter homogeneous with its vowel, saying َهَذَا َرُطُّو This is the bruise and َهُسَرَُتْ ِبَلَوُّثي slowness and َرُطُو ِبَطُر the buttress, and َبَٰيُ لَرُدّي ِبَلَبُطُثِي, with quiescence of the َاء in the whole [of them]: while, in the acc., quiescence of the letter before the ِل not being possible, since the ِل occurs only after Fatha, they say َرَأَّيُ ِبَطُثًا and َرَأَّيُ ِبَطُثًا [below], with transfer and conversion; so that here the
Hamza is made plain by its conversion into ۲, as some make the ۲ in حُبِّي plain by its conversion into Hamza [643], because [here] the ۲ 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 ۲: (2) some transfer the vowels to the ۲ in the whole [of these formations]; and afterwards regulate the Hamza, in respect of conversion, by the vowel of what precedes it, saying أَُوْدُوُّ عَدَّا الْبُطُوُّ and and رَأَيْتُ بَعْضُ الْهَدَاءِ and and مَرَّتُ بَعْضُ الْهَدَاءِ and and الْرَّدُّ and الْوَنَّا and الْبُطُوُّ [above]. This conversion, however, is not an alleviation of the Hamza, as in بِيَّر well, رَأْس head, and مُؤُمِّنَ مُؤُمِّنَ 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 رَأَيْتُ الْبُطُوُّ حَدَّا الْبُطُوُّ and and مَرَّتُ بَعْضُ الْهَدَاءِ and and رَأَيْتُ الْرَّدُّ حَدَّا الْرَّدُّ and and مَرَّتُ بَعْضُ الْهَدَاءِ , making the ۲ inseparable from the first [formation], and the ۲ from the second. And, in the case of these [formations], whose ۲ 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
3 of femininization [640]. All of this is when the
letter preceding the Hamza is quiescent. But, if it be
mobile, as in ُ RSA young gazelle, أُmarried mushrooms, and
أُؤثبي [below], you pause upon such a formation as you
pause upon جـُ he-camel, ُّـُ man, and كـُliver, with-
out 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 Fath, some of the Arabs, I
mean, of those who sound [the Hamza] true, regulate it
[in respect of conversion] by its own vowel, from eager-
ness to make [the Hamza] plain, because they account
the Fatha [on the penultimate], by reason of its lightness,
to be like the non-existent, so that it does not serve to
make [the Hamza] properly plain; and therefore they say
This is fresh herbage, I saw fresh
herbage, I passed by fresh herbage, [with
Fath of the J, and quiescence of the, and ى (Sn),] con-
verting the Hamza pronounced with Damm into , the
Hamza pronounced with Fath into !, and the Hamza
pronounced with Kasr into ى, because, after Fatha, the
unsound letters are not considered heavy, when quiescent.
But, when the letter before the Hamza is pronounced with Damm, as in أَكْبُرُ, or Kasr, as in أَهْمُي [below], it is not possible to regulate the Hamza [in respect of conversion] by its own vowel, because the ِ does not occur after Damma or Kasra, nor the quiescent ُ after Damma, nor the quiescent َ after Kasra; and moreover the Damma and Kasra [on the penultimate] manage to make [the Hamza] properly plain: so that they retain the two Hamzases in their [original] state, [saying أَكْبُرُ and أَهْمُي]; 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 Hijāzīs], 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 أَلْحَبُ and أَبْطَ and أَبْطَ; and here quiescence, Raum, Ishmām, and reduplication [641] occur: while, in the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, the Tanwin is converted into ِ as أَلْحَبُ and أَبْطَ and أَبْطَ. (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 أَلْحَبِ, in the three cases; اَ and
and a  in the sound [640] (R). The people of AlHijáz 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 Fath; so that it is [converted into (IY),] like [the Hamza in] head [658] (M) and 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 or , respectively; so that (IY)] they say for (above] (M, A); and for I give (M), from gave to the man, aor. , i. q. (IY); and for full (A); being (IY) like pounce-box, and [ like (IY)] wolf [658] (M).

§. 643. The unsound n. is that which has for its final an unsound letter, vid. a, or or (697); and what precedes these letters is either quiescent or mobile (IY). When the final is unsound, and the penultimate is quiescent,
[which occurs, only with the or ٰ (IY),] like the final of ُ تُنَبَّي gazelle [and ُ صُبْيَي boy (IX), and of ُ دُلْو bucket [and ُ وَعَدَي enemy, not with the !, because what precedes the ! 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 Banū 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 ُنُبْيَي for ُنُبْيَي Fukaima [311], ُنُبْيَي for ُنُبْيَي Tamimi, and ُنُبْيَي for ُنُبْيَي Ali: the poet says ُحَالِي عَرْفَ فِ عَلَيْ عَلِيّ Alī [694], meaning ُعَلَيْ عَلِيَ ٓأَلَّهَ (IY). [When the penultimate of the unsound n. is mobile, the n. 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 ُي, as when you use the aor. of ُنَعَي fulfilled or ُرَعَي stored up as a [proper] name, in which case you say [in the nom. (Tsr)] ُهَذَا يَعِي This is Yafî and ُهَذَا يَعِي This is Yafî, [and in the gen. ُمَرَّتْ يَعِي I passed by
Yajl and by Ya' (Tsr), with expression [of the in the nom. and gen. of both (Tsr)], because their o. f. is [482, 644, 699]; and then their ف is elided, [on account of its occurrence between a ي pronounced with Fath and a Kasra (Tsr)]; so that, if their J 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 ا, as in act. part. of shewed: for its o. f. is نـ on the measure of مـ; and then the vowel of its ا, vid. the Hamza, is transferred to the [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 (Tsr), its ا being elided, because of its concurrence, when quiescent, with Tanwin (Sn): and the ا, [which is its J (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 ا and its J, and [from] its being left with a single quiescent rad. (Tsr); so that you say هـا مـ: This is a shewer (IA, A): (3) when it is an acc., whether it be pronounced with Tanwin, as in III. 190. Our Lord, verily, we have heard a summoner; or not, as in گـإذا بـلُغت.
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 \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) must be expressed in both [exs., as \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) and \( \text{\textasciitilde} \)], because it is fortified [against elision] in the first by the \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) of the Tanwîn, and in the second by \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) (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 Tanwîn, its \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) is made quiescent, as \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) I saw the judge; and, if it be pronounced with Tanwîn, an \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) is substituted for its Tanwîn, as \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) I saw a judge (Jrb). If, however, the defective be a nom. or gen., its \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) 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 Tanwîn, [there is a dispute as to which of the two modes is preferable: and, according to S (Tsr),] the preferable [mode] is elision, as \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) This is a judge and \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) I passed by a judge (Aud): This is the opinion of S and the moderns, because the \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) is not expressed in continuity; so that, when pause upon the defective is intended, its vowel and its Tanwîn are elided, by analogy to the sound: and because, pause being the place of rest, it is not fitting that what is not
found in continuity should be put in it: so says YS (Sn): [or] because the Tanwin, which is the necessitating cause of elision [16], is constructively remaining (Jrb, Fk). But [ and ] are allowable, with expression of the , which is preferred by Y; and, in accordance therewith (Tsr),] Ibn Kathir reads XIII. 8. And every people hath a guide, XIII. 12. Nor have they, beside Him, any protector (Aud), and XVI. 98. [2], with expression of the in [all of] them (Tsr); [for] some do not elide it, from regard to the fact that Tanwin is not in the word (Jrb). And in the [defective] not pronounced with Tanwin, [vid. the synarthrous (Tsr),] the preferable [mode] is expression [of the ] (Tsr), as This is the judge and I passed by the judge (Aud). But pause with elision is allowable, as and ; and, in accordance therewith is the pause of the majority [of the Readers] upon and XIII. 10. The Great, the High [645] and XL. 15. That He, [or it, or he (K, B),] may give warning of the day of meeting, [i.e., of resurrection (K, B),] where Ibn Kathir pauses with [expression of] the ; according to the preferable mode. The argument of
those who, in the state of pause, express the \( \ddot{\text{i}} \) in the [defective] pronounced with Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n is that its elision is allowable only on account of the Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n [16]; while in pause there is no Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n, so that the \( \ddot{\text{i}} \) must return. And the argument of those who elide it in the [defective] not pronounced with Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n is that the pause is assumed to be upon the indet., with elision of the \( \ddot{\text{i}} \) and Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n; and the art. to be then prefixed to it, after elision of the \( \ddot{\text{i}} \). But the argument of the first is stronger (Tsr). The [defective (Tsr)] not pronounced with Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n is of four sorts (A, Tsr), (1) that whose Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n falls off because of the prefixion of \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) [609] (Tsr), [i. e.] the synarthrous (A), which has been mentioned above (Tsr): (2) that whose Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n falls off because of its being put into the voc. [48], as in \( \text{يَا قَاضِي} O \) judge, in which case expression [of the \( \ddot{\text{i}} \)] 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 Tan\( \text{w} \)\( \text{i} \)n falls off because of diptote declension [17], in which case, if it be an acc., as \( \dddot{\text{رَآيُت}} \) \( \text{جَوارَي} I \) saw maidens [18], it is paused upon with expression of the
\( \text{[necessarily (Sn),] as above mentioned, in [the discussion of pause upon] the [defective when it is an] acc. (A, Tsr);} \) 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 millstone, 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! (IY). The abbreviated pronounced with Tanwin is paused upon with the! (Jrb, MN, A,
Tsr), which must be expressed, in the three cases (Tsr), as I saw a youth [below] (MN, A). The GG dispute about this I (IY, R). As to this I 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 I [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 I” (IM)], because the Tanwin is after a Fatha (A): (2) that it is the converted I, in the three cases; that the Tanwin is elided; and that, when it is elided, the I returns: this is transmitted from IA1, 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 I in pause, [as in LXXV. 36. neglected, with Imāla, in the reading of Hamza and Ks (Sn); and by the I’ 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 Rajiz [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 سُرَى (MN, Sn), because سُرَى is pronounced with Tanwīn (MN); not in الْفَتَى [below], because it is not pronounced with Tanwīn (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 Tanwīn, and in the nom. and gen. a subst. for the ُ of the word: this is the opinion of S [below] (MN, A, Tsr), as reported by most (A, Tsr); and [is said to be the opinion (A, Tsr)] of the great majority of GG (MN, A, Tsr)]; and is adopted by F [below] (MN, A), except in the Tadhkira, where he takes to agreement with Mz [above] (A). But what is [last] ascribed to S is not intelligible from his language, since he says "As for the ِ that goes away in continuity, it is not elided in pause, because the Fatha and the ِ are lighter. Do you not see them flee to the ِ from the ِ preceded by a letter pronounced with Fathā [684]?
And sometimes they flee to it from the \( \text{ر} \) or \( \text{ى} \) preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as \( \text{ذ ما ر} \) and \( \text{ذ ما ن} \) (S, IY), for \( \text{ذ ما ر} \) and \( \text{ذ ما ن} \) (IY).

And he also says that they lighten \( \text{ع ح م} \) [368, 408] and \( \text{ع ح م} \) [368, 468, 482] by eliding the vowel of their \( \text{ع} \) s; but do not elide the vowel of the \( \text{ع} \) in \text{ج م ل} \( \text{ح-ق} \) \( \text{ر} \) (R), because of the lightness of Fatha (IY). Sf [above] says, which is the truth, "This passage indicates that the opinion of S is that the \( \text{ى} \), which is expressed in pause, is the very one which was elided in continuity".

The meaning, I say, of S's language is (1) that, when you say \( \text{م ر ت} \) \( \text{ب ق أ} \) [above], you elide in pause the \( \text{ى} \) that you elided in continuity on account of the two quiescents [16]; although one of the two quiescents, vid. the Tanwin, has disappeared; and that because its disappearance is accidental: while, if the \( \text{ى} \) and Kasra were not elided in pause, the word, in the state of pause, would remain of a heavy aspect, according to them; although it would be lighter than it is in continuity, because the \( \text{ى} \), in every state, is lighter than Tanwin: but (2) that, in the abbreviated, you restore in pause, in the three cases, the \( \text{ى} \) elided on account of the two quiescents, because the last quiescent, vid. the Tanwin, has disappeared, [such restoration being] because the \( \text{ى} \) is lighter than every [other] light [letter]. In the
abbreviated, then you consider the disappearance of the Tanwin, notwithstanding its being accidental, because the consideration of it conduces to making the state of pause the lightest possible. But, in the defective, you do not consider that accidental [disappearance of Tanwin], because the consideration of it would conduce to making [the word in] the state of pause assume a heavy aspect. And you see how general—in the nom., acc., and gen. —S makes the restoration of the I, 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) al-Idāh (HKh). The fruit of this dispute appears in parsing: for, on the theory that the I is a subst. for the Tanwin, the abbreviated is infl. with vowels assumed upon the I elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and, on the theory that the I is converted from the [أ] or [ى], the abbreviated is infl. with vowels assumed upon the [I] present, because it is then the seat of inflection (Sn). As for the abbreviated stripped of Tanwin, like the youth [above], the I in pause is the one that was in it in continuity, without dispute; and is sometimes elided by poetic license, as

\[
\text{ذَيْبُ مِنْ نَكْيَرُ شَاهِدَ} \quad * \quad \text{رَعَطُ مَرْجُومٍ وَرَعَطُ أَبِي الْمَعَلَّ}
\]

80 a
[645, 648] (R), by Labid [Ibn Rab’ra al’Amirî (MN)],

*When a clan of Lukaiz was present, the kinsfolk of Marjûm, and the kinsfolk of Ibn AlMu’alla*, where he elides the doubling and the ! 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 ! is not elided, except in poetic license, as in رَتْبِيِّلُ آلِ اِبْنِ أَلْمُعِلْلِيُّ[above], meaning اِبْنِ أَلْمُعِلْلِيُّ آلِ آلِ اِبْنِ أَلْمُعِلْلِيُّ (A). As for the diptote, like حُبِّلْيِي سَكَرَى and حُبِّلْيِي سَكَرَى [18, 272], and what has no Tanwîn affixed to it, like اللَّعْصَا and للَّعْصَا [16, 326], its !, vid. the original !, which was [sounded] in continuity, is retained, because there is no Tanwin in it, for which the ! might be a subst. (IY). The ! paused upon has [four] *dial. vars.*, (1) retention of its form; which is the best known *dial.*; (2) conversion into ي, because ي is plainer than !; which is the *dial.* of Fazâra and some of Kais: (3) conversion into ه, because ه is plainer than ي; which is the *dial.* of some of Tayyi: (4) conversion into همزة [642], because همزة is the sister of the ! [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 !, or from the ! substituted for the Tanwîn, according to the different opinions before mentioned.
This is a pregnant (female), with the Hamza, meaning حُبْلَةٍ حُبْلَةٍ. I saw a man [below], meaning رَآيتُ رَجُلًا، where the Hamza in رَجُلًا is a subst. for the I, 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 رَجُلًا is substituted for the I, not for the Tanwin, is that you say رَآيتُ حُبْلَةٍ I saw a pregnant (female), pronouncing with Hamza, although there is no Tanwin in it; and for that reason اَهْوَيْضَرَبُهَا He strikes her [below] is transmitted (IY). Conversion of the I [substituted for the Tanwin (Jrb)] into Hamza, [as in رَآيتُ رَجُلًا (Jrb),] is [of] weak authority: as [likewise (Jrb)] is conversion of every [other (R)] I (SH) into Hamza (Jrb), whether it be for femininization, as in حُبْلَةٍ (R, Jrb); or co-ordination, as in مُعَرَّى 273, 375 (R); or anything else (R, Jrb), as in عَصَمَ (Jrb), [and] as in يَضْرَبُهَا [above], where some of the Arabs convert it into Hamza (R). And so is conversion of the I of [femininization in (Jrb)] such as حُبْلَةٍ into Hamza, or ى, or ى (SH), where IH’s saying “Hamza” is not needed, with his [previous] saying “conversion of every I” into Hamza (R). All of this is in pause: for, when you continue, you say قُوَّةٌ يَضْرَبُهَا 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 J is unsound, is with retention of its finals [without elision (IY)], as, [in the ind. (IY),] يُغَرِّرُهُ يَرَمِي He raids, يُذْخِشُهُ يَرَمِي He throws [645] (M), and يُذْخِشُهُ يَرَمِي He dreads; and similarly, in the subj., لَنْ يُغَرِّرُهُ لَنْ يَرَمِي He shall not raid, and لَنْ يَذْخِشُهُ لَنْ يَرَمِي He shall not throw, and لَنْ يَذْخِشُهُ لَنْ يَرَمِي He shall not dread: (a) the v. has no Tanwin 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 يُغَرِّرُ يَا فَتَى و يَذْخِشُهُ يَا فَتَى يَرَمِي يَا فَتَى He raids, and throws, and dreads, O youth; and, in the subj., لَنْ يُغَرِّرُ يَا فَتَى لَنْ يَذْخِشُهُ يَا فَتَى لَنْ يَرَمِي يَا فَتَى 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),] لَمْ يُغَرِّرَهُ He did not raid [below],
He did not throw, and He did not dread (M), orig. لَمْ يَكْتَشَنَّ (IY); and [similarly, in the imp. (IY),] أَخْشِئُ Raid thou [below], إِحْشَأْ Throw thou, and إِحْشَأْ Dread thou (M), orig. أَخْشِئُ [431], and إِحْشَأْ: (a) the لْسْ are elided [in the apoc.] because of the apocopation; while the vowels before them remain, indicating the elided لْس; the Damma, Fatha, and Kasra being an indication of the elided لْس, لْس, and لْس, respectively: and similarly in the imp.: but, when the لْس is paused upon, elision of the vowels is entailed, since pause is only with quiescence, not upon a لْس; so that, grudging that pause should take away the vowels, and thus the indicator and the indicated should [both] be removed, they affix the لْس 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 لْس, as لَمْ يَغْرُ [below], لَمْ يَكْتَشَنَّ [IY]; and لَمْ يَكْتَشَنَّ (IY)]; and أَخْشِئُ [below], إِحْشَأْ, لَمْ يَكْتَشَنَّ (IY)]; except in what is reduced, by omission of the لْس, to a single لْس; for here affixion [of the لْس (IY)] is necessary, as تَأَهِّلُ Guard thou, [imp. لَبْتَنيَّ (IY),] and لَبِتْيَهُ See thou [615] (M), in order that the quiescence may fall upon it, and the لْس be preserved (IY). One peculiarity of pause is the importation of the لْس of silence [615, 646] (Aud), to enable the
vowel to remain in pause, as the *conj.* Hamza is imported, to enable the quiescent to remain in beginning [667, 668]. It is named "the s of silence" because the silence falls upon it, not upon the final of the word (Tsr). And it has three positions. One of them is the v. altered by elision of its final, whether the elision be (1) for apocope, as in لَمْ يَغْرَثْ لَمْ يَخْسَحْ [above], и and لَمْ يَخْسَحْ لَمْ يَتْسَأْ لَمْ يَتْسَأْ [above], hence II. 261. [647] (Aud), according to the saying that it is from سِنْوْنَ سِنَّة year, sing. of سِنّوْن [284], and that its لا is an elided, the o. f. being يَتْسَأْهُ يَتْسَأْهُ; but the, being converted into ل because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 719]; and the ل elided on account of the apocopative [404]; and then the s of silence affixed in pause: which is the opinion adopted by Mb (Tsr): or (2) on account of uninflectedness (Aud), as in the *imp.* v., according to the saying of the BB [431] (Tsr), as إِخْشَهُ إِخْشَهُ [above], إِخْشَهُ إِخْشَهُ إِخْشَهُ فِهِدَدَاهُمْ أَقْتَدْهُ VI. 90. [647] (Aud), *imp.* of يَقْتَدِئُ, 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 يَغْرَثْ لَمْ يَخْسَحْ لَمْ يَخْسَحْ [above], إِخْشَهُ إِخْشَهُ إِخْشَهُ [above], and لَمْ يَخْسَحْ لَمْ يَخْسَحْ لَمْ يَخْسَحْ [above], 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, Tsr); but this *dial.* is the rarer of the two *dials.* [615] (S). And the $s$ is not necessary (Tsr), except in one case, viz. when the $v.$ [subjected to elision (Tsr)] remains with one letter, like the *imp.* of $جُعُبَى$ *aor.* $جُعُبَى$ [482, 643, 699], where you say $عَطَى$ (Aud), with elision of its $ف$ and its $ج$, as in its *aor.* *apoc.*; and with importation of the $s$ of silence, necessarily, in order that you may not be obliged to begin with a quiescent, or to pause upon a mobile (Tsr). And similarly, says IM [in the Alfiya and elsewhere, following others (Tsr)], when the $v.$ [after elision (Tsr)] remains with two letters, one of which is *aug.*, [because the $v.$ then remains with one *rad.* (MKh)], as *لَمْ يَعَدَّ* $جُعُبَى$ *He did not collect*; but this [that IM says (Tsr)] is refuted (1) by the common consent of the Muslims that pause upon such as *لَمْ يَعَدَّ* $جُعُبَى$ *XIX. 20. [450] and* $جُعُبَى$ *XL. 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 (Tsr): and (2) by the fact that the $s$ is not necessary in the $لَمْ$ governed in the *gen.* by a $د.$, because the $د.$ becomes like part of the $لَمْ$, 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 لَآ لَيْلٍ إِنَّ يَسَرُّ LXXIX. 3. [below], مَا كُنتَ نُبُوتَ XVIII. 63. What we were desiring, يَوْمُ الْيَوْمَانَ 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 لَكْبِرُ الْمَتَعَالِ XIII. 10. [643] (S); and in rhymes (S, R), as in the saying of Zuhair وَأَرَأَكَ تَفْرِى مَا خَلَقْتُ آخَنَ [below] (S) He intends by "prose" [above] what has no pause in it: and by "terminations of versicles" the extremities of verses, and the breaks in speech (R), an expository coupling, meaning that what is intended by the "extremities" is the endings, not the beginnings (MAR). But ns. are more fit [than vs.] to suffer [such] elision, since, in them, elision occurs otherwise than in terminations of versicles and in rhymes [below] (S). S means [by "what is not elided"] the quiescent and يَفْرُى in [the ind. of] the defective v., as يَفْرُى [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 لَا أَدْرُ I shall not know, [transmitted by Khl
and $S$ (K on XI. 107),] and the texts XVIII. 63. [above] and 

\[
\text{يَوْمُ يَاتَبِ لا َّكَلَمُ نَفْسَ XI. 107. On the day, when it shall come, no soul shall speak} \ (R)\text{, the latter being read by Ibn 'Amir, 'Āṣim, and Ḥamza with elision of the ى, because the Kasra is considered sufficient without it} \ (B); \text{[or as a dialectic peculiarity, since Z says that] elision of the ى, because the Kasra is considered sufficient without it, is frequent in the} \text{dial.} \text{ of Hudhail} \ (K \text{on XI. 107): while [in most} \text{dials.} \text{] they do not say}
\]

\[\text{I shall not throw. This is as they say} \]

\[\text{Zaid was not} \ [450]; \text{but not} \text{،} \text{،} \text{لمَ يَأْتَنَذِدُ} \]

\[\text{was not mean. When, however, the ى and mentioned occur in terminations of verses, in continuity, it is allowable to elide them, contenting oneself with the vowel of the preceding [letter], as in} \]

\[\text{LXXIX. 3. [319], for observance of homogeneity and conformity} \ (R) \text{with what precedes and follows them} \ (\text{MAR}). \text{And it is necessary to elide them, when you pause upon those terminations of verses, whose} \]

\[\text{s are elided in continuity. And similarly, in rhymes, they are often elided, for conformity, not for pause; although they are not elided [in poetry] for pause otherwise than in rhymes. It is therefore established that what is not elided otherwise than in terminations of verses, and in rhymes, is elided in them.} \]
poet [Zuhair, praising Harim Ibn Sinān alMurrī (IY, AKB, MAR) for decision, and execution of his resolve (IY),] says

(R) And assuredly thou cuttest out what thou hast measured; while some people measure, and then cut not out (AKB, MAR); or, in another version, 

And I see thee cut out what thou hast measured; etc. [above] (MAR): which is thus recited [ ] with the made quiescent, and the rhyme bound. S's saying "and what should preferably not be elided" [above] means the defective n., as الفاضلي [643], the of which is sometimes, though rarely, elided in continuity, otherwise than in terminations of versicles and in rhymes [above], as يوم النَّان وَيَوم هُم بَارزون [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 وَجَفَّائِي كَالْجَرَابٍ رَفَّتُور رَسِبَاتٍ XXXIV. 12. And bowls like huge watering-troughs [149], and cooking-pots standing firmly (R), read with elision of the [from ] the Kasra being considered sufficient, like LIV. 6. [640] (K), because it is not liable to be mistaken for an apoc. [above]. In terminations of
versicles, then, elision of its ل in continuity is better than elision of the ز of such as يَرْمَي [above], because the ل of such as الْرَأْمِي the thrower is elided in continuity, otherwise than in terminations of versicles, without anomalousness, as يَمُومُ الْتَنْنَادَ ويَمُومُ نُمُّ بِأَرْزُونَ [above]; while the ز of such as يَرْمَي is not elided, in the like [position], except anomalously, as we have mentioned. And, when you pause upon the defective n. whose ل is elided in continuity, elision of the ل is necessary. But, when you pause upon the defective n. whose ل is retained in continuity, elision of its ل is allowable, not necessary: S says (R), Retention of the ل، and ل، [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 ل، however, is not elided, either in terminations of versicles, or in rhymes [below], except by poetic license, as in رَفْعٌ مَرْجِي [643], because of the lightness of the ل، and the heaviness of the ل، and ل،. S uses language whose meaning is that, in rhymes, you elide the rad، and ل， in imitation [of the elision] of the aug،، and ل، following دامما and كاسرا، and resembling the ل، and ل، in the pause of the Azd of AsSarat [640]. He means that you elide the ل، from يَرْمَي [above] in imitation of the elision of the ل، in the preceding verse, vid. لَانَّآ أَسْكَمْ.
[193]; so that, since elision of the ى of the dāʿūr is allowed, because it is like [the ى in] the pause of the Azd of AsSaratāt in [640], the rad. ى imitates it in elision, since the rhymes must proceed uniformly: and similarly with the ى, as in the saying [of Zuhair (Jh, MAR)]

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

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

Daʾibīn ى أرى و الديون ى تقضى™ فمظلات بعضًا وأدت بعضًا (S, R), by Ruʿba Ibn AlʿAjjāj—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 I paused upon, in such as ُزِبَدَأ, is not elided in the best-known [dial.], as the ی and َی arising, in pause, in the dial. of the Azd of AsSarāt [640], are elided by most of the Arabs (R); and therefore, as the I of ۵بَعَضَأ is not elided, so the I of ۵تُقَضَی [below] is not elided (S). S says (R), The elision of the ی of [such as (R)] ُبَذَعُرُ, and of the ِی of such as ُبَذَعُرُ, in rhymes (R),] induces many of Kais and Asad to elide the ی and َی that are [the sign of (S)] the pron.: though neither of them is so often elided as the ی of ُبَذَعُرُ (S, R), and the ِی of ُبَذَعُرُ, 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 ِی in

ُوُلْدُُعُرَ طُرَاِنْثُهُ

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

لا يَبَعِدُ اللَّهُ إِخْوَانًا تَرْكُنُهُمْ َلَمَّا أَدُرْ َبَعْدَ غَدَاءِ الْبَيْنِ ِما 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 ُصَنَعَ (S),] is recited (S, R), by some of the Arabs that I have heard repeating this poem (S), with elision of the ی of the ِی.
and quiescence of the ر (S, R) O home of 'Abla in AlJiwa, speak, and tell me of thine inmates, what they have done. And be thou pleasant at morn, home of 'Abla, and be safe! (EM), meaning ﴿وَأَسْلَمْ﴾ (S), [which] also is recited with [elision of the ﯿ and (MAR)] quiescence of the م (R); and AlKhuzaz Ibn Laudhán says ﴿كَذَبَ أَلْعَفِيقَ وَمَا أَشْيَاَ بَارَداً﴾ ﴿وَأَسْلَمْ﴾ (S). But the ﯿ [of the pron. (R)] in [such as (R)]

[recited to us by Khl (S), My two friends, fly with separation, or fall, or, in one MS, ﴿فَتَا﴾ stop (MAR),] is not elided (S, R), as it is not elided from ﴿تَفْسِلَ﴾ above (S), because of what we have mentioned (R), vid. that the ﯿ paused upon, in such as ﴿رَبَدَ﴾, is not elided in the best-known [dialect.] (MAR). I do not know any instance where the ﯿ of the pron. is elided in terminations of versicles, as it is in rhymes; but the ﯿ of the pron. is elided in terminations of versicles, as XXIX. 56. [420] (R).
§ 646. When the ت of feminization is paused upon, the ت is kept, [being preserved from conversion here (Tsr),] if it be attached to (1) a p. [263, 402], as in لعَلْتَ [263, 402, 540] (Aud), رَبَّتْ [505], and لَعَلْتَ [537] (Tsr) : (a) لات [109] is paused upon, by خس [alone (Tsr)], with the ت (A, Tsr), irregularly (Tsr); and, by the remainder [of the Seven Readers], with the ت : (b) IM says in the CK “In my opinion, it is allowable to pause with the ت upon لَعَلْتَ and رَبَّتْ, by analogy to their saying لاَت لَعَلْتَ in the case of لات” (A); but this is open to the objection that (Sn) the [similar] saying of AH “As for لعَلْتَ, and رَبَّتْ, they are commonly regarded as analogous to لات, so that they are paused upon in both modes,” is refuted, because (Tsr) pause upon لات with the ت is not regular, and (Sn) what is irregular is not to be copied (Tsr, Sn) : (2) a v. [263, 402, 607], as in تَمَّتْ She stood (Aud) and تَعَدَّتْ She sat : (a) the ت is kept, in the p. and v., from fear of confusion with the pron. in رَبَّتْ [168, 505] and مْسَرَبَتْ 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 مْسَرَبَتْ Darabat, and then made it a dim., saying مْسَرَبَتْ Duraiba, you would pause upon it with the ت, because it would have been transferred from the [the cat. of] the v. to [that of] the n.” (Tsr) : (3) a n., when
the َن is preceded by a sound quiescent, as in ُخُوُـُخُوُ~
For S, Fr, IK, and most of the GG hold that the  is the o.f., as in the v.: but that, in pause, it is converted into  to distinguish the nominal from the verbal  as the nominal [ ], which is for feminization, as in  [385], from that which is not so, as in  

*malignant* and  [399, 678]: while the reason why it is converted into  is that, in the , there are more faintness and softness than in the ; so that, in the state of pause, which is the position of rest [640], the  is more appropriate, for which reason, in pause, the  is added to what does not contain it, I mean the  of silence [615, 644], as in  and  [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 v., to indicate the feminization of its ag. [607]; and alteration is more appropriate in what is original, because of its stability. But Th says that the , in the feminization of the n., is the o.f.; and that, in continuity, it is converted into  , because, if it were left in its state, as a  , one would say  . *I saw a tree,* with Tanwin; and, in pause, the Tanwin would be converted into  , as in  [640]; so that, in pause, it would be liable to be mistaken for the [attached gen.]* fem. [pron.]  [161]: and therefore, in continuity, the  is converted into
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 Tanwīn [in the acc. of the n. made fem. by the s] is not converted into †, after conversion of the ت [into s], is fear of confusion (R) with the fem. هَا (M.A.R). But the preferable mode is pause with the ت in (1) the sound pl., like مُسَلِّمَةَتٍ (Aud) and مُسِلِّمَةَتٍ [17] (Ts'r): (2) what resembles it, vid. (a) the quasi-pl. n., [which has no sing. of its own crude-form (Ts'r),] like لاتٍ [17] (Aud), which has no sing. of its own crude-form [257], but only a sing. of its sense, vid. دَاتٍ [below] (Ts'r): (b) the pl. used as a name, (a) actually, like عَرَفَاتٍ and آذِرَعَاتٍ [17] (Aud), which are actually pls. of عَرْفَةُ 'Arafa, the halting-place of the pilgrims, and آذِرْعَةُ Adhria, a town of Syria (Ts'r): (b) constructively, like هَيْهَاتٍ [below], which is constructively pl. of هَيْهِيَةٍ, [its o. f. being هَيْهَاتٍ, the ل of which, vid. the ال, is elided; and its measure being نَعْلَةٍ, orig. نَعْلَةٍ (Ts'r)]: and is afterwards used as a [verbal n., literally] name of a v. (Aud); so that its sense becomes بعد Far off is! [187]: though هَيْهَاتٍ is said [by some] to be a sing., its o. f. being هَيْهِيَةٍ, on the measure of نَعْلَةٍ, reduplicated, like نَعْلَةٍ [332] (Ts'r). The reason why the [well-known, usual (Jrb), preferable (Ts'r),] mode is
pause with the ֗, [not otherwise (Jrb),] is that, since they mean to have two augments in the perf. pl. fem. (Jrb, Tsr), as we have explained in its place [234] (Jrb), and they are unable to add the ֔ or ֗ with the †, because, if added [with the †], it would be converted into Hanza [683], therefore they add the ֗ with the †, because the ֗ [sometimes] becomes a subst. for the ֔, as in [֔ and (Jrb)] [689]; and it then becomes the sign of feminization, and does away with the necessity for saying מָסָלֵי נָתָא as pl. of מָסָלֵי נָתָא; so that, since this ֗ imports pluralization and femininization [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 s (Jrb, Tsr): while they deal with what is co-ordinated with the pl. in the same way as with the pl. [itself], because, since they treat it like the pl. in inflection [17], they treat it so in other particulars (Tsr). But pause with change [of the ֗ (A) into s (A, Tsr)] has been heard in the sayings [of some of them (A), transmitted by Ktb from Tayyi (Tsr),] ֗ הַקְּיִיף אֶלֶּנְּרִינְּ הַלְּבָּנָּא How are the sons and the daughters? (R, Jrb, Fk),] ֗ הַקְּיִיף אֶלֶּחָיִהְוָה הַאָלָּחֶוָּא How are the brothers and the sisters? [690], and ֗ הַלְּבָּנָּא דַּעְּנַ הַלְּבָּנָּא The burial of daughters is one of the noble deeds (Aud, A), with change of the ֗ of the pl. into s ,
[in pause (Jrb),] by assimilation to the pure ٍ of feminization (Jrb, Tsr): while ُهُمًا and ُهُمًا have been heard (A); and ُهُمًا XXIII. 38. [187, 195, 504] is read by Ks and Bz (Aud), with change of the ٍ into s (B, Tsr). Some report that this is the dial. of Tayyi; but [IHKh (HKh),] the author of the Ifṣāḥ [bi Fawā'id alDāḥ (HKh),] says that it is anomalous, not to be copied (A).

As for ُهُمًا [above], it has two dial. vars., Fath and Kasr of the ٍ [195]. Those who pronounce [the ٍ] with Fath make ُهُمًا a sing., and pause upon it with the s; while those who pronounce the ٍ with Kasr make ُهُمًا a pl., and pause upon it with the ٍ (TY). The [statement] reported from Ks is that those who pronounce the ٍ with Kasr pause upon ُهُمًا with the ٍ; while those who pronounce the ٍ with Fath pause upon ُهُمًا with the s or ٍ (Tsr). But [the GG say that (Jrb)] ُهُمًا, if held to be a pl., is paused upon with the ٍ; 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)] ُهُمًا, being a verbal n., cannot be truly said to be sing. or pl.; while that [pause upon it with the ٍ or s] is only because of its resemblance in form, not in number, to [a n. ending in] the ٍ of feminization (Jrb, Tsr). We have mentioned its
predicament among the verbal *ns.* [187, 195]. And here we mention that, whether it be pronounced with ذَمَّم, فَث, or كَسَر of the ك, its o. f. may be ُقِهَّة; but that pause upon it with the ِس is rare, because it is co-ordinated with vs., on account of its being a verbal *n.;* while conversion of its ك into ِس is nevertheless allowed, because it is assimilated, in form, to such as ُثُرَّة clucking (R). When a man is named ُقِهَّة, according to the dial. of those who change [the ك into ِس in pause], it is like كَلْدُقة [18], being diptote because of the quality of proper name together with feminization; but, when ُقِهَّة is used as a name, according to dial. of those who do not change, it is like عَرَنَات [17], being infl. like the perf. pl. fem. when used as a name (A). And apparently َأَركَت [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)] إِسْتَمَضَّ أَلَّهَ عِرْقُاتٍ هُم God extirpate their roots! or عِرْقُاتِهِم their root! (M). For عَرْقَة root, pronounced with فَث [of its ك in the acc. (R, Jrb)], is [held to be (IY)] a sing. (IY, R, Jrb), co-ordinated with ُدْرَهْم [392] (R), like سَعَالَة [248, 272] (Jrb), the ل in it being for co-ordination with [ ُدْرَهْم] سَبِّجَع [392] (IY), as is the case in مَعَرَى (IY, R) and ذَنْرَى [272, 375], according to those who pronounce them with تَانْـَِـْوِ
pronounced with Kasr [of its ت (R, Jrb) in the acc. (R)], is [held to be (IY)] a pl. (IY, R, Jrb), the ل in it being the one accompanying the ت of the pl. fem., as though it were pl. (IY) of عَرَقٌ root (IY, R), the masc. being pluralized with the ل and ت, notwithstanding the occurrence of a broken pl. for it, i.e., عَرُوقَاتٌ, as is said, notwithstanding بُرَوُنُ, in the pl. of بَرَوانٌ [261] (R); [or] of مَعَرَقَةٌ (Md, KF); and pause upon it is more properly with the ت, as in the case of مُسْلِمَكُ [above] (R). And, in other formations [than the sound pl. and what resembles it (Tsr)], the preferable [mode] is pause with change (Aud) [of the ت ] into ُ, for distinction between the ت of feminization and the rad. ت, as in مُمْتَأْتٍ [above] and مُمْتَأْتُ death, this being the reason assigned by S: or, as is said (Tsr), for distinction between it and the ت of feminization affixed to the v. (Jrb, Tsr, Fk), as in ضَرْبَتٌ [607] (Tsr); while they do not reverse [the distinction, assigning the ت to the n., and the ُ to the v.], because, if they said ضَرْبَتٌ for ضَرَبْتِ, the ُ would be confounded with the objective pron. (Jrb, Tsr, Fk): so says Jrb, confining himself to this reason; [and he is followed by Fk] (Tsr). But [Akkh asserts that (R), in the less chaste mode (Fk),] some [of the Arabs (M, R, Jrb)] pause [upon such as رُحُمَةٌ
(Fk)] with the ت (M, R, Jrb, Fk), without change, as رحمة (Fk), which is a wide-spread dial., transmitted by Akh (IY), whence [their saying وَعَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ وَالْرَّحْمَةُ and upon him be peace and mercy], and (IY, Jrb)] the saying of the poet بَلْ جَوَّى تِهِهَا آلَع [183, 640, 690] (M, Jrb) : while an [additional] instance of pause with omission of change [into ِ (Tsr)] is the reading of Nafi', Ibn 'Amir, and Hamza إِنْ شَكَرْتُ XLIV. 43. [below] (Aud), with the ت (Tsr); and the [other (IY, Jrb)] poet [Abu-nNajm (Tsr, YS)] says وَاللَّهُ نَجَّالَ يَقِى مَسْلَمَتْ # مِنْ بَعْدِهَا وَبَعْدِهَا وَبَعْدِهَا صَارَتْ نُفْسُ الَّذِي عَصَيْنَالْغُلْصَمُ # كَأَدَّى الْجَحْرَةَ أَنْ تَدْعِي آمَنَ (IY, R, Aud, Jrb, Fk) And God saved thee, by my hand, O Maslama, after, and after, and after the souls of the people had become near the top of the wind-pipe, and the free-born damsel was well-nigh being called a handmaid (MN), where he does not change the ت into ِ in [all three of] them (Tsr). What is meant by بَعْدِهَا, a ِ being supposed to be substituted for the ِ (IY, Jrb, MN, Tsr, YS), so that it becomes بَعْدِهَا, since the ِ is sometimes substituted for the ِ, as in [175, 181, 690], meaning هُنَا (IY) and قد وَرَدَتْ آلَع (Jsh); and the ِ being then changed into ت, 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 ʼ is changed into ș; and the ș 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)]

سَكَرَتُ الرُّقَم

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

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

(Fk),

نَحْوُ تَأْمُٰرَاتُ لُوط

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 ٖ, mentioned in the Kur with her husband, is written with the extended ٖ (Sn). Therefore Näfi, Ibn ‘Amir, ‘Ăṣim, and Ḥamza pause upon them with the ٖ; while Ibn Kathîr, IAl, and Ks pause upon them with the ș (A). The ٖ, if written as a ș [in the Codex], is paused upon by all the [Seven] Readers with the ș: but, if written as a ٖ, is paused upon by some with the ș, for observance of the o. f.; and by others with the ٖ, for observance of the ‘Uthmâni orthography: so says our master, the Sayyid (Sn). Most of those [Arabs] who pause [upon such as ٖ] 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. ِـَٰـْنَِْثُمْ ُّمّتا I saw a handmaid, like ِـُرَّٰىٰطِمْتا [640], with the ِـَٰـْنَِْثُمْ ِـَٰـْنَِْثُمْ, as in ِـِٰٰذَّٰٰٰلِّحُرْةِالْعِحَجُ [above], because it is made to accord with ِـَٰـْنَِْثُمْ with the ِـَٰـْيَٰذُا, which is the o. f. in pause (R). But some of them pause upon the [n.] made fem. by the ِـَٰـْرَْٰىِٰطِمْتا, when it is an acc. pronounced with Tanwin, as they pause upon the [n.] bare [of the ِـَٰـْيَٰذُا], when it is an acc. pronounced with Tanwin [640] (Sn). There is a dispute about ِـَٰـْذَّٰٰٰٰلِّحُرْةِالْعِحَجُ [above] in such as ِـٰٰضَٰٰٰلِّحُرْةِالْعِحَجُ 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 ِـَٰـْتُ, because, being pre. [115], it is always intermediate; while KS and Jr say that it is paused upon with the ِـَٰـْيَٰذُا, because [the ِـَٰـْتُ in] it is a ِـَٰـْتُ of femininization, so that you say ِـَٰـْتُ: so says Hf (Tsr). The ِـَٰـْتُ not for femininization is not altered [in pause], the saying of some ِـٰٰضَٰٰٰٰلِّحُرْةِالْعِحَجُ We sat by the Euphrates being anomalous (A).

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

الما رأى أن لا دعة ولا شبعه مال إلى أرطاة حقه نالتفع [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 Ārṭâ tree of a curving tract of sand, and lay down (MN, Jsh) to sleep (Jsh), where he substitutes a s for the s of دعّة, and retains it in continuity (IY); [and] hence<br>

أو كالكزكي آخر [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) دلُّئة أربعة [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.,

ثلثة أربعة [321, 648], where they substitute a s for the s [of ثلثة أربعة] in pause, and then throw the vowel of the Hamza [of أربعة] upon the s, and elide the Hamza, on the principle of the reading تد أفنح اليومنون XXIII.

1. The believers have prospered [16], which occurs only in continuity (IY): (2) XVIII. 36. [521] (M, R), in the reading of Ibn Āmir (IY, R), with retention of the !, orig. لَكِنَّ (K, B), the vowel of the Hamza
being thrown upon the \( \text{لَكُنْ} \), the Hamza elided, and the \( \text{n} \) incorporated into the \( \text{n} \); whereas analogy requires the \( \text{l} \) of \( \text{أَنَا} \) to be elided in continuity, because it is put to make the vowel plain in pause [161], like the \( \text{s} \) in حِسَابُهُ LXIX. 19. and حِسَابُهُ LXIX. 20. [below]: Zj says "Retention of the \( \text{l} \) [of \( \text{أَنَا} \)] is excellent here, because, the Hamza being elided, the \( \text{l} \) becomes a compensation for it", meaning in لَكُنْ (IY): (3) [similarly (IY)] II. 260. [166] (IY, R), with retention of the \( \text{l} \) of \( \text{أَنَا} \) [161]: LXIX. 19. [22, 638, 648, 679] and حِسَابُهُ LXIX. 20 My reckoning [648], in continuity, according to some readings (R). Continuous speech is [thus] given that [predicament (IA, Aud, A)] which belongs to pause (IM), vid. quiescence—with or without Raum or Ishmām—and reduplication [640], transfer [640, 641], and importation of the \( \text{s} \) 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 يَتَسَهَّلَ وَأَنْظُرُ II. 261. It hath not been altered by the lapse of years: and look [644] (IA, Aud, A) and فَنِيْهِذَا الْعَمَّ أَفْتَادَهُ فُلْ VI. 90. Then by their guidance
suffer thou thyself to be led: say (Aud, A), with
expression of the s of silence in continuous speech (Aud):
(b) تَلْدَثُنِيّةً ([above] (Tsr): (c) عَنْي سُلْطَانِيّةٌ حُذْرَهُ لَهَدْدٌ LXIX. 28–30. My wealth hath
not availed me: my power etc. [615, 648]: (d) the
saying of some of Tayyi هُدْدِي حُبَّلَوُ يَا فَتْى This is a
pregnant female, O youth, because it is only in pause
that this l is changed into , [643] (A): (2) in poetry,
(a) ب٢ [640] (IA, Aud, A), where the
is doubled, notwithstanding that it is conjoined with the
letter of unbinding (IA, A): (a) it is orig. القصاب , with
a single ب; but, being assumed to be paused upon, the
ب is doubled, on the principle of their saying in pause,
هُدْدِي خَالِدُ [640], with reduplication; and then the letter
of unbinding is put, vid. the l; while the reduplication
of the ب remains (Aud) in continuity, by assimilation of
continuity to pause in respect of reduplication (Tsr): (b)
أُوُّـُـُـُّ~
[183] (A), where there are two anomalies,
(a) affixion of the and to in continuity (MN);
whereas analogy requires من أنتم , because, in continuity,
the form of من does not vary [in number or gender]
(Sn): and (b) mobilization of the [affixed] ن , which is
[properly] quiescent (MN). The GG say that the poet,
in such as عَيْهَهٍ and القصاب [640, 648], treats continuity
like pause. They mean that, the letter of unbinding being the [letter] paused upon, since it is not put except to be paused upon, that [rhyme-letter, here the ج or the ب ] , which precedes it, is not paused upon, but is in the interior of the sentence; and this [reduplication of it] is treating continuity like pause (R). And, [says S (R),] one that I trust has told me that he heard an Arab say ُبِينَيْنِي أَبيضَهُ Give me a white one, meaning أبيضًا (S, R); but affixing the س as he affixes it in هُنَّة, when he means فُنَّ [161] (S), the س being for silence: which is a most hideous anomaly, because the س 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 ة or a ئ, or ى (Sn),] as in

[608]. But the Hijāzīs retain the letter of prolongation, unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether they intend to quaver or not (Sn),] saying والعَتَابُ: while the Tamīmīs, if they [intend to (Sn)] quaver, do likewise, [i. e., retain the letter of prolongation (Sn)]: and, if not, put Tānwīn as a compensation for it, [in order to discontinue the
quavering (Sn),] unrestrictedly, [i. e., after a Ḍamma, Fatha, or Kasra (Sn),] as in

سُفِيتَ الْفَيْتَ آيَتَهَا الْحُيَامُ[1],

يا صَاحِبَيَّ مَا هَاجَالْعَيْنَ أَلْذَرْنَ[by Al 'Ajjāj (S).] O my companion, what has excited the streaming eyes?, and

لمَ تَرْتَ بِرَحَالِيَّة وَكَانَ قَدِينَ

[577, 608] (A).

§. 648. The second [position (Tsr) of the s of silence] is the interrog. ما governed in the gen. (Aud) by a p. or pre. n. [181, 615] (Tsr). For, when it is governed in the gen., [and is not compounded with دا (Tsr),] as in ِعَمَّ and ْقِيَمَ, [where it is governed in the gen. by a p. (Tsr),] and in ِمَكَّيَّه مَحْتَ 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 ound must be elided, to distinguish it from the enunciatory, [which is the conjunct and the cond. (Tsr),] ِما I asked about what thou askedst about [or ِعَنْ مِثْلِ مَا آلَحُ about the like of what etc., where is conjunct; and in ِبِنَا تَفْرَحْ أَفْرَحْ At whatever thou rejoicest, I will rejoice and
Whenever thou comest to me, I will honor thee, where ما is cond. (Tsyr) : so that, when you pause upon it, you affix the َ, for preservation of the Fathā indicative of the [elided (Tsyr)] ! [below]. And the َ is necessary if the genitival op. [of the interrog. ما (Tsyr)] be a ََ, as in مَيْلِيَةٍ آليَّ : and preferable if it be a َ, as in عم يَنِسَأَ لَوْنَ LXXVIII. 1. [181], where [it is reported (K) by] Bz [that Ibn Kathir (K)] reads [عَمَّةٍ (K),] with the َ (Aud) of silence (K, Tsyr), either because he continues like pause [647]; or because he pauses [upon عَمَّة Of what (question they among themselves) ?], and begins afresh with يَنِسَأَ لَوْنَ عَنِ الْنَّبِيِّ أَلْعَظِيمِ LXXVIII. 1, 2. They question among themselves of the great tidings, a [previous] يَنِسَأَ لَوْنَ, [on which عَمَّة depends,] being understood, because expounded by what follows it (K). The difference is that the ما governed in the gen. by a ََ is conjoined with it [181]; while the prep. is not independent in its meaning [497], so that it is like part of the ما [644]; for which reason the َ is [merely] allowable, [not necessary, because the conjunction of ما with the prep. prevents it from being considered unil. when the ِ is elided]: whereas the pre. ََ is independent in its
sense, so that the \( n. \) 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 \( i \) of the 1st pers. [161], \( h \), and \( f ^ u \), according to those who pronounce them with Fath [below] (Aud) in continuity; and like the \( l \) of the 2nd pers. [below] (Tsr). The Revelation has [below] (Aud) CL. 7. What it is, and the \( m \) of LXIX. 28. and the \( s \) of LXIX. 29. [below]; and the poet [Hassan (MN, Tsr) Ibn Thabit al Anṣārī (MN) al Saḥābī (Tsr)] says

\[
e\text{إذامأ} 
\text{تُرَعَرُع فِيْنَا} 
\text{العَلَمَ} \quad \text{فِيْنَا} 
\text{إِنْ} 
\text{يَقَالُ} 
\text{لَهُ} \quad \text{مَنْ} 
\text{هُوَ} 
\]

[below] (Aud) When the lad grows up among us, it is not said of him "Who is he?", \( i n \) being red., as in \( f \) (MN). But the \( s \) is not affixed to such as (1) Zaid came, because \( r \) 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 \( p \) He struck not, because the \( v. \) is quiescent; [and the \( s \) is affixed only to make the vowel plain (Tsr)]: (3) [99] (Aud), with Fath (Tsr), and \( y \) and \( y \) [48] and [201] (Aud), with Ḍamm (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 ' being affixed to what is accidentally uninfl., since عَلَّمْ مَنْ تَكْتُ أَلْمَعْ belongs to the cat. of عَلَّمْ and تَكْتُ: so say F and IM; but as to this there is a dispute [before] mentioned [201] (Aud); and some say that the ' in عَلَّمْ is a subst. for the عَلَّمْ, the o.f. being عَلَّمْ (Tsr): (4) the pret. v. [403], like [the trans. (Tsr)] ضَرَبَ rode (Tsr), and [the intrans. (Tsr)] قَامَ 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 جل [99], the aprotthetic 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 فَعَدَة He sat; and disallowance if ambiguity result, as in ضَرْبَة [below], because the ' is liable to be mistaken for the obj. (Tsr).

In pause upon the uninfl. [ns. (IY)], you say (1) أَنَا 81a
with the \( \text{I} \) [161, 497] or \( \text{ء} \) [690] (M), in place of the \( \text{i} \), because their outlet [732] is one, whence the saying of Ḥātim: َعُدَا نُرِدي َء This is my way of bleeding; mine [696]: (a) this: \( \text{I} \), in its being imported, in pause, to make the vowel [of the final] plain, is like the \( \text{s} \) in LXIX. 19. [22, 638, 647, 679] and LXIX. 20. [647]: (b) hence their saying; in pause: حَلَعَة مَكَّة [with the \( \text{I} \)], or حَلَعَة عَرْع [with quiescence]; but, when they continue, حَلَعَة مَكَّة [191] with Fath of the \( \text{J} \), without an \( \text{I} \): (c) the Arabs do not pause, upon any thing in their language, with the \( \text{I} \), to make the vowel plain, except in these two positions, I mean حَلَعَة and َء [615] (IY): (2) with quiescence, or مَكَّة [with affixion of the \( \text{s} \) (M): (a) pause upon the pron. هُوَ he [161] is mostly with the \( \text{s} \)., to make the vowel of the \( \text{J} \) plain; and so is pause upon. َء she: you say َءَيْه [not eliding anything from it, as you elide in the case of the decl. [643]; and the poet says إِذَا مَا تَزَّرَعَ أَلْوَع [above], cited by S: but some of the Arabs pause with quiescence, saying هُوَ and َءَيْه, contrary to َء which is not paused upon with quiescence; so that, in answer to “who did?”, one does not say َء i \( \text{I} \), as one says هُوَ he or َءَيْه she: for َء, in addition to the paucity of its letters, has for its final \( \text{نا} \), which is faint, and is not a letter of inflection here, like the final of َن.
hand and *dum* blood; so that, on account of the faintness of the ن، the paucity of the letters, and the fact that the final of *an* is not a letter of inflection, an ل is imported in pause, and is inseparable from that [expression], contrary to *hii* and *hru*, 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 [١] with *Fatha* [above]; while those who make [١] and *i* quiescent [below] pause only with quiescence, not otherwise (IY): (3) *hii* here or *hii* [175]; and *these* or *hru* [174], when it, [i. e., *hulal* (IY),] is abbreviated (M): (a) this ِ in *hii* and *hru* 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 ِ: (6) those who prolong [the final ل of *hru*], and add a Hamza, [saying *hulal*], pause upon the Hamza with quiescence: (c) this ِ does not follow any of the quiescents, except the ل, because of its faintness; so that you do not say *hru* for *hru*، nor *hii* for *hii* [above], according to the *dial*. of those who make the ل and *i* quiescent [above], because the ل, being faint, on account of its remoteness [732], is more in need of being made plain (IY): (4) I honored thee or *akrimtaka* [below] (M):

(a) in the case of the ل of the *pron*. [161], as in *akrimtka* I honored thee [masc.] and *akrimtka* I gave thee [fem.]
there are two modes, pause with quiescence, as 
[Fath] and pause with the [Kasr] [above] and . from avidity for the vowel, because the ل is pronounced with Fath in the masc., and with Kasr in the fem., so that the vowel distinguishes the masc., from the fem.; and they want the distinction and explanation in pause as much as in continuity: (b) some intensify the distinction, affixing to the ل and ی in the masc., and a ی in the fem.; and then affix the ی of silence [to the ل or ی], saying أَكَرَمْتُكَ in the masc., and أَكَرَمْتِكَیا in the fem., because distinction by a consonant and a vowel is more intensive and corrob. than distinction by a vowel alone: but the better of the two dials. is not to affix the letter of prolongation to the ل (IY):

(5) my manservant and ضِرْبَنِی He struck me [below], with quiescence, or ضِرْبَنِیة and غُلامِیة, with affixion of the ی [to make the vowel plain; pause upon the ی being in two modes (IY)], according to those who mobilize [the ی with Fath (IY)] in continuity [161] (M); whence the reading of the majority مَا أَفْنِى عَنّی مَالِیةٍ هَلْدُکَ عَنّی سُلْطَانِیةٍ LXIX. 28, 29. [615, 647] (IY): and ضِرْبَنِی and غُلامَ, according to those who make [the ی] quiescent in continuity, whence the readings of IA1 زَبَی آَکَرْمِی LXXXIX. 15. My Lord hath honored me
and LXXXIX. 17. *My Lo'd hath degraded me,* [with pause (IRO)]; and the saying of Al A'اشَةَ [Maimün Ibn Kais (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,

**Qfhl ِ يَبْنَعْنِي أَرْزِيَادِي أَلِيَّةٌ** 

**أَلِيَّةٌ أَخُو الْمُوتِ مُسْتَوْقِئًا** 

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 *يَأْتِيَنِي أَنْ يَأْتِيَنِي* and أَنْسَنَى: (a) those also who make the يَ quiescent pause in two modes, the better being retention of the [quiescent] ِيَ; while the other is elision of it, as *هُدَأَ غَلَمْ*.

This is my manservant and ِضْرِيْنِ [above], meaning ِضْرِيْنِ غَلَمْيَ. (b) elision of the ِيَ in the case of [the pron. attached to] the v. is good, because the ِيَ, being always preceded by a ِنَ [170], is indicated by the ِنَ; so that there is no ambiguity, for which reason such elision is frequent in the Kur: whereas, when you say ِهُدَأَ غَلَمْ.
[above], pausing upon it with quiescence, one does not know whether ُعَلَّمُ is meant to be pre. to the ی, or to be aprothetic, 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): (ê) Ibn ‘Āmir and the KK read ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ, without a ی, in continuity and pause; and the like is reported from IAl [above]; while Nāf' agrees with them in pause (B); and [Z says in the K that] ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ, with quiescence of the ُن, are read in pause, according to those who omit the ی in continuous speech, deeming the Kasra sufficient without it (K): (6) He struck you, عَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ He struck them, عَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ upon them, and ِبِهِمْ ِبِهِمْ ِبِهِمْ by them; and and ِمُنَّهُ ِمُنَّهُ ِمُنَّهُ from him and ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ He struck him [above]: with quiescence, according to those who, in continuity, affix [the conj. to the م or ی], or [simply] mobilize [the م or ی with Damm or Kasr] (M): (a) as for ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ and ِبِهِمْ ِبِهِمْ ِبِهِمْ you pause upon them with quiescence of the م, not otherwise; and elide the ی or ی from it [161], because they are aug., and are often elided in continuity [161], as ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ He struck you before, ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ He struck them, O youth, ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ ُعَلَّمُ IX. 99. May misfortune fall upon them!, and یُسْتَعَانُ یُسْتَعَانُ Of them is help sought, for a kind of lightening, from frequency of usage, because of
the heaviness of the combination of two Dammas with the, in \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) and \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) [below], and of two Kasras with the in \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) [below] and the like (IY): [for,] according to those who do not affix the conj., in continuity, to the \( 
m \) 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 \( 
i \), must be elided in pause, as in \( 
\text{مَنَتْ} \) and \( 
\text{عَلِيْخَةٌ} \) [below] (R): (b) they differ in opinion about the, in such as \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) [above], and the \( 
i \) in such as \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) [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 \( 
i \) is part of the n. itself: and they differ about the opinion of S on that [matter]; but the [opinion] apparent from his language is that the, and \( 
i \) are not part of the n. [161]: (c) similarly pause upon \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) and \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) also is with quiescence [of the \( \text{x} \)] (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 \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) [and the \( 
i \) of \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \), and by conversion of the \( 
i \) of \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) into \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) (R); [so that] the o. f. of \( 
\text{مَنَتْ} \) and \( 
\text{ضَرَّبَّةُ} \) is conjunction of [the \( \text{x} \) in] them with a letter of
prolongation, as ضَرَبَتْهُ and مَنَّهُ, that being proved by
the existence of [the letter of prolongation correspond-
ing with] it in the fem., as ضَرَبَتْهَا and مَنُّها (IY): the ֶ occurs, [says S (IY),] with what follows it, here in the
masc., as it occurs, with the ֶ following it, in the fem.
(S, IY): (c) Zj holds that the conj. after the ֶ 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 [الْقَانِئِي 643]; and,
as for the necessity for elision of the conj. in pause, and
not of the ٰ of الْقَانِئِي, it is because the conj. is one of
those things that, in the state of continuity, have a share
in elision, as in مَنَّة III. 5. and مَنَّة 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 ֶ be preceded by a quiescent,
as in مَلِيِّي and مَلِيِّي, they do not put the quiescent ָ in continuity: so that they do not say, according to the
most frequent [dial.], مَنَّهُ and مَلِيِّي, because the, and ָ are heavy; and because the ֶ, on account of its
faintness, is like the non-existent, so that, if they said
that, two quiescents would, as it were, concur (R):
[thus even] in [continuous] speech they often elide the ֶ,
or ى [conjoined with the ُ] : and, when the ُ is preceded by a letter of prolongation and softness, elision of the ُ, or ى is [held by S to be] better than retention, because the ُ proceeds from the same outlet as the ٍ [732], and the ى resembles the ُ and ى, so that it is as though they fled from the combination of likes, and therefore elided the ُ or ى; and, for that reason, لَيْلَيْتْ XVI. 107. And We have revealed it, part by part, [according to the measure of events (K, B)]، لَيْلَيْتْ VII. 175. If thou bear down upon him, he will loll out his tongue [from breathing hard (B)]. 

XII. 20. And they sold him [640] for a mean price, and 

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], and عَنْهُو مَنْهُ are more appropriate than [منْهُ and عَنْهُو مَنْهُ] with] elision; so that منْهُ آيَات، مَعْكَمَة سُ نَفْعَالًا 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 منْهُ آيَات III. 5. [below] and أَصَابَتْ جَانِبَة A calamity afflicted him; and this [opinion] is adopted by Mb and Sf; and, according to me, is correct, because, the ُ being faint، عَنْهُو مَنْهُ and عَنْهُو virtually contain [a combination of. (Jh on
the pron. 산] two quiescents, like كَيْفٌ and كَيْفَ (IY): S prefers retention of the conj. after the ْسَ, when the preceding quiescent is a sound letter, as in مَثْهُ and أَصِبْتُهُو; and elision of it, when the preceding quiescent is an unsound letter, as in ُجُدُوْتِهِ VIII. 14. Then taste ye it, عَصَّة VII. 104. His rod, and فِيّه III. 1. About it: but Mb [followed by Sf and IY] makes no distinction between the sound and unsound quiescents before the ْسَ; 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 ٨ مَهُ آيَات III. 5. and ٩ فِيّه آيَات بِيَمُت 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 ْلَ] from عَلٰٰ١٠ُهَا upon her and مَنُّهَا from her, though these also contain a quasi-combination of two quiescents, because of the lightness of the ْلَ; so that this is the counterpart of their omission, in the most frequent [dial.], to convert the Tanwin, in pause, into a letter of prolongation in the nom. and gen., and their conversion of it into ٰ in the acc. [640]: (h) if the ْسَ be preceded by a mobile, as in ٍبَنِيّ and ُعَكْلُمةٌ [161], the conj. is indispensable, except when a poet is constrained.
to elide it, as in the saying [of Hanzala Ibn Fatik (S)]

وَأَيُّهُمْ آنِ الكَرّ بِهِ تَلْتَمِسُوهُ هُمْ يُكَنُّ لِفَسْبِ الْمَكْعَلِ بَعْدَهُ آيَٰهُ

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

تَغْتَرَبُوهُ فِي الأَنْفُسِ السَّنِّهَا وَالْبَرِّدُ فِي النَّفَرِ وَالْأَفْلاَمُ فِي الْكَتِبِ

[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 ِ to the ِِ, 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 I in [643] (R): and what is stronger than this has been transmitted from the Arabs, like the saying of the poet

وَأَشْربُ اَلْمَاءَ مَا ِْبِي نَكْرَةٌ عَطْشٌ ۡلَا لَّنِّ عَيْوَةَ سَيِّلٌ وَادْبِهَا

And I drink water, when there is not in me any thirst for it, except because its springs are the sources of the torrent of her valley; and this is like the reading [of Ḥamza, Abu Bakr, and IA] III. 68. Will render it unto thee and (B) III. 68. Will not render it unto thee, with quiescence of the ِِ (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 لَهُ and [161], by common consent, and in عَلَى and لله [161], according to some; or not, as in مَنّى and عِنْد [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 غَلَامَيْنِ and ضَرْبَيْنِ [above]; so that they invariably elide this letter, whose elision is often authorized in continuity, as in مَنّى and عِنْد: 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 ِDACMuMM or Kasr, as in II. 273. Ḳnoweth it and ِغَلَامَيْنِ by his manservant; and similarly when it is preceded by a، or ی، as in II. 70. [640] and مَنّى ِيَأْتِكِهِ تِلَيْنِ. 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 ِDACMM or ی، it is as though you pronounced the final, pausal, letter with ِDACMM, or put a، at the end, since the s is like the non-existent, on account of its faintness; and if, immediately after the ِDACMM 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 ّ, 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 Fatḥa, as in ینَ علَمَة verily his manservant, or a sound quiescent, as in مَثَة [above], Raum or Ishmām is allowable, without dispute [640]: (l) some allow them after the s of the pron., unrestrictedly, whether it follow a ّ, or ی or any other consonant; and whether it follow a Fatḥa, Damma, or Kasra: even though they be not so plain as they ought to be (R): (7) عَنْهُ, [even] according to those who say ُهُدْعِيُ أُمَّةٌ أَلِلِّهِ This is the handmaid of God
(M): (a) the s in [تَمَيِّظ] and (R) [هذى] is [not an aug.; but only (IY)] a subst. [690] for the ى [263] in [تَمَيِّظ] and (R) [هذى] [171, 174] (IY, R), the proof of which is that you say ذيَا in the dim. of ى [293], as you say in the dim. of ذَا: nor is the s in [هذى] for femininization, like the s in طَلْكَةُ حَمْرَةٌ [265], because the s in طَلْكَةُ حَمْرَةٌ is aug., and you find it a s in continuity [646]; whereas the s in [هذى] is a s in continuity and pause, and is the أ of the word: (b) the reason why it is pronounced with Kasr, and conjoined with the ى , is that, being in a vague indecl. n., it is assimilated to the s of the pron., which [like this s ] is preceded by a Kasra, as in مُرَّتْ بِهِ I passed by him and نَظَرَتْ إلَى غُلَامِهِ I looked at his manservant (IY): [thus] the ى after the s is on account of the assimilation of the s to the s of the masc. pron. preceded by a Kasra, [from the impletion of which a ى is engendered,] as in غَلَامِي and بُيُوِي , in the most prevalent [dialect], as before explained [161]; except that the s of the pron., notwithstanding its being preceded by a Kasra or ى , is sometimes conjoined, according to the people of AlHijāz, with the , as بهُو and عَلَيْهُو [161], because the [attached] gen. pron. is orig. the detached nom. [pron.], as above mentioned; whereas [the s in ] ُهُذِيِّي تَمَيِّظ is not conjoined with أ at all
S says "I do not know any one pronounce it with Damm, because, though they assimilate it to the s of the pron., still it is not the pron.; so that they assimilate it to the most frequent pronounciation, which is Kasr of the s, when preceded [like this s] by a Kasra" (IY): (c) some of the Arabs assimilate it to the m of the pl. [161]; and therefore do not put the conj, saying in continuity and pause (R): [for] I have heard some Arabs, whose Arabic is trustworthy, say making [the s] quiescent (S); but this, though the o.f., is rare in usage: and some of them elide the ى from it in continuity, but preserve its Kasra (R): (d) pause [upon it (R)] is with quiescence of the s (IY, R), and omission of the conj. (R), not otherwise (IY), without dispute (R), the ى 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 ى [in continuity] elide it in pause, as they elide it from and علامة [above]; and, since elision of the ى is permissible in ىي and the like, notwithstanding that its augmentativeness is disputed [above], the elision here is more appropriate, because the augmentativeness is certain (IY): (8) and قبض (IY) [and علام (IY)], with quiescence; or and علام (IY), with the s (M): (a) the
$s$ is preferable in the case of these *ps.*, because the $l$ in $\text{ما}$ is elided, while the Fatḥa remains as an indication of the elided; and therefore, grudging that pause should elide the Fatḥa, and thus the indication and the indicated should [both] be removed, they affix the $s$ of silence, upon which the pause falls, while the Fatḥa is preserved [above], as is done in $\text{آمرة أُتْر}$ and $\text{أُتْر}$ [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 م quiescent in continuity, as in $\text{يا أَبَا أَلْسَوْدٌ آَلِهِ}$ [181]; but that belongs to the cat. of treating continuity like pause, by poetic license, as in $\text{عَيْنَهُ وَلَقِصَاءُ}$ [640, 647] (IY), as $\text{تَلْتَنِيرُ بَعْهُ}$ [321, 647, 663] has been heard (K on LXI. 2): (9) $\text{مِنْلُ مَّمَّأْ مَكِيَّ} \text{مَّم} \text{آَلِهِ}$ [above] and $\text{مِنْلُ مَّمَّأْ مَكِيَّ}$, in the case of $\text{ماكِيٰ مَم} \text{آَلِهِ}$ Like what art thou?, [pause being (IY)] with the $s$, not otherwise (M): (a) $\text{مُمْلَكِ} \text{مَكِيٰ مَم} \text{آَلِهِ}$ and $\text{مُمْلَكِ}$ are *ns.*, detached from what follows them; while $\text{ما}$, after elision of the $l$, becomes *unil.*; and therefore, disliking that, they affix the $s$, in order that the pause may fall upon it, and the *n.* be not excluded from the formations of *ns.* (IY).
§ 649. The single ن [of corroboration is light and weak; so that, when preceded by a Fatha, it (IY)] 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 (IY). You say لَنْسَفَعَ for لَنْسَفَعَن in XCVI. 15. [153, 497, 610, 684] (M); and, in the imp., إِضْرَبْا for إِضْرَبْيْنِ [614, 684] (IY). Al A'šā [Maimūn Ibn Kais (Jsh)] says, [in an ode praising the Prophet (IY, Jsh),]

فَأَيْكَ وَالْمَيْتَاتِ لا تَقْرِبِنِهَا ❦ وَلَا تَأْخُذُنَّ سَهْمًا حَدِيدًا لِتَفْصِيدَا ❦ وَلَا تُفْصِيِّدَانَ ❦ وَلَا تُعْبِدَ الشَّيْطَانَ وَاللَّهَ نَعْبَدُا

[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 قَابِدَانُ (Jh, IY), but pausing with the \(\) as you say رَايَتْ زِيدًا [640] (Jh); and hence the saying of the other

ąd َأَبُوك يَزِيدْ وَأَوْلَيْدُ وَمَسْ يَكْسُ يُهْمَا أَدْوَةَ لاَ يَذِلُّ وَيُكَرِّمْا

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

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

Do thou cast, arguing that the address, in that, is to an Angel, the Keeper of the Fire (IY). And, [if what precedes this \(n\) be pronounced with Damm or Kasr, as (IY)] in

Will ye surely strike, O my people?

Wilt thou surely strike, O woman?, then, if you pause (IY), you say

[and the ِ of the 2nd pers. sing. fem.] (M). For the predicament of this ِ is [like] that of the Tanwin [above]: therefore, as you substitute an ِ for the Tanwin in the acc. [497, 640], so you substitute an ِ for this ِ, when what precedes it is pronounced with Fath; and, as the Tanwin is suppressed in the nom. and gen. [640], so
this م is suppressed, when what precedes it is pronounced with دامم or كسر. And, when the م is suppressed, the م, which is the pron. of the pl., is restored [614], because of the removal of the quiescent after it, vid. the م of corroboration. And the م also, which is the sign of the ind., is restored [614], because, it was elided only on account of the uninflectedness of the م, [consequent] upon the attachment of the م 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 م, 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 a م or ع for the single م [of corroboration], when preceded by a letter pronounced with دامم or كسر, respectively, by analogy to the م [preceded by a letter] pronounced with فتح, saying مُخْشُوْن Do ye dread, and مُخْشَٰٰئْيِ for مُخْشُوْن Do thou [fem.] dread, which is analogous to [the practice of] those who substitute [م or ع] for the تانوين [640] in the nom. or gen., [respectively]. But س 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 حلفت بالله I have sworn by God or أقسمت [below], and علَمَ اللهُ God has known or يعَدلُ اللهُ God knows, or nominal, as لعمرَ الْلهِ [27, 29] or لعمرُ أبِيلة Assuredly thy father's life or لعمرُ اللهِ Assuredly God's life, and يَعْبِسُ اللهُ God's oath [29] or أمُانَةُ اللهِ [below] or أمينُ الله [651], and أَعْهَدُ اللهِ God's trust [below], and عَلَى عَهْدٍ اللهِ [29], whereby a prop., aff., as لا أَفْعَلُ Assuredly I will do, or neg., as لا أَفْعَلُ Assuredly I will not do [652], is corroborated [654] (M). The verbal prop. in the oath is أَحْلَفُ باللهِ I swear by God or أَقَسَمَ باللهِ, 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] مرتُ (S, IY) to Zaid in your saying مرتُ بزيدي [503] (IY), except that the v. [sometimes]
occurs understood in this cat. [651, 653], and that the oath is a corroboration" (S). There are some vs., such as [ مَثَّلُ (Jh, KF)] أَلْحَفَتُ I testify, [meaning I swear, by such a thing (Jh, KF)],] أَعْلَمُ I know, and ۚ I have sworn [above], that contain the sense of the oath, and are therefore treated like أَلْحَفَتُ, the v. occurring [as a correl.] after them, as after ۚ By God. The nominal prop. is لَعْمُ أَپِيكَ and لَعْمُ كَذَكَ, where is an inch., the ۚ in it being the ۚ of inception [604]; while the enunc. is suppressed [29, 651], constructively فَسَوْى mine oath or حَلْفِي, 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 لَعْمُ كَذَكَ [29], because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the correl. (IY). The meaning of ۖ يَمِينُ اللهِ is what God has sworn by, vid. XCI. 1. [533, 657], وَالشَّمْسِ, and the like; or the oath that is [sworn] by His Names, as ۚ Oَرْبُ ۛالْكَعْبَةِ, By the Lord of the Ka'ba, وَالخَالِقِ By the Creator, and the like: and the sense is يَمِينُ اللهِ يَمِينٌ God's oath (is mine oath) [29] (R).
And hence \( \text{أَيْمَٰسُ} \) (IY). According to S (R), \( 
abla \text{أَيْمَٰسُ} 
abla \) (IY, R), which is peculiar to the oath (ML), inasmuch as it is not used elsewhere, being thus distinguished from \( 
abla \text{أَيْمَٰسُ} 
abla 
abla \) occurring in the like of \( 
abla \text{أَيْمَٰسُ} 
abla \text{اللَّهِ} \text{بَارَة} \). The oaths of the people are true, or faithful, about which there is no dispute at all, since it is a \( \text{n.}, \text{pl. of} \text{يَيمِين oath, by common consent (DM),] is a sing.} \) (IY, R, ML) \( \text{n. (IY, ML), applied to denote the oath (IY); not a p., contrary to the opinion of Zj and Rm (ML), who say that it is a prep. (DM); and not pl. of} \text{يَيمِين}, \text{contrary to the opinion of the KK [below] (ML): derived from} \text{يَيمِين} (IY, R, ML), i. q. \text{بَرَكة blessing (IY, R, DM), as though they swore by God's blessing (IY): always (ML) (a) governed in the nom. [653, 655], by inchoation, its enunc. being [necessarily (DM)] suppressed (IY, ML), because known, as in the case of} \text{لَعْبُرُ} \text{اللَّهِ [above], constructively} \text{يَبِينى or} \text{يَبِينى} \text{بَرَكة} \text{اللَّهِ} \text{يَبِينى God's blessing (is mine oath) (R); and (b) pre. to the name of God: contrary to the opinion of (a) IDh, who allows it to be governed in the gen. by the jurative p., [vid. the} \text{و}, \text{as} \text{اللَّهِ} \text{يَبِينى By the oath of God (DM)]; (b) IM, who allows it to be pre. to} \text{الْكَعْبَة} [653] \text{and the} \text{ب} \text{of the pron. [651]; and (c) IU, who allows it to be an enunc., the suppressed being the} \)
inch., i. e., تَسَيَّبَيْنَ آيَٰبُنِ اللهِ (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 اًفعلُ اًفعلُ with Kasr of the Hamza among ns. or vs.; and it also seems improbable that اًفعلُ اًفعلُ should be an original sing. (R). According to the KK [651], آيَّسٰنِ اللَّهِ is pl. of يَمَينٌ oath (R, DM), so that آيَّسٰنِ اللَّهِ is like يَمِينٌ اللَّهِ [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 جل [below] (R). Their argument is that this measure is peculiar to the pl., like أَكْلُبُ and أَفْلَسُ [237] (DM), which is refuted by the fact that Kasr of the Hamza [below], and Fath of the م, are allowable, [so that آيَّسٰنِ اللَّهِ is said (DM)]; whereas the like [pronunciation] is not allowable in the pl., such as أَكْلُبُ and أَفْلَسُ [above] (ML), so that أَفْلَسُ is not said (DM): and by the saying of [Abû Miḥjan (ITB, Syt)] Nuṣaib [Ibn Rabāḥ alBalawi (Jsh)]
Then said the party of the people, when I entreated them, "Yes"; and a party said "By God's oath, we know not" (Jsh), where he elides its [669] in the interior [of the sentence] (ML), after the J of inception (Jsh); though the KK may say that it is exclusively distinguished [among pl's. of this measure] by that [elision], because of frequency of usage (DM). The J of inception is prefixed to it, as [to ُعِبَر] inُعِبَرُ اللَّهِ [above]; and hence ُعِبَرُ اللَّهِ [above]. And its Hamza is pronounced with Fath, because this n. 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 J [above]: but Y has transmitted إِيَّٰسُ اللَّهِ [651] with Kasr of the Hamza [above]. As for ٳَماَنَةُ اللَّهِ in ٳَماَنَةُ اللَّهِ, it also is governed in the nom. by inchoation, the enunc. being suppressed [651, 655] (IY). What is meant by ٳَماَنَةُ اللَّهِ is what He has enjoined upon His creatures, vid. obedience to Him, as though it were a trust committed by Him to them, that it was necessary for them to render entire unto Him: the Kur has إِنَا عَرَضْنَا ٳَماَنَةَ عَلَى ٱلسَّمَوَاتِ وَٱلْأَرْضِ وَٱلْجِبَالِ فَأَمَّلَنَّ أَنْ يَكْتُبْنَهَا وَأَشْفَقْنَ مِنْهَا وَحَمْلَهَا
XXXIII. 72. Verily We offered the trust, [meaning obedience (K, B),] to the heavens and the earth and the mountains; and they refused to undertake it, and were afraid of it. And man undertook it: verily he was wrongful, ignorant (R), where obedience is named trust, because it [must be present, as the trust (K)] must be rendered (K, B). And َعَلَى َعَهْدٍ َالْلَّهِ َعَهْدٍ [below] is governed in the nom. by inchoation, while َعَلَى is its enunc. ; the form being like نُعِيَ أَلْدَارِ رَبِّكَ [28], but the sense being

*I swear by God* (IY). One property of the two props., [the oath and its correl. (IY),] is that, [since one of them is corroborated by the other (IY),] they are equivalent to one prop. [compounded of two terms, such as the inch. and enunc. (IY)], like the two props. of the prot. and apod. [419] (M): so that, as, when you mention the inch. alone, or the enunc. alone, it does not import any material sense, so, when you mention one of the two props., as َأَحْلَفُ بِاللَّهِ [above], without the other, it is like your saying َزَيْدُ زَيْدُ 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 َمُتَّكَنُبَ ُّالَّلَّهِ Thou hast perished, by God,
(assuredly thou hast perished), meaning [880Xx] (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 ُزیدَ ۗ وَاللَّهِ قَآئِمٌ Zaid, by God, is standing [below] (WIH, R, Jm) and ۗ قَآئِمٍ وَاللَّهِ رَبٌّ Zaid, by God, stood, and, in the Nahj alBalāgha, ۗ قَآئِمٍ وَاللَّهِ لَقُوا آللَّهَ They have, by God, met God [575, 577] (R); or (2) is preceded by what indicates it (IH), as ۗ زیدَ ۗ وَاللَّهِ Qa‘īm Zaid is standing, by God [below] (WIH, R, Jm) and ۗ قَآئِمٍ وَاللَّهِ رَبٌّ 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 ۗ أَكَرِمْكَ إِنِّي أَتَيْتُكَ I shall honor thee, if thou come to me, as before mentioned [419] (R). But the prop. mentioned, though, according to the sense, a correl. of the oath, is, according to the form, named
only the indicator of the correl., not the correl., for which reason the sign of the correl. of the oath [652] is not necessary in it (Jm). Sometimes the jurative prop. is followed by a context indicative of the correl., which is therefore suppressed [333], although this context is not, like the two [indicators above] mentioned, a correl. in respect of the sense, as لَا أَلْفَاحِبٌ وَلَا لِيَالٍ إِسْتِرُ. LXXXIX. 1. [(I swear) by the daybreak and the first ten nights of Dhu-lHijja, where the sworn-to is suppressed (K, B)], i.e., لَا يُؤْخَدُنَّ وَلَا يُعَاتِبُنَّ 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 زَيَّدْ وَاللّهُ قَاتِمٌ and زَيَّدْ قَاتِمٌ [above] : (a) if you say لَا قَاتِمٌ or لَا يُؤْخَدُنَّ 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 لَا يُؤْخَدُنَّ وَلَا يُعَاتِبُنَّ عَصِرًا LXXIX. 1. [By the bands of Angels vehemently tearing out the souls from the bodies, (assuredly ye
shall be raised from the dead), the sworn-to being suppressed (K), i.e., لَنْ تَبْعَشْ، 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 [655]: and, wherever لَنْ تَبْعَشْ or لَقَدْ فَعَلْ or لَقَدْ فَعَلَّ or لَقَدْ فَعَلَّنَّ occurs, when not preceded by a jurative prop., there a jurative prop. is supplied, as لَقَدْ فَعَلَّنَّ 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 زَيْدَادَ قَائِمٌ [below] and لَنْ تَبْعَشْ or لَقَدْ فَعَلَّ or لَقَدْ فَعَلَّنَّ 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 عَوْضٌ أَلْعَانِيِّسِينَ لَا أَنْفَعْلَ عَوْضٌ [206], from the frequency of the usage of عَوْضٌ with the oath, together with the fact that its sense is أَبَدَا ever [206] and decidedly, so that it contains such a corroboration as imports the sense of the oath. And, on account of its importing the sense of the oath, it sometimes precedes its op., standing in the place of the jurative prop., even if its op. be conjoined with a p. that prevents an op. from governing what precedes it, like the ن of corroboration [610] and [the neg.] مَا [498, 546], as عَوْضٌ لَا آتِينَكَ
Never indeed will I come to thee and \( عَوَضَ مَا آتَيْكَ \)

Never will I come to thee, the object being that \( عَوَضُ \) should supply the place of the oath. But sometimes it it used otherwise than in the oath, as

\[
	ext{هَذَا تَنْتَائِي بِمَا أُولِيتْ مِنْ حَسَنٍ}
\]

\( لَأَرْتُ عَوَضَ قَرْبَ أَلْعَيْنِ مَتَكُسَوَدًا \)

(R), by Rabî‘a Ibn Makrûm aḍ-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. جَيْبُ i. q. نَعْمَ [556], the connecting link being that assent is a corroboration and confirmation, like the oath: you say جَيْبُ لَأْقَلِلْنَّ Yea, assuredly I will do, as though you said نَعْمَ وَاللَّهُ لَأْقَلِلْنَّ Yes, by God, assuredly I will do. But sometimes جَيْبُ is put without any oath, as in وَقَلَّسْ عَلَى الْفَرْدُوْسِ الْحَر [556]. It is *uninfl.* upon Kasr, but is sometimes pronounced with Fatḥ; and sometimes it is pronounced with Tanwin, by poetic license, as in وَقَتَّالِيْ أُسِبِتَ الْحَر [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

\[
	ext{فَأَقْسِمُ لَوْ شَئْنَا أَتَاّنا رَسُوْلُهُ} * 
\]
[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., فأقسم بمِّبَا يقسمُ يَهَيْ 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 لَأَضْرَّبَنَّكَ Assuredly I will strike thee, because the ن has [certain specified] positions, and does not occur in pure enunciation, as يَضْرِبُنَّ زِيْدًا [612]; but, as for such [phrases] as لَقَدْ سَبِعَ اللهُ, III. 177. Assuredly God hath heard and لَمْ رَبَّتْ قَتَّلَम [above], there exists no evidence that they are correls. of the oath, contrary to the opinion of the KK [652]. And sometimes حَقَّا Truly, يَقِينًا certainly قَطَّعًا decidedly, and what resembles them, stand in the place of the oath, as حَقَّا لَا نُعَلَّم Truly, I will assuredly do. And so does كَلَا [598], when not [denoting] reprehension, as لَمْ يَنْبِدَنِ CIV. 4. Now, assuredly etc. [406]. And so also does the obligation of a vow, as لَنَعَلَّم I have covenanted with God, assuredly I will do, and لَنَعَلَّم [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. أَحْلَفَ ُ[above], أَحْلَفَ, and the like, such as and أَشْهَدُ and أَعْلَمُ; and similarly لَعْبَرُ ُاللٰهِ and أَيْسُ ُاللٰهِ (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. whereto the oath is made to adhere [653], in order that it may thereby be magnified, and rendered solemn, is the sworn-by (M), which is every name or ep. of God, and the like, vid. what is magnified [657], according to them, as
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[652] (IY), by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulma Rabia 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], "الذَّارِيَاتِ دَرَوْا" LI. 1. By the winds scattering the dust about (K, B), "الَّذِينَ ذَاتِ الْحُكْبِكَ" LI. 7. [368], and C. 1. [246, 652] (IY).

§. 651. The oath being frequent in their speech, they take many liberties with it, and study [different] kinds of abbreviation. Hence (1) the suppression of (a) the v. [653] in يَأْتِيْفُ بِلَّلَهِ (I swear) by God, the jurative v. being often suppressed [650], because it is known, and can be dispensed with, as بِلَّلَهِ إِنِّي أَشْرَكْنَ لْتُطَهَّرَ 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 أَقَسِمْ لَأَتَعَلَّقُ I swear (by God), assuredly I will do, meaning أَقَسِمْ بِلَّلَهِ.
because it is frequently used, and the person addressed knows what is meant: the poet says [564, 652], and another says [650, 652]:

(a) the jurists say that, if a man said *I make oath* or *I swear* or *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 *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 *مَنْ كَانَ حَافِزاً فَلّيَضْحَفْ بَيْنَ الْلَّهِ وَالْفَلْسَةُ* Whoso is about to swear, let him swear by God, or let him hold his peace [650] (IY): (c) the enunc. [of the inchoatical prop., as (IY)] in لَعَمَّرْلِكَ [29, 650] and its congeners (M), and [650], [the pre. ns. in] all of which are *inches*., whose enuncs. are suppressed, for abbreviation, because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the correl. (IY), the sense being لَعَمَّرْلِكَ مَا أَقْسِمْ بِهِ Assuredly thy life (is what I swear by) (M), [or] هَمَّا أَقْسِمْ بِهِ (is part of what I swear by) (K on XV. 72), [or] قَسِيْبُ (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
the life of any other than the Prophet (peace be upon him!)” (IY): (a) if the \( n. \), that you make an \textit{inch.}, be specifically assigned to the oath, as in 
\( \text{أَيْسُ} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \) \[650\] and 
\( 
\text{كَعْرُ} 
\) \[29\], suppression of the \textit{enunc.} is necessary, as before explained in the \textit{cat.} of the \textit{inch.} \[29\], because that expression indicates the particular \textit{enunc.}, vid. 
\( 
\text{مَا} \quad 
\text{أُقَسِّمُ} 
\text{يَا} 
\) , while the \textit{correl.} supplies the place of the \textit{enunc.}: but, if it be not specifically assigned to the oath, as in 
\( 
\text{يَبِينُ} 
\text{اللَّهُ} \quad 
\text{عَهْدُ} 
\text{اللَّهِ} 
\text{وَأُمَانَة} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \) \[29, 650\], you may suppress the \textit{enunc.}, as 
\( 
\text{عَهْدُ} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{عَلَى} 
\text{أُمَانَة} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{يَبِينُ} 
\text{اللَّهُ} 
\) God’s trust (is what I swear by), assuredly I will do and 
\( 
\text{عَهْدُ} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{عَلَى} 
\text{أُمَانَة} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{يَبِينُ} 
\text{اللَّهُ} 
\) God’s covenant etc., and 
\( 
\text{عَهْدُ} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{عَلَى} 
\text{أُمَانَة} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{يَبِينُ} 
\text{اللَّهُ} 
\) God’s oath etc.; or express it, as 
\( 
\text{عَلَى} 
\text{أُمَانَة} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{يَبِينُ} 
\text{اللَّهُ} 
\) God’s trust is binding upon me, [assuredly I will do,] and 
\( 
\text{عَلَى} 
\text{أُمَانَة} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{يَبِينُ} 
\text{اللَّهُ} 
\) God’s covenant is etc., and 
\( 
\text{عَلَى} 
\text{أُمَانَة} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{يَبِينُ} 
\text{اللَّهُ} 
\) God’s oath is etc.: and similarly you say 
\( 
\text{الْكِعْبَةُ} 
\text{لَانْعِلَانَ} 
\text{The Ka'ba} 
\text{(is what I swear by), assuredly etc., and} 
\text{الْمُصْحَفَ} 
\text{الْكِعْبَةُ} 
\text{يَبِينِي} 
\text{لَانْعِلَانَ The Holy Book (etc.), or} 
\text{الْكِعْبَةُ} 
\text{يَبِينِي} 
\text{لَانْعِلَانَ The Ka'ba is mine oath, assuredly etc. [and} 
\text{الْمُصْحَفَ} 
\text{يَبِينِي} 
\text{اللَّهُ} 
\text{The Holy Book is mine oath, etc.]}: (b) Fr says that, if the \textit{inch.} be an abstract \( n. \) \[3\], as in 
\( 
\text{أَيْسُ} 
\text{اللَّهِ} \quad 
\text{لَعْبَرُ} 
\) , then the \textit{correl.} of the oath is its \textit{enunc.}; and there is no need to supply another \textit{enunc.}, because 
\( 
\text{لَعْبَرُ} 
\) is
an oath, and also is an oath, so that the former is [identical with] the latter: but this is of no account, because the continuance is the sworn-by, while is the sworn-to; and this cannot be [identical with] that: and so may one say of and 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 and, with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza, together with Damm of the , 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, [690]; and sometimes the is elided, together with the , so that, and, with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza, are said: (c) what is contracted from is
used only with the word الله, as
is used therewith [650] (R): (d) Y asserts that the ٌ of أن is conj.; and so the Arabs treat it, pronouncing the ٌ with Fath, as they pronounce the ٌ in القرآن [599] with Fath [668]; and similarly [the Hamza of] ٌ: the poet says
فِنَالْ فَرِيقُ الْقُرْنِ الْحَمِيدِ [650], which we have heard from the Arabs thus [recited] (S): (e) the of من and مُن [653]:
الله ُ\[503, 514, 515, 655]\; and, with compensation, in ها الله ُ[552], ُ and ها الله ُ[656]: (2) substitution of a ت for the jurative ِ, without compensation, in [506, 653] (M), as XII. 85. [454] and XII. 91. [575] (IY): (3)
their preference for Fathā over Дamma, which is better known in عمر (M), whence your saying in the oath ُلَعْمَرَ َلَّنَّعْمَلَ [29, 650]: (a) عمر continuance, life, has three dial. vars., (a) عمر ُ with Fath of the ُ, and quiescence of the ُ; (b) عمر ُ with دamm of the ُ, and quiescence of the ُ; and (c) عمر ُ with دamm of both [ُ and ُ]: (b) you say أَطَالَ ُ اللهُ ُعَمَرَ God prolong, or lengthen, thy life! or or: but, when you come to the oath, you use only the [dial. var.] pronounced with Fath of the ُ, because it is the lightest of the three dial. vars.; while, the oath being frequent, they adopt the lightest [form] for it (IY).
§. 652. The oath is of two kinds, either an adjuration [654], as *عَمْرُ تُكَ آللّهُ نَسْدُتَ تِلَّنَي* [below], *I have besought God to prolong thy life or I have entreated thee by thy confession of God's eternity,* [41] and *قَعْدُ ال۱آللّهُ لِتلَفَعَّلَ* [below], and sometimes *عَمْرُ ال۱آللّهُ* [650, 651]; or not an adjuration. The correl. of the adjuration is a command, prohibition, or interrogation, as

*بِذِينِكَ عَلَى ضَمْتِ إِلَيْكَ لِيَلَّيْلَيْ قُبْلَ ال۱صَبَّحِ أَوَّلَ تَلَمُّتْ فَتَأَعَا* [654] (R), by the Majnūn of Laila, addressing her husband, *(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 إِلَّا or لَا, as *لَا نُسْدُتَ ال۱آللّهُ إِلَّا فَعَلَتْ* I have adjured thee by God [above], etc. [95] or لَبَّا فَعَلَتْ [559]. But when in *قَعْدُكَ أَنِّي لا آخِر* [Part I, p. 42 A] is red [564]. And sometimes one says in adjuration *(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 إِنْ, [when the correl. is aff. (WIH),] and the neg. p.
By God, assuredly I will do and verily thou art going and I have not done and I will not do. Since the oath and the correl. are, each of them, a prop. [650], which is an expression for every independent phrase, standing by itself; but each of them has some dependence upon the other; therefore cops. are unavoidable, to connect one of them with the other, as the cond. p. connects the prot. with the apod. [419]: so that two ps. are assigned to affirmation, vid. the َل [600] and ْإِن ْعَمَّ [517]; and two to negation, vid. ْمَا [546] and ْلَكَ [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 َفَ [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 َوََاٰلِلَّٰهُ إِنّ َزِيَادًا [427]; or the َلَّٰكُنَّ تَأْمُّ [650]; and sometimes by both combined, as َوََاٰلِلَّٰهُ إِنّ َزِيَادًا لَقَآئِمٌ, for corroboration, and for connection of the correl. with the oath (WIH): the Kur has َحَمَرَ وَاٰلِكْتَابِ الْبُيَّنِ السَّيِّيِّسِ إِنّا أَنَرَّنَاهُ.
XLIV. 1, 2. Hā-Μīm. By the clear Scripture, verily We revealed it in a blessed night [518], CIII. 1, 2.[518, 469, 650], and إنَّ آدَّنَّا لَرَبِّي مَكْفُودً C. 6. Verily man to his Lord is ungrateful after C. 1. [246, 650]; and [the corroboration in] the correl. [headed] by إنَّ falls upon the pred. [650], because it is in the sense of the v. (IY): (a) the aff. nominal [prop.] is headed by إنَّ, uncontracted [517] or contracted [525]; or by the J [600]: (b) this J is the J of inception [604], importing corroboration, there being no difference between it and إنَّ, 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 J introduced after إنَّ [521, 604] also is orig. the J of inception; and therefore this J, i.e., the J of the correl. of the oath, is not prefixed to anything except what the J occurring after إنَّ is prefixed to: (d) the opinion of the KK is that the J in the like of كَرَّيْنَ ۖ عَايَمَ [650] also is [the J of] the correl. of the oath, the oath before it being supplied; and, this being so, there is no J of inception in existence, according to them: but the better [opinion] is that the J in كَرَّيْنَ ۖ عَايَمَ is the J 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 َلا ِما َرَيِّد ُقَاتِئِمُ By God, Zaid is not standing or ُقَاتِئِمُ [107], and َلا ِما َرَيِّد ُقَاتِئِمُ By God, Zaid is not in the house nor 'Amr [100] (WIH): the Kur has َلا ِما َرَيِّد ُقَاتِئِمُ XIV. 46. What! and had ye not sworn before, there should not be for you any removal? (IY), i. e., by death (K, B): (a) the neg. nominal [prop.] is headed by (a) َما [38, 107, 546], op. according to the people of AlHijāz, and inop. according to others; (b) the ل of exemption [36, 99, 547], in its various states; (c) َلا ِما َرَيِّد ُقَاتِئِمُ [550], as By God, Zaid is not standing (R). If it be a verbal [prop.], then, (1) if aff., (a) when its v. is a pret., it is attended by the ل, with َلا ِما َرَيِّد ُقَاتِئِمُ [427]; or without it, as َلا ِما َرَيِّد ُقَاتِئِمُ [below]; and sometimes by ُقَاتِئِمُ 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 ُقَاتِئِمُ [577], as َلا ِما َرَيِّد ُقَاتِئِمُ [600] (R): [for,] when the ل is prefixed to the pret., the phrase is not good unless ُقَاتِئِمُ be with it, as َلا ِما َرَيِّد ُقَاتِئِمُ [above], because ُقَاتِئِمُ approximates the past to the present, as
By God, assuredly ye have known, we have not come to do evil in the land and XII. 91. [575] (IY): (b) in the case of and َنَعْمَ ِبَسْ , however, the ل alone is put [604], since َنَدْ is not prefixed to them, because of their aplasticity [575], as

ِبِيْنَّا لِنَعْمَ َسَيْدَانِ وَحَدَّتُما ُعَلَى كُلِّ حَالِ مِنْ سَحِيمٍ وَمَبْرَمٍ (R), by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulma, An oath, َبِيْنَّا being [governed in the acc. as (EM)] an inf. n. [corrob. (AKB)] of َأَقْسَمْتُ [39, 40] in the preceding verse َأَقْسَمْتُ الْعَرْ[650], assuredly such that most excellent are the two chiefs have ye been found to be, in every state, easy and hard! (EM, AKB), meaning by "the two chiefs" AlHarith Ibn 'Auf and Harim Ibn Sinan (EM): (c) َوَأَلْلَّهُ لَقَامَ [above] is allowable, but not frequent, whence َإِذَا لَقَامَ بِنَصْرِيِّ الْحَرْثِ [23] (IY), the ل in َلَقَامَ being [the ل of] the correl. of an oath understood, constructively َلَقَامَ إِذَا وَأَلْلَّهُ لَقَامَ (T); and َحَلَفْتُ لَهَا الْحَرْثِ [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 ل is not put because of the length [of the sentence]; and َحَلَفْتُ لَهَا الْحَرْثِ [575, 577, 600] (R), where the connection is effected by the ل, without َتَدْ, 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 the opinion of S is that is subsidiary [to the oath], like the J in [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 By God, if thou stookest, assuredly I would honor thee (AKB); so that, in the evidence of [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 ت. 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 alFawāris Ḫūsain Ḫūsain Ḏirār ʿadḌabbī (T, AKB)] says

(R). Ibn Aus swore an oath, assuredly he would [take me prisoner, and then grant me grace, and (AKB)] restore me to women as though they were pokers or spits (T, AKB), because of their being burnt by love for, and grief over, me; then I did with him the like of what he purposed to do with me (AKB): (d) all of this is if the "aor. be future: whereas, if it be present, the majority allow its occurrence as a correl. of the oath; contrary to the opinion of Mb, [who disallows it,] because the present, being actually in existence, does not need to be corroborated by the oath; and properly it should be allowed, since many an existing [matter, when] not
witnessed, is deniable: [Ks, says (AKB)] Fr [in his commentary on XVII. 90. (AKB),] has cited [to me the verse of AlKumait Ibn Ma'ruf (AKB)] 

I saw that he denied [613] (R), where the sense is assuredly my Lord (now) knows (AKB); and you say "By God, assuredly Zaid is praying, where you must content yourself with the J, and do not put the N, because it is the sign of the future (R): (e) BD says "If the aor. be in the sense of the present, it is corroborated by the J, without the N, because the latter is peculiar to the future, as By God, verily 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 By God, Zaid has not stood or will not stand (WIH): (a) the neg. pret. is [headed] by as 

Assuredly I swear etc. [566] and the saying of the poet cited by Fr [above]" (AKB): (2) if neg., (a) when its v. is a pret., it is attended by [546] or [547], as By God, Zaid has not stood or will not stand (WIH): (a) the neg. pret. is [headed] by as [above] (R): the Kur has
VI. 23. By God, our Lord, we have not been polytheists and polythei...
Yet he hath not freed a captive, nor fed [an orphan or (B)] a needy man were said (R), so that ل is repeated in sense (K): (b) when its v. is an aor., it is attended by م or ل, [the latter] with the ن of corroboration [612]; as By God, assuredly I will not do; or without it, as لَأ أَنْعَلَ I will not do (WIH): (a) the aor. is negatived by م or ل or ل (R): an instance of the correl. [headed] by ل, in the Kur, is LIX. 12. [599, 650], where لَأ يَنْخَرْجُونَ and لَأ يَنْصُرُونَهُمَّ 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 م and ل, when not restricted by [something indicative of] future time, apparently denote negation of the present [546, 550]; so that Mb [above] does not allow لَأ أَنْعَلَ or لَأ أَنْعَلَ By God, I do not stand or لَأ أَنْعَلَ or لَأ أَنْعَلَ [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 ل or ل 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 لئن or لَمَّا is very rare, as in the saying of Abū Talib وَاللَّهِ لَنْ يُصِلْوا اللَّهُمَّ نعَمَ وَحَالَقِهِمْ لَمْ تَقْمَ عَنْ مِثَالِهِمْ منْتَكِبَةَ Yes, *by their Creator, not a bearer of noble children has given birth to the like of them!* said by an Arab in reply to "Hast thou sons?"; though this [second ex.] may be by suppression of the *correl.,* i.e., إنَّ لَيْتَ بْيْئَنَ (Verily I have sons), the *neg. prop.* being afterwards begun (ML on لئن.). If the sworn-to be the *correl.* of a future condition preceded by an oath, the *cond.* instrument is often conjoined with a ل pronounced with Fath, named subsidiary [599, 601], i.e., subordinating, and specifically assigning, the *correl.* to the oath, not to the condition [427], as وَاللَّهِ لَنْ آتَيْتُنِي لاَتَبْيِنَكَ By God, *if thou come to me, assuredly I will come to thee,* where إنَّ آتَيْتُنِي without a ل is allowable. If, however, the oath be suppressed, and supplied, the subsidiary ل 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) ل (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., لا تَنفَّضُ (IY, WIH); whether the aor. be لا بِرَأَلَ and its sisters [447, 454], as in للهِ يَبْقَى الْحَرَجُ [454, 547, 655] (R), orig. (AKB); or any other, as in للهِ يَبْقَى الْحَرَجُ [504, 653] (R), constructively لا يَبْقَى (AKB), [and] in the saying of the [Hudhalri (IY)] poet

تَأَلَّللهِ يَبْقَى عَلَى أَلْيَامٍ مُبْتَقِلٍ وَجَوْنُ الْسَرَّةَ رَبَاعٍ سَنَةٌ غَرُدُ (M) 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 لا بِرَأَل لا تنفَّصَ للهِ [454]-(R), constructively لا تنفَّصَ (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 رَبَّتَهُ مَا إِذَا (By God,) ye
will (not) find him"; and Dm says that apparently his opinion is more probable (AKB). As for the saying, however,

[Then she (Dahmâ, the name of a woman) shall not, by Abû Dahmâ, 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. وَأَبَيُّ دِهْمَة (AKB). Properly لا or ما should not be separated from ريال and its sisters by an adv. or its like, though that is allowable in the case of other vs., as لا أُلْبِيمَ جَتَنَا وَلا أَمِّس Not to-day didst thou come to me, nor yesterday, because the neg. p. is compounded with ريال and its sisters to import affirmation; and فَلا وَأَبَيُّ دِهْمَة الَّذِي [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 سَلَا أَرَأَيْتَ كَرَأَل فَلا وَأَبَيُّ دِهْمَة الَّذِي [1] and فَلا وَأَبَيُّ دِهْمَة الَّذِي [above]". His Commentator IMH says that لا 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 فَلَا رَأَيْتِ ذَهْبًا لَا زَالتُ Then no, by Abû 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 فَلَا رَأَيْتِ ذَهْبًا لَا زَالتُ [above] and فَقُلْتُ يِبِينَ آللَّهِ آللَّهُ لَا زَالتُ (AKB). The sign of affirmation may not be suppressed in the aor., because it is mostly two signs, the ل and the و, 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 مُا, because لَا is used more than مُا in negation of the aor. (R). IU holds the verse [last cited] to be a case of suppression of the neg. مُا; but quotes its first hemistich differently, saying "And hence the suppression of the neg. مُا, which is very rare, as in لَعْبَر أَبِي دُهْسًا زَالتُ آللَّهُ By the life of Abû Dahmá, she has (not) ceased to be exalted above her people, so long as a striker of fire has twisted a fire-stick!', meaning مُا زَالتُ": and so is it quoted, and explained, by IUk in
the Commentary on the Tashil, except that he says "i.e., يَأْتُ she shall (not) cease", [which involves "shall twist"] (AKB). None of these [four] ps. [above] may be suppressed, except َن alone, because (1) ُن is op.; and may not govern, when understood, on account of its weakness : (2) َما also is op., in the idiom of the people of AlHijâz : (3) suppression of the َن 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 ُن [506], the ُن [506], the َل [504], and َمَن [499] (IY). The jurative ps. are preps.; but are named "jurative ps." because of their prefixion to the sworn-by (CAj). The َب is the original jurative َب [503, 654], because it is a prep., meaning adhesion; which attaches the idea of swearing, and makes it adhere, to the sworn-by, in أَحْلَف بِاللَّهِ [650], as the َب conveys the [idea of] passing to the passed-by in مَرْتُ بِرَبْيّد [503]. The َب , then, is one of the preps. [498], on a par with َمَن [499] and َعَلَى [502]; and, for that reason, we say that it is "the original jurative َب.", 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 َلاَّ فَعَلَْنَى (I swear) by God, etc. [654] (II). And, after suppression of the ِن, which you have made to adhere to the sworn-by, they sometimes put, in place of the ُب, four ُب, the ُم, and the ُن, and two ُن, vid. the ُل and ُم in your saying َلاَّ يُؤَخَرُ َالأَجْلُ ِبِلِّلَّهِ By God, the end shall not be delayed! [498] and ُم ِبِلِّلَّهِ َلاَ فَعَلَْنَى By my Lord, assuredly etc. [499], from desire for peculiarity [654] (M). The ُم is a subst. for the ُب [506], because they mean to allow themselves some latitude [in the choice of a ِن], on account of the frequency of oaths [651]; while the ُم 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 ُم 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 ُم 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 ُم is a subst. for the ُب; and is ِن with the government of the latter, unlike the rest of the cons., because the con. ُم is itself inop., being only indicative of the suppressed ِن. [131, 538], for which reason, instead of َلاَّ فَعَلَْنَى َزَيْدٌ َعَمْرُ ْنَيُذَلُّ Zaid and َعَمْرُ ْنَيُذَلُّ 'Amr
stood, you may say 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, وَيْرَذِيدَ and by Zaid, this is not the jurative (IY). The ت and the ل contain the sense of wonder (M), as XII. 91. [575, 651] and للهِ يَبْقِى آلِحٰ (508, 652) (IY): and sometimes the ت occurs otherwise than in wonder (M), as XXI. 58. [498, 611] (IY); but not the ل: S cites للهِ يَبْقِى آلِحٰ [above], by 'Abd Manāt alHudhali (M). The ت is a subst. for the ل [506, 651], being often substituted for it, as in اْنْتَجِاهُ and تُرَائِف [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 للهِ [504], in great matters. And so does مَعْنِي, pronounced with Kasr, and sometimes with دamm, of the م, Kasr being more frequent; and peculiar to the expression رَبِّي my Lord [499]. It is held (1) by S to be a prep., standing in the place of the ب; the دamm of the م being to indicate the alteration of its meaning, and its exclusion from its cat., as you say of the proper name شمس ابن مالك Shums Ibn Malik, with دamm of the ش: (2) by some of the KK to be contracted from 8يُسُ when
pronounced with Damm, and from دِیْبَس when pronounced with Kasr of the م. but this requires consideration, because دِیْبَس is peculiar to the kubba or مَنْ[650], and to رَبْی [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 دِیْبَس or دِیْبَس, because contraction of the infl., and its reduction to two letters, do not necessitate uninflectedness, as [we see] in يَد hand and دِم blood. And one should rather say that مِنَاللهُ in their sayings مِنِاللهِ with Damm, and مِنِاللهِ with Kasr, of the م and ن, [used] with the word الله alone, is [identical with] the prep. مِنِاللهِ used with رَبْی; the ن being made to imitate the م in Damm and Kasr, because of the two quiescents [664, 666]: and that مِنِاللهِ in مِنِاللهِ [499], with two Fathas is [identical with مِنِاللهِ in مِنِاللهِ [499], with Kasr of the م and Fath of the ن, the م being made to imitate the ن [in Fath], from desire for lightening; although the Fatha of the ن arises accidentally, because of the two quiescents. It is said, however, that all three [vurs.], i. e., with Damm, Kasr, and Fath of both م and ن, [used] with the word الله, are contracted from دِیْبَس. As for the abridgment of مِنِاللهِ, with
two Ğammāṣas, from ʿayább, it is plain. But, as for those
[vars.] with Kasr or Fath of both letters, I see no reason
for their being contracted from it, because ʿayább, accord-
ing 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, ʿayább ʿllahu ʿalayhim ʿalā ʿllahu ʿalayhim
occurred, in the three cases, nom., acc., and gen., as ʿayább
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
with two Fathās may be contracted from ʿayább ʿllahu ʿalayhim, by
making the م imitate the ن [in Fath] after the contrac-
tion; but not ʿayább مِنَ ʿllahu ʿalayhim with two Kasras, by making the
م imitate the م [in Kasr], because the vowel of inflection
is not removable for the sake of alliteration. Sometimes
مِنَ ʿllahu ʿalayhim with Damm, and مِنَ ʿllahu ʿalayhim with Kasr, of the م are
said, being contracted from مِنَ ʿllahu ʿalayhim [651], according
to what S says. It is said [by others] (1) that they
are contracted from ʿayább, in which case there is a
difficulty in [accounting for] the Kasr of the م: (2) that
the one with Kasr is contracted from ʿayább: (3) that
both are subs. for the م [687], like the م [above],
because the م and م are labial [732], for which reason
they are peculiar to the word Allah, like the ُمَبَعَّنَ; but this requires consideration, because the word of one letter does not occur, in their language, pronounced with Damm (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 بَعَّنَ لَأَنْعُسَ By God, assuredly I will do; and (IY)] the pron., as بَعِيدَة By Him, assuredly I will worship Him and بَعِيدَة 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 لَأَنْعُسَ is not allowable, nor تَكَ (IY): the poet says

Now Umâma 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 حَلَّفَتِ بِاللهِ [650] (M), and أَحُلفُ بِاللهِ; whereas you do not say أَقْسَمُ تَالِبَة, nor أَحُلفُ وَأَلْلَهِ, and the like (IY): (3) [that you apply it to denote (IY)] conciliatory [and propitiatory (IY)] adjuration of the man [addressed (IY)], as بَعَّنَ لَمْ أُرْتَنِى (I adjure thee) by God, only that thou visit me [95, 559, 652]
and (I adjure thee) by thy life, inform me (M); whereas you do not say تَآَلِلَهُ، nor أَلَّهُ، 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 ; and these conditions are prescribed in the case of the ت, and add its being made peculiar to الله; and make the ب 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 ب is dependent upon a suppressed v., as though he said أَسْأَلْتُ بِاللَّهِ [below], which is suppressed because indicated by the circumstances of the case; and the sense is أَسْأَلْتُ بِقُدْرَةِ أَلَّهُ (IY): and the [other (IY)] poet says بِدِينُكَ مَعَ اللَّهِ أَسْأَلْتُ بِكَ بِكَ وَأَلَلَهُ [652] (M), i.e., أَسْأَلْتُ بِكَ بِكَ وَأَلَلَهُ, 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

أَيُّهَا الْخَيْرُ حَيِّي فِي الْأَرْضِ كُلُّهَا أَيُّهَا الْلَّهُ ٍ هَلْ لِيْ فَيْ يَبْيِنِي مِنْ عَقْلِكُنَا

O best of living beings, in creation, all of it, what! (I ask thee) by God, will there be for me any sense in mine oath? where he names it an oath, because he says هل لي في يبيني آلح?”, the reply is that the full phrase is will there be any sense in mine oath (if I swear that thou art the best of living beings in creation)?, not that he regards this phrase [(I ask thee) by God] as an oath (IY). In holding this [kind of phrase] to be an oath [652], R is following IM. “We do not know”, says AH, “any one that takes the course of naming this an oath, except IM: but, in one of the Commentaries on the Book, when عَمِرُ ٍك [652], عَمِرُ ٌك, and ٍتَعْدَلَك, and ٍتَعْبِدَك ٍ[Part I, p. 44 A] have been mentioned, there is a declaration to the effect that some of the GG assert these [expressions] to be oaths; so that IM agrees with those who say that: whereas, according to our school, the juratory prop. is only enunciatory [below]”. And this [declaration] is confirmed by the
fact that IJ says "The oath is an originative prop., whereby another prop. is corroborated [650]: then, if the latter be enunciatory, the oath is non-adjuratory; and, if it be requisitive, the oath is adjuratory". IU expresses himself strangely, saying, in the small Commentary on the 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 بِنَبِيَّ الْحَقَّ [above] and بِديِبْكَ ۝ هَدُّ الْحَقَّ [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 Ïdäh, "As for these two verses, they are not oaths, because the two props. أَسْأَلَكَ بِنَبِيّ ۝ بَلْ لاَّ بَلَّامِعَةٍ [above] and أَسْأَلَكَ ۝ بَلْ لاَّ بَلَّامِعَةٍ [above] do not admit of being [pronounced] true or false; but what is meant thereby is only conciliation [below] of the person addressed, the full phrase being أَسْأَلَكَ بِنَبِيّ and أَسْأَلَكَ بِنَبِيّ [above],
except that they understand the v., because it is indicated by the sense”. “And”, says he, “three things will prove to you that [پَآَللّهُ ﻋَلَّمُ ﺗَذَّبَعُ بِذِكْرَمُهُ By God, has Zaid stood?] or [پَآَللّهُ ﻋَلَّمُ ﺗَذَّبَعُ ﻣَأْذَكَرَمُهُ 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 بـ, in the language of the Arabs, who do not say ﺗَأَذَّبَعُ ﻋَلَّمُ ﻣَأْذَكَرَمُهُ, nor ﺗَأَذَّبَعُ ﻋَلَّمُ ﻣَأْذَكَرَمُهُ that, when they express the v. whereon the بـ depends, it is not one of the jurative vs., ﺗَأَذَّبَعُ ﻋَلَّمُ ﻣَأْذَكَرَمُهُ not being said; (2) 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 قَسْمُ آسِتْعَطَافِي conciliatory [or adjuratory] oath (AKB). The correl. of the non-adjuratory oath must be enunciatory [above]; and the correl. of the adjuratory oath originative, as in ﺛَاﺪَرَكَ ﻋَلَّمُ ﺗَأَذَّبَعُ آٓح (I adjure thee) by thy Lord, hast thou drawn etc? and

ٍبِعْيْشُكِ يَا سَلَمِي أَرْحَمُي ذَٰٔ صَبَابِي

أَبٌ يُعْرِبُ مَا يُرَضِيكِ فِي أَلْسِنَةِ وَالْبُعْرُ
[(I adjure thee) by thy life, O Salim, 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 اللهُ لا تُعَمَّدَ (By) God, assuredly I will stand is said, transmitted by S, meaning اللهُ بالله، (IY on §. 656). The [jurative p. (IY)] ب is (1) [often (IY)] suppressed [514, 651] (M), as اللهُ لا تُعَمَّدَ with the acc. [651]: (a) they hardly ever suppress this p. in the oath with [expression of] the v.; and do not say أَقْسِمُ اللهُ أَحَلَفَ اللهُ, nor أَقْسِمُ اللهُ; 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, أُقِيمُ, 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 تَمَرَّنَ آلِ ديَار آَلِ نَحْذَر [514] (IY): the poet [Dhur-Rumma (IY, N)] says

أَلَا رَبِّ مَنْ قَلْبِي لَهُ أَلْلَهُ نَاصِحٌ
وَمَنْ قَلْبُهُ لَيْنَ فِي أَطْبَابِ آلِ السَّوِّابِحِ

[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 بِآَلِ نَحْذَر (IY); another says فُقُلْتُ بِيَبِينَ أَلْلَهُ [454] (M), orig. أَحْلَفُ بِيَبِينَ أَلْلَهِ (AKB); and another says

إِذَا مَا أَلْحَبَرَ تَأَذَّمَهُ بَلَحْمِ أَذَا مَانَأَ أَلْلَهُ أَلْحَدِيدٌ

[below] (M) Whenever thou seasonest the bread with meat, then that, (I swear by) God's trust, is the dish called أَحْلَفُ بِآَمَانَةِ آَللَّهِ تَرِيدٌ (N), which [last verse], they say, is spurious: (d) if you wish, you understand a trans. v., such as أَذَا كَرُرُ I mention, أَشْهَدُ I call to witness, or the like: IS says that only a trans. v. is understood;
but the proper way is the first, because, when you understand a trans. v., it is not of this cat., [i. e., jurative] (IX): (e) the مَانَةُ شَيْءً،... [here] are also related in the nom., [nَاَلِلَّهُ يَسُّ مِنْ أَمَانةٍ ْتُقَلِّدُ يَسِيرُ... Then said I, God's oath (is mine oath, or what I swear by) and then that, God's trust (is binding upon me) (IX),] as inches. whose enunc. is suppressed [29, 650, 651] (M), the full phrase being مَا أُقَسِّمُ بي إِنْ يَسِيرُ أَلَّهُِ ْتُقَلِّدُ, and similarly مَانَةُ شَيْءً،... (IX): (2) understood [503, 515, 651] (M), for a kind of abbreviation, because frequently used (IX), like the لَّهُ أَبُوَّةُ... (M) and لَّهُ أَبِي، meaning لَّهُ أَبِي اوْبَأَيْكَ, as لَّهُ أَبِي اوْبَأَيْكَ [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 ي, and also because the o. f. of the prep. ل is Fath [504]. And sometimes they say لَّهُ أَبِي اوْبَأَيْكَ [206] (IX). When the original jurative ب., 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'bī (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 لعمرَكَ لا يُسبقُ اللهِ [650], must be in the nom.; and so, says Jz, must [إِنَّ اللَّهَ أَيُّهُمُ أَلَّهُ] [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 [إِنَّ اللَّهَ أَيُّهُمُ أَلَّهُ], may be governed in the acc. by the jurative v. understood, as (I swear by) God's covenant and (by) the Ka'ba 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 

\[ \text{فيَّ لَكُحْقَيُّ} \]

[above], only the acc. and gen. have been heard; but An allows the nom. also, in accordance with analogy (R). In XXXVIII. 85. 

\[ \text{فَلاً لَكُحْقَيُّ} \]

is read with (1) the two [ حقُّ ]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 عَلَيَّكَ اللهُ أَنِّي أَلْهُ Verily incumbent upon thee, (I swear by) God, is that etc. (K), or, in another version, إنَّ عَلَيَّ أَلْهُ [154]; and like [أَمَانَةَ 

فَذَادْ أَمَانَةَ أَلْهَ] [above], [اللهُ 

أَلاً رَبَّ مَنَ ] [above], and [اللهُ 

قَلْبِي أَلْهَ] [above] (N): (b) the nom., the first being an inch. whose enunc. is suppressed like لَعْبَرُ [above], i.e., 

[بَا لَكُحْقَيُّ] [27]; (c) the gen., Then, (by) the truth, etc., the first being a sworn-by whose jurative p. is understood, like ُأَلْهَ] [503, 515, 651]; while i.e., And I say (not aught save) theحقّي، is a lit. imitation of the sworn-by, its sense being corroboration and strengthening: (a) this construction, [by which the second حقّي is treated as a lit. imitation of the first,] is allowable in the acc. and nom. also; and is a fine, 92a
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 لَا هَا الْلَّهُ ذَا [552], the interrog. Hamza in لَا عَا لللَّهِ [below], or the disjunction of the conj. Hamza in لَا أَنَا لللَّهِ [651] is put as a compensation for it (M). And they say لَا هَا لللَّهِ, meaning لَا, لَا لللَّهِ [556] (IY). The word لللَّهِ is exclusively distinguished by receiving [the premonitory (AKB)] كَا or the interrog. Hamza as a compensation for the [suppressed] prep. (R). The language of Kh in the CAj, [where he says “The $w$ is sometimes, though rarely, changed into كَا, as لَا لللَّهِ, with the disj. or conj. Hamza, and, in both cases, with retention or elision of the !”], apparently means that the كَا here is [not a premonitory, but] a jurative $p.$ [653]; and that it is a subst. for the كَا [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 كَا). And similarly, in لللَّهِ, 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 ت، [which is a subst. for the، (506, 651, 653)]. When you put the premonitory يا as a subst. [for the jurative p. (AKB)], you must put the word ٌا after the sworn-by, [whether الله be governed in the gen. by the supplied p. (AKB),] as in إى يا الله يّا [552] and إى يا الله يّا [556] (R), meaning يا الله (by) God in both [exs.] (AKB); or [by لعمر pre. to it (AKB),] as in تعلمس يا لعمر الله يا قسمًا نأتزيد بذرك وانظر آين تنسلك (R), by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulma, threatening AlHarith Ibn Warka а Saidawi, who had made a raid upon his people, Know thou, now assuredly the life of God, this (is what I swear by), solemnly (being, says Am, governed in the acc. as an inf. n. corrob. of what precedes it, because the sense thereof is أقسم 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 يا is prefixed to الله، there are four modes [of pronunciation]. The
most frequent of them is retention of its َلَّا, and elision of the conj. Hamza from ُلْلَّا; so that two quiescents meet together, the َلَّا of ُلْلَّا, and the first َلَّا of ُلْلَّا (R); and therefore you say ُلْلَّا (IY). Analogy requires elision of the َلَّا [of ُلْلَّا], because such [a concurrence of two quiescents] as that is pardonable only in a single word, like الصَّالِينَ I. 7. [539, 663]; while in two words, elision is necessary, as ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا and ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا [pronounced ُلْلَّا and ُلْلَّا]: but here the َلَّا is mostly not elided, in order that it may be a quasi-premonition that the ُلْلَّا belongs to ُلْلَّا, since ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا [below], with elision of the َلَّا of ُلْلَّا, suggests the notion that the ُلْلَّا is a subst. for the Hamza of ُلْلَّا, as in أَرَتْتُ ُلْلَّا for ُلْلَّا and ُلْلَّا for ُلْلَّا [690]. The second [mode], which is intermediate in rarity and frequency, is ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا [pronounced ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا], with elision of the َلَّا of ُلْلَّا, because of the two quiescents, as in ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا and ُلْلَّا [above]. The third, which is below the second in frequency, is ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا [with] retention of the َلَّا of ُلْلَّا, and disjunction of the Hamza of ُلْلَّا [669], notwithstanding its being in the interior [of the phrase], as a premonition that ُلْلَّا ought to be with ُلْلَّا, after ُلْلَّا, in which case the Hamza would not occur in the interior. The fourth, which is transmitted by F, and is the rarest of all, is ُلْلَّا ُلْلَّا with elision of the conj. Hamza [from ُلْلَّا], and Fath of the َلَّا of ُلْلَّا,
after conversion of it into Hamza, as in َٰٓلا لِيَنَ I. 7.
and َٰٓن أَبَه [665]. Khl says that ِذَا is part of the correl. of the oath; and is enunc. of a suppressed inch., i.e., َٰٓللّ أَمَرَ ذَا (assuredly the matter is) this; or an ag. [of a suppressed v.], i.e., َٰٓليِكُنَّ ذَا (assuredly) this (shall be the case) or َٰٓلا يِكُنَّ ذَا (shall not be the case); while the correl. that comes after it, whether aff. or neg., as َٰٓوَلِلّ ذَا لا نَعَلَنَ Now, (by) God, (assuredly the matter is) this, or (assuredly) this (shall be the case), assuredly I will do or َٰٓلَا أَنْعُلَ [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 َٰٓوَلِلّ ذَا أَخْرُونَ (assuredly I am) thy brother. But Akh says that ِذَا is part of the oath, either an ep. of َٰٓاللّ أَلْكَحَامِرِ النَّاظِرِ (by) َٰٓThis, i.e., the Present, the Overlooking, God; or an inch., whose enunc. is suppressed, i.e., َٰٓذَا قَسَّبَى 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 َٰٓاللّ َٰٓلِيِقُومُ بِهِ مِنْ عَبِيْدِي نَيْقُولُنَّ كَذَا وَكَذَا 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 Allâh Ibn Mas'ûd, when the latter said "This is the head of Abû Jahl", 
Is it, (by) God, than Whom there is no other god? When the interrog. Hamza is prefixed to ﷺ, the Hamza of ﷺ is either changed into a pure ٰ, which is the more frequent mode [ of pronunciation]; or softened, as is the rule in ﷺ 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'bî (K, B)] ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ 
What! (By) God, verily then are we sinners (IY), i.e., if we hide (B), with pause upon شهادة ﷺ, and prolongation [of the Hamza] in ﷺ (K, B). And, as for disjunction of the Hamza of ﷺ, 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 ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ 
Then, (by) God, assuredly such a thing has taken place; and the ﷺ may be prefixed without [a Hamza of] interrogation, as ﷺ Then, (by) God, assuredly, etc. (R). As you prolong the ﷺ in ﷺ 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 ُبَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ B. But, according to Akh, the ُبَلْ بَلْ B in ُبَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ بَلْ B is red. [540]. The proof that these three [things, the ُعَا, the *interrog.* Hamza, and the disjunction of the *conj.* Hamza in ُبَلْ B] are *subs.* is (1) their interchangeability with the jurative *p.* (R): (a) the ُعَا and the ُعَا may not be combined; so that one does not say ُعَا وَُبَلْ B, nor ُعَا وَُبَلْ B: 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 ُعَا, in such as ُعَا وَُبَلْ B XCIll. 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 ُعَا in the beginnings of Chapters LXXVII. and LXXIX. (ML), because, the ُعَا there being necessarily a copulative *p.*, the ُعَا here must be so (DM). When the ُعَا is repeated
after the jurative, as in

\[\text{after the jurative} \Rightarrow \text{إذا يغشي المَّلَئ } \Rightarrow \text{النهاار إذا تعبَّل قُومًا} \Rightarrow \text{خلق الله} \Rightarrow \text{وَالْأَنتَيْ إِن سَعْيَتُمْ لَشَتَّي} \Rightarrow \text{XCII. 1–4.} \]

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 \(\text{[539]}\), while some say that it is the jurative \(\text{[506]}\). But the first [opinion] is stronger, (1) because, if the \(\text{was jurative, it would be a subst. for the} \ (506, 653) \); and would not import coupling, and \text{connection} of the second sworn-by, and what follows it, with the first : but the passage would be constructively

\[\text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created; so that there would be} \]

three oaths, each of them independent ; and, a \text{correl.}

being indispensable for each oath \(\text{[650]}\), three \text{correls.}

would be required : while, if we say that two \text{correls.}

are suppressed, the remaining one being deemed sufficient, then [the reply is that] suppression is contrary to the \text{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 \text{requirer of the correl.} ; so that one \text{correl.} suffices it, and the passage reads as though

\[\text{I أَقْسَمُ بِالْلَّيْلِ وَبِالْفَجْرِ وَمَا خَلَقَ إِنَّ آلِمَ} \]
swear by the night, and the day, and That Which hath created, verily etc., were said: and (2) because you say, displaying the coupling, بِاللهِ تَأَلَّلِهَا لَا تَعْلَنَّ By God, then God, assuredly I will do and بِحَيْبِتَكَ ثُمَّ حَيْبِتِكَ لَا تَعْلَنَّ By Thy life, again Thy life, assuredly etc. [134, 540]; but do not say أَنْسُ بِاللَّهِ أَنْسُ بِاللَّهِ تَأَلَّلِهَا لَا تَعْلَنَّ I swear by God, I swear by the Prophet, assuredly etc.; while conformity to what is authorized in their language is more proper. An objection to its being the copulative اذَا يُعَجَّبَ اذَا تَعَجَّبَ is taken on the ground that this entails a coupling [of two regs.] to [two regs. of] two [different] ops. [with one p.], because النهار is then coupled to الْلَّيْلِ, and اذَا يُعَجَّبَ اذَا تَعَجَّبَ, while the con. is one [538] (R), by means of which [131] you govern the acc. and the gen., as in مَرَّتْ أَمْسِ يُبْنَى وَالْيَوْمُ عُمِرَ 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 النهار اذَا تَعَجَّبَ is, as it were, coupled to [two regs. of] a single op., vid. the ، [in رَالْلَّيْلِ إِذَا يُعَجَّبَ]. But, according to this, says IH, he must 93a
disallow

Is wear by the night when it covereth, and the day when it become clear; whereas the Kur has LXXXI. 15-17. [538], where, though the passage does not involve [a coupling to] two regs., still the in أَسْتَمِعِ اللَّيْلِ إِذَا يَغْشَى وَالْيَوْمُ إِذَا يَتَهَارُ إِذًا تَحْجَلِي

being a subst. for بٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٍ
or supplied, suitable for being a correl.; nor preceded by anything indicative of a correl. of a condition, except the oath: so that, if إلاِّ were cond., the phrase would be constructively إذا يغشى أقسم 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 إلاِّ is a bare adv., what governs it in the acc. ?", I reply that إلاِّ may be said, not improbably, to be an adv. to the sense of greatness andجلال majesty indicated by the oath, because one does not swear by any thing except because of its great state [650]; so that إلاِّ 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 عظمَةَ اللهِ إلاّ إلَّهَ إلاّ إلَّهَ above, like عَمِّبَ مِنْ زَيْدٍ إلاّ رَكِب I marvel at Zaid, when he rides, i. e., من عظمةِ at his greatness, where عظمة 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 heanness (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 AlHijāz [641, 642], and [especially (R)] of Kuraish (IY, R, Jrb). The Commander of the Believers, 'Alī (God honor his face!), is reported to have said: "The Qur'ān 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 Tamīm and Ḫais (IY, Jrb), who pronounce it [fully], like the rest of the letters (Jrb). Sounding true is the o. 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 ' or ⼤, or ی, 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 ُ, saying "The Hamza does not remain uniform, nor do I reckon it with the letters whose ways are known, remembered." Elision is omission of it from the expression altogether [663]. And putting it betwixt and between means [putting it] between Hamza and the consonant that its vowel is connected with; so that you put it between Hamza and ل when it is pronounced with Fath, between Hamza and ِ when it is pronounced with Damm, and between Hamza and ی 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 \( \text{سُبُلُ} \) was asked, between Hamza and \( \text{ى} \) (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 \( \text{سُوُلُ} \) was asked, between Hamza and \( \text{پ} \) (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 \( \text{سُبُلُ} \) and \( \text{عُثَرِيْنَ} \) [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 "a, as in صٰبٰلٰانٰ, and مٰرْحَمٰتٰ, ْمَرْحَمٰتٰ; but that is an anomalous conversion (R). The Hamza is either one [658, 660] or two [659, 661, 662] (Jrb). And, [if one (Jrb),] it is [either (R, Jrb)] quiescent or mobile (SH). The quiescent Hamza is of one kind, being preceded only by a mobile, because two quiescents do not come together [663]; unless indeed the [mobile] Hamza, when preceded by a quiescent, be made quiescent for pause [642], its predicament in which case will be mentioned [below]. The vowel of what precedes the quiescent Hamza is (1) in the same word as the Hamza, which is then (a) in
the middle, as in رأس head [and I read (IY)],
well, and believer ; (b) at the end, as in لم يقرأ لم يقرأ did not read, لم يقرأ لم يقرأ was not bad, and لم يقرأ لم يقرأ did not teach reading : (2) not [in the same word], as in إلى الهداية أتينا VI. 70. To guidance, [saying to him (K, B),] “Come thou unto us,” أَلْدَى أَوْرِينَ II. 283. [Then let] him that hath been entrusted [repay], and يَفْعَلَ أَكْدَّانِي لى IX. 49. That saith “Give me leave” (R).
The quiescent [Hamza] is changed into the consonant of the vowel of what precedes it, [i. e., is converted into if precedes by Fatha, into ی if preceded by Kasra, and into ٍ if preceded by Damma (Jrb, MASH),] as رأس [and قراء (M)], سوت I was evil; [and لم يقرأ لم يقرأ, and لم يقرأ لم يقرأ; ] and إلى الهدايتنا VI. 70. [below], يَفْعَلَودُنَّ أَلْدَيْمُسْنَ II. 283., and IX. 49. (SH): whether the quiescent Hamza and the preceding mobile be in one word, as in ّسيء I was evil, 1st pers. pret. of ساء, aor. يسوء; or in two words, as in VI. 70., II. 283., and IX. 49. (Jrb): [and] whether the Hamza be in the middle, as in يَرْجَعُنَّ I was evil, and قرت , or at the end, as in لم يقرأ لم يقرأ, and لم يقرأ لم يقرأ: their predicament being one (MASH): because the unsound 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 ی of یلُذِی is elided [663]; so that the expression becomes یلُذِیناا with a quiescent Hamza after the ں; and then the Hamza is converted into й: [similarly,] in II. 283., the conj. Hamza is elided [669], and then the ی of یلُذِی [663]; so that the expression becomes یلُذِین , with a quiescent Hamza after the ں; and then the Hamza is converted into й: and, in IX. 49., the conj. Hamza is elided [669], so that the expression becomes یلُذِینلْوَذَن ; and then the Hamza is converted into й. 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 یلُذِین.
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 i, or an l; and, if a, or i, 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 i, is converted into a, or i, respectively; and, [when so converted (Jrb),] has the preceding, or i incorporated into it, as خَطْيِّة, [orig. خَطْيِّة fault (Jrb)]; مَقْرُوْة, [orig. مَقْرُوْة read (Jrb)]; and أَنْيِس (SH), orig. أَنْيِس (Jrb), dim. of أَنْوَس, pl. of أَنْيِس 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
prophet and ْبَريئة creation [278] is incorrect, [because ْبَريئة with Hamza is read by Nāfi' in the whole of the Kur, and ْبَريئة 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 ﷺئٍ and ْبَريئة; though that is rare, corrupt (S, R), meaning "rare, corrupt" in the language of the Arabs, not "corrupt" in analogy, it being authorized among the Seven Readings; and similarly he holds alleviation to be obligatory in the inf. n., like ْنُبراء "prophecy, prophetic office": but IH, seeing that ْنُبراء and ْبَريئة with Hamza are authorized among the Seven, decides that alleviation of them is not obligatory; and similarly ْنُبراء with Hamza occurs among the Seven: whereas S holds that to be corrupt, notwithstanding its being so read; and perhaps, according to him, the Seven Readings are not canonical, otherwise he would not decide that to be corrupt which [by its canonicity] would be authenticated as part of the noble, ancient Kur'ān, far above corruptness! (R): (2) when the quiescent is an ﷺ، is alleviated by the well-known betwixt-and-between
(SH): so that you put it between Hamza and  ۱ , if the Hamza be pronounced with Fath, as in سَاۡۡلُ questioned and قْرَآَة reading; between Hamza and ۰ , if it be pronounced with Damm, as in تَسۡأَلُ asking one of another and تَلَامُ تَلاَمَ تَلاقی reading; and between Hamza and ۳ , if it be pronounced with Kasr, as in ۱ قَبِلُ sayer [below] and بَایع seller: (a) elision by transfer of the vowel to the ۱ is disallowed, because ۱ does not receive a vowel; and conversion with incorporation is disallowed, because ۱ 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 مَسۡلَة question and ۳ حَب [641, 642] (Jrb), or an unsound letter other than that [ ۱ or non-coordinative aug. ۰ or ۳ , vid. a rad. ۰ or ۳ , as in سِرَ evil and شَيَهٔ thing, or a coordinative aug. ۶ or ۰ , as in جَوۡاَة Ja’aba, name of a water, and جَیَلَ the she-hyena, where the ۰ and ۳ are for coordination with جَعَفَر (392) (Jrb)], has its vowel transferred
thereto, and is elided, as حَبٌ [663] and حَبَّ [below], سُرَ and سُرُ [below], and جِئَلَ [300] (SH), because elision of the Hamza is most effective in alleviation; while one appurtenance of the Hamza remains to indicate it, vid. its vowel transferred to the preceding quiescent (Jrb); (a) the Hamza is not put betwixt and between, lest a quasi-concurrence of two quiescents be entailed, the Hamza being put betwixt and between only in a position where a quiescent would be allowable in its place, except with the I alone, as in قَآيِلُ [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 و and [for their جs (S)]: (b) the KK and some of the BB, like AZ, allow conversion of the Hamza into an unsound letter, without transfer of its vowel, in various ways, without rule or system, saying I darned, as they say, in the case of the quiescent Hamza preceded by a mobile, نَشَرَتُ and نَشَرَتْ for I grew up, and حَبَّتُ and حَبَّتْ for I hid and حَبَّتْ I read; but all of this, according to S, is corrupt: (c) the KK allow as regular the conversion of the Hamza pronounced with Fath, exclusively, into I, after transfer of its vowel to the preceding
quiescent, as كَبَّأَة مَّرَأَة [for مَّرَأَة 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 إِنْفَعْلَ [491] to be invariably quiescent (R): (e) [all of] this is when the quiescent is in the same word as the Hamza (Jrb); and, [if it be not, then also the vowel of the Hamza is transferred to the quiescent, and the Hamza is elided, whether the quiescent be an unsound, or a sound, letter (Jrb),] as أَبُو يَوْبَ [for the father of Job (Jrb)], دُوُّ مُهْمَّ [for أَبْنُي مَّهِمْ the author of their matter (Jrb)], قَاطِسُو بِبِكَ [for I seek for his matter (Jrb)], and (SH) for the judges of thy father; and similarly من أَبْنَ for من أَبْنَ Who is thy father?, for من أَبْنَ Who is thy mother?, كَمْ يَلُكَ كَمْ يَلُكَ How many are thy camels? (Jrb): (f) the cat. of شَيْء and سُوء [above] also occurs incorporated (SH), as شَيْء and سُوء (MASH), the non-aug, and being assimilated to the aug., as in مَقْرِة خُطْيَة and [above], and incorporated, like them [into the converted Hamza]; but the well-known [mode of alleviation] is the first (Jrb): (g) that [transfer of the vowel with elision of the Hamza (Jrb)] is (a) obligatory in the cat. of يَرَى
sees, [orig. َيرَأَي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ (Jrb),] and of َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ grazes (Jrb),] and of َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ showed and َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ shows, from frequency (SH) of usage (Jrb), since َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ, according to the o. f., is hardly ever used as aor. of َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ saw, or and َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ as pret. and aor. in the conjug. of َينَسَأَي (MASH); contrary to َينَسَأَي َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ goes far away, [aor. of َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ (Jrb),] and to َينَسَأَي َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ sent far away and َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ sends far away (SH), which are treated like other words as regards allowability of alleviation, because they are not so frequent as َيرَآي َيرُمَعَي ِجرَةُ, etc. (Jrb): (α) every word composed of َرويْيَةٍ رَآي knowledge, opinion, or َريْيَةٍ رَآي vision, dream, when you prefix another letter to it, for the formation of its paradigm, and its ِرَآي ِرَآي is quiescent, must have its Hamza elided, after transfer of the vowel thereof [to the quiescent ِرَآي], from frequency of usage, except ِرَآي ِرَآي aspect, ِرَايَةٍ outward appearance, and ِرَايَةٍ mirror; but in poetry such as

[by Surākā Ibn Mirdās alAzdí alBārīkī, I make mine eyes see what they have not seen: each of us is knowing in falsehoods (SM),] sometimes occurs : (β) the Hamza ِرَايَت ِرَايَت, when conjoined] with the interrog. Hamza, is often elided, notwithstanding the mobility of what precedes it, in such as ِرَايَت ِرَايَت [below], as [will be]
mentioned (R): (b) frequent in the cat. of سَلُّ ask, [orig. إِسْلاَلُ (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 جَرْ (Jrb): (β) إِسْلاَلُ being used more frequently than such as إِجَّأَر ؛ 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 إِجَّأَر ؛ but, if the alleviation were frequent, [as IH suggests,] because of the two Hamzas only, إِجَّأَر 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 إِسْلَلُ is the combination of two Hamzas; while the [second] Hamza [of إِسْلَلُ ] is [constructively] remaining [in إِسْلُ ], 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 إِسْلُ ؛ like [660]; but states that what he transmits is vitiated by [the fact] that no one says إِنْتَلُوا They fought together
Reject thou [664]: and he distinguishes between \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{سُلَيْنَ} \) by [saying] that the \( \text{س} \) [in the latter] is orig. mobile, as in \( \text{سُلَيْنَ} \) asked; whereas the determinative \( \text{س} \) [in the former] is orig. quiescent: while S says that the distinction between them is that the Hamza of the determinative \( \text{س} \) resembles the disj. Hamza of \( \text{سُلَيْنَ} \) in being pronounced with Fatha when inceptive [668]; and in being retained in interrogation, as \( \text{سُلَيْنَ} \) [669], and in [the voc.] \( \text{سُلَيْنَ} \) [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 ا] is either transfer and elision, as in حَبّ بَرَى [above]; or conversion and incorporation, as in حَبّ مَقْرُو. free and مَقْرُو [above]: so that حَبّ remains, with the ب mobile, like دُمّ blood; and is then paused upon with mere quiescence, or with Raum, Ishmām, or reduplication [641, 642]; and بَرَى and مَقْرُو remain, [with the ا or و ] doubled; and are then paused upon with quiescence, Raum, or Ishmām: while the alleviation of سُو شَى and حَبّ [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 ا: but, if the final Hamza be preceded by an 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 I; so that nothing remains but conversion of the quiescent Hamza into I, because the preceding I is like Fatha; and thus it becomes like [the I in] لَمْ يَقْرَ [above]: but, in addition to quiescence, neither Raum nor Ishmām is allowable, because the vowel was upon the letter for which this I is a subst., not upon the I [itself], so that the latter should be pronounceable with Raum or Ishmām, as we said of pause upon the 8 of feminization [640]; and also because Raum is [achieved] by retaining part of the vowel, whereas the pure I does not admit of that. This [second] mode, I mean pause with quiescence, and [with] conversion of the Hamza into I, 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 Tanwîn, the Hamza is not final; so that these varieties are not found in it; but the Tanwîn is converted into ِ, as ِ دعاء prayer and ِ عشاء nightfall [640] (R). The discussion is [still] upon the mobile Hamza (Jrb). If it be preceded by a mobile, it is [of (Jrb)] nine [kinds (Jrb)], being pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm, and, in each case, preceded by [any of] the three [vowels], as (1) ِ سأل asked, (2) مائة hundred, (3) مجعل limited [661], (4) ِ سِمَم was disgusted [661], (5) مستهرتٌس نسُم scoffers, (6) ِ سُتّل was asked, (7) ِ روف pitiful, (8) ِ روس scoffers, (9) ِ روس 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) ِ قال أحمد said, (2) بغلام أبيك by the manservant of thy father, (3) ِ إن هدا غلام أبيك Verily this is the manservant of thy father, (4) ِ قال إبراهيم said,
This is the property of Ibrāhīm, (6) 

This is the property of thy sister, (8) 

This is the property 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 مَرْجَلٍ; or Kasr, as in مِن: because, in the well-known betwixt-and-between, the Hamza would approximate to an ی 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 مَقاَنِثٍ, it is converted into a pure ی, because of the impracticability of eliding it, since it is elided only after transfer of the vowel, whereas no vowel is transferred to a mobile: while softening [below] also is impracticable, since the Hamza would become [intermediate] between Hamza and ی; so that, as the occurrence of ی 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 مِرْجِلِ, it is converted into a pure ۱, for a reason like what we have mentioned in the case of مَلَحٌ [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 I [above], because the remaining modes of alleviation are [then] impracticable, as we have mentioned; and because the I [663], being a letter of prolongation more frequently than the rest of the soft letters, is available, like
the mobile, as a support [for the quiescent after it], as [will be seen] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents. The KK hold that the softened [Hamza] is [actually] quiescent. But S adduces an irresistible argument for its mobilization, vid. that, when following a quiescent, it is softened, in poetry, in the position where, if two quiescents were combined, [the metre of (MAR)] the verse would be broken, as in the saying of AlA‘shà

(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 Damm, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in مُسْتَهْبَطَتْنَ (MAR); and the one pronounced with Kasr, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, as in سْتَل [661]: the first, says he, being converted into a pure ﴿ى﴾, [as مُسْتَهْبَتْنَ]; and the second into a pure ﴿ى﴾, [as ﴿سْوَل﴾]: since, if they were softened, the first would be like the quiescent ﴿ى﴾, which does not occur after Kasra; and the second like the quiescent ﴿ى﴾, which does not occur after Damma; as the ﴿ى﴾ does not occur after Damma or Kasra. And some, in the case of such as
and, have recourse to the strange betwixt-and-between, [saying سُئِلَ and مُسْتَهْزَبُونَ, 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 َ, mobilized by Kasr after Damma in سُؤَلَ, and of the pure ى mobilized by Damm after Kasra in مُسْتَهْزَبُونَ: 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 سَلَ asked; into a quiescent َ, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Damm, as َرُوسُ heads; and into a quiescent ى, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Kasr, as مُسْتَهْزَبُونَ 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 I rendered eager (R). And hence [659], orig. مَنْسَأَة 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, Fazāra. May the pasture not be pleasant to you! (N)],

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

سَأَلَتْ هُذِئِلَ رَسُولُ ٱللَّهِ ﷺ نَاحِشَةً صَلَّتْ هُذِئِلَ بِمَا سَأَلَتْ ﴿وَلَمْ تُصَبِّ﴾ (R), by Ḥassān, Hudhail asked of the Apostle of God a lewd boon. Hudhail erred in what it asked, and did not right (N). For ِسَلَتْ I asked, [aor. أَسَالُ, like I feared, aor. أَخَافُ (Mb),] does not belong to the dial. of these [poets]: nor does [سَأَلَ He asked, aor.] [below] (S); or هُمَا يَتَسَاءَلُانِ They two ask, one of 96a
another (Mb). It has reached me that ْسُلْت Thou askedst, aor. ْتَسَالَ, is a dial. var. (S); and Am says that it is a recognized dial. var., [being the dial. of Kuraish (K, B), who say ْسُلْت, aor. ْتَسَالَ, and يَتَسَايلَان] They two ask, one of another (K),] in accordance with which is the reading [of Nafi' and Ibn 'Amir (B)] سَال سَائِلْ آللَّهِ LXX. 1. [503] (AKB); and [the author of the KF says that] يَسَالَ سَال, aor. يَسَالَ [above], like حَافَ He feared, aor. يَكَافُ, is said, and هَمَّة يَتَسَأَلَان] [above] (KF). S cites, among [the exs. of] what is not allowable out of poetry, except by hearsay, the saying of the poet ['Abd ArRahmân Ibn Ḥassân (S, N)]

(952)

وَكَنَتْ أَذَلَّ مِنْ رَتِّي يَقَاعُ ٍ يُشَكْحِجُ رَأْسَهُ بَأَلْفِهِرِ وَاجْجَي (R) And thou wouldst be viler than a tent-peg in a plain, whose head a hammerer batters with the stone, meaning ۞ رَجَاي (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 ۞ رَجَاي 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 ۚكَمْ يْقُرَى [above], the rule of which is to be alleviated by being made into ى, in, or out of, poetry. When, indeed,
such as $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$ occurs in continuity, as $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$

*I passed by the hammerer, O youth,* the Hamza being made a quiescent ی, [as in $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$ 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 ٠ when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Fath, into ی when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Kasr, and into ٠ when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Damm: but the truth is that one should restrict this, as IY does, by saying "The Hamza is [sometimes] converted into ٠ 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 ٠ when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Damm", as above expressed. IY, however, does not restrict the ٠ and ی, that the Hamza is converted into, by quiescence; but it is more proper to say "a quiescent ٠" and "a quiescent ی", as we have done above. According to this, then, [the Hamza in] such as $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$ was base or $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$ ٠ [above] is not converted into ٠, either in, or out of, poetic exigency; nor [the Hamza in] such as $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$ or $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$ into a quiescent ی; nor [the Hamza in] such as $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$ or $\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}}$ with a quiescent ٠. Sf says "Among the anomalies that occur are the following:—(1) some
transfer the vowel of the detached Hamza [below] to the final of the preceding word mobilized with an uninflectional vowel, as قال سماة Ishak said and قال سماة Usama 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 يقول سماة Ishak says or لَنْ يُقْوَلُ سماة Usama 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 قال سماة: 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 ا at the end of the [preceding] word: and then, if the Hamza be followed by a quiescent, as in مَا أَحْسَنَ How good is! and مَا أَمْرُ What is thine affair?, the ا is dropped, [as مَ حَسْنٌ م مُرُ and م حَسْنٌ]; but, if it be followed by a mobile, as in مَا أَشْدَ How hard is!, the ا remains, as مَا شَدَ, whence ما شَدْ أَنفُسَهُمْ رَأْعَلُهُمْ بِيْما یُخْسِی الْجَمَارِی الْكَرَمِ الْمُسْلِمُ (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 من سِ نَاسّ for أُناس سّ نُاس [52]: (2) in رَأَیت, (a) [often] with the interrog. Hamza,
as [above] for ʿarāʾīt ʿāʿīt; and this is the reading of Ks in the whole of the formations of ʿay ; conjoined with the ت , and having the *interrog.* Hamza at their beginning (R): Abu-lAswad [adDuʿālī (KA)] says

(955)

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

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

(433, 488)

(R), by Ismāʿīl Ibn Yāsār (KA, Jh) anNisāʿī (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 الالکب 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 يسالون for They ask, because its alleviation is then by conversion, not by elision; the poet says

إذا قام قوم يسالون مليكهم وعطاهم فأذهبوا الي هو نا سائلة

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

§ 659. In the imp. of the v. whose ف is a Hamza quiescent in the aor., as in أتى came, aor. يأتى, and sinned, aor. [and أسا sasa dressed the wound, aor. يأسو,] the Hamza is changed into a pure ى if the conj. Hamza be pronounced with Kasr [428], as come and sin, orig. [661] and ىنثت ىنثم; and is converted into a pure ى if the conj. Hamza be pronounced with Damm, as أوس أَلْجَح Dress the wound, orig. the second Hamza being converted into a soft letter, as an escape from the combination of two Hamzas, because alleviation, which is allowable in the case of [one] Hamza [658], is necessary in the case of two Hamzas
Three *vs.*, however, deviate from this [rule], vid. *take, َكل eat, and ِمر command*, which are heard, but are not to be copied, because of their exclusion from [the predicament of] their counterparts (IY). They elide the [*rad. (Jrb)*] Hamza (M, Jrb), which is a ُن (IY), in َكل [above], َخُذ, and ِمر, 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 *conj.* Hamza (IY, Jrb), because of the disappearance of the quiescent [Hamza], and the mobility of what is made the initial, vid. the َكل in َخُذ, the َن in َكل, and the ِمر in َكل [428]. Thus the measure of the v. is َخل, with the ُن elided (IY). Then they make this elision obligatory in َكل and ِمر (M, R), where elision, though chaster than conversion, is not obligatory (R). Therefore they do not say َأوُكَل اوُحُذ or َوُحُذ ِمر: but [you say َأوُكَل اوُحُذ ِمر; and (IY)] the Kur has XX. 132. [428] (M). The regular form is َأوُكَل اوُحُذ (IY, Jrb), and اوُمَر (IY), in the *imp.* from taking, َأَكِل eating, [and اوُمَر 'commanding,' like ِابسَر [in the *imp.*] from ُإِسَر exulted, i. q. ُبطر (Jrb). But they keep to َكل and َخُذ, irregularly, from frequency (SH) of usage (MASH). As for the *imp.* from اوُمَر 'commanding,' it does not reach the same extent of frequency as the [other] two;
so that they assign to it an intermediate predicament, allowing ٌمُرَ ٌوُمُرَ in it (Jrb). This is when it is inceptive. When, however, it occurs in the interior [of the sentence], as in ٌفَأَمُرَ Then command, and ٌوُمُرَ 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 ٌوُمُرَ and ٌقُمَرَ, 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] ٌمُنَسَّةٍ [658], and ٌبُلْوَٰجِيٌّ 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 ٌمُسَلَّةٍ (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 ٌ机体 in [668], when its Hamza is alleviated (IV). If the vowel be not taken into account, as is the method of most, 机体 must be said, with expression of the conj. Hamza, because the ی is virtually quiescent (Jrb). [For,] when the vowel of the Hamza, which is the initial of a word, is transferred to the preceding ی of determination, that ی is constructively quiescent for [three] reasons:—(1) that the ی is orig. quiescent, contrary to such as the ی of تُلٍ [below]: (2) that the ی, 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 ی remaining quiescent; contrary to the ی of تُلٍ, which belongs to the same word as the [elided] ی: (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 ی, [in the o. f.] of تُلٍ to the preceding [quiescent] (R). But, if the vowel be taken into account, 机体 must be said, with elision of the [conj.] Hamza, because the vowel of the ی renders it unnecessary. For the ی becomes like part of the ی, literally, because it consists of one letter; and ideally, because it alters the signification of the ی. from indeterminativeness to determinateness: 97a
and, since it becomes like part [of the မ.], the vowel transferred to it [in လာ့ကြာ] resembles the vowel [transferred to the စ] in စို [below], orig. [စို] [658] (Jrb).

When [therefore] the cat. of အိုး့္း is alleviated, the Hamza of the ဗ more often remains (SH); while some elide it (MASH): so that မ္း့္း is said (SH), the second Hamza [only] being elided, according to the more frequent [method] (MASH); or ဗ်း့္း (SH), the conj. Hamza also being elided, according to the rarer [method] (MASH). And apparently the cat. of အိုး့္း အိုး့္း asking pardon is like that, as respects the allowability of [အိုး့္း အိုး့္း] or [အိုး့္း အိုး့္း] (Jrb). And, [when မ္း့္း or မ္း့္း is conjoined with the cat. of ဗ်း့္း] then (Jrb) one says, (1) according to the more frequent [method, pronounced] မ္း့္း မ္း့္း from the red, with Fatḥ of the ဖီး (SH), because, the ဗ being quasi-quiescent [above], if the ဖီး were not mobilized, two quiescents would come together (Jrb); and [မ္း့္း pronouned] မ္း့္း in the red, with elision of the ဖ (SH), lest two quiescents come together, because the ဗ is virtually quiescent [above]: (2) according to the rarer [method], မ္း့္း, with quiescence of the ဖ; and မ္း့္း, with expression of the ဖ (Jrb). As for မ္း့္း from now, henceforward
it is [treated] according to both methods:—(1) if you say لَخْمَر, taking the vowel [of the ل] into account, you say مَنْ لَان, with quiescence of the ن in مَنْ لَان, because what follows it is mobile; and, according to that, قُلْتُمْ لَان

(2) if you say أَلْخَمْر, with expression of the conj. Hamza, not taking the vowel of the ل into account, but treating the ل as quiescent, you say مَنْ لَان, with Fath of the ن, because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and, according to that, you say مَلَن, on the principle of the poet's saying

Convey thou to Abū Dukhtanās a message, not that which is sometimes said, consisting of falsehood, the ن [of مِنْ (Jh)] being elided [by some of the Arabs, in juxtaposition with the art. (Jh)], on account of the concurrence of two quiescents, because it is treated like the unsound letters [663] (IY). But Ks and Fr relate that some of the Arabs convert the Hamza into ل in such [formations] as this, [i.e., where an initial Hamza is preceded by a determinative ل,] saying أَلْخَمْر for أَلْخَمْر أَلْخَمْر the red, and أَلْخَمْر أَلْخَمْر the earth (IY, R); and, in order to preserve the quiescence of the determinative ل, do not transfer the vowel [of the Hamza] (R).
It is as though the speakers of this *dial.* avoided mobilization of this *J*; and therefore converted the Hamza [into a *J*] homogeneous with the *J*, as they say [191, 200, 275, 306, 321], when they treat it as a *n.*, adding a *J* homogeneous with the *J*. And [مین آلْرَض] and [مین كَرْض] from the earth and [مین لَرَض] are read, [the former] by throwing the vowel of the Hamza upon the [preceding] quiescent, which is the *J*; [and the latter by converting the Hamza into *J*]. He that says *ألْحَمْرُ*, expressing the [conj.] Hamza, ought to say *إسْمَل* [658] for *إسْمَل* when alleviated; and he that says *لْحَمْرُ* ought to say *سَل* [above]: except that the conj. *I* is more often retained with the determinative *J*, and elided with any other [letter]; because this *J* is constitutionally quiescent, not being subject to the alternation of mobility, except for an accidental cause [669]; so that the quiescence in it is stronger (IY). But [IH states that] they do not say *إسْل* or *أَتْل*, 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 *سَل*, the vowel of the س is not so constant as the vowel of the ق in ثُلْن [below], nor so transient as the vowel of the ل in تُلْمَم [above], because سَل is like ثُلَن in respect of all the [three] reasons [above]
assigned for the constructive quiescence of the \( \mathbf{J} \) in \( \text{آل خمر} \), except the third, since transfer of the vowel [of the Hamza] in it is not so constant as transfer of the vowel of the \( \mathbf{J} \) in \( \text{أُنْزَل} \) [below]; but, though not so constant [as that], it is more frequent than transfer of the vowel of the Hamza in \( \text{ألا خمر} \): 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 \( \text{إِسْنَلٌ} \)" above], which is the opinion of S; whereas Akh allows \( \text{إِسْنَلٌ} \), as before mentioned [658].

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

§. 661. Having finished the single Hamza [658, 660] in the word, [Z followed by] IH begins the explanation of the two Hamzas [659, 661, 662] (Jrb). They are [combined (R)] either in one word, or in two words (R, Jrb). When two Hamzases 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 ع as رأس [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 I after Fatha, as آمن (orig. آمنت (Tsr)): (a) hence the saying of 'A‘isha And he, [meaning the Prophet (Tsr),] was wont to enjoin upon me, [when I menstruated (Tsr),] that I should wear a waist-wraper, with a Hamza [pronounced with Fatha (Tsr)], and then an !: (b) [MM says that (Tsr)] the generality of Traditionists mispronounce it, reading it with an I [pronounced with Hamza (Tsr)] and a double ط: but for this [pronunciation] there is no reason [in Arabic (Tsr)], because it is [an aor. v., whose measure is (Tsr)] انْتَعَلَ [with Kasr of the ع, derived
(Ts r) from waist-wr apper; so that its ف is a quiescent Hamza, after the aoristic Hamza pronounced with Fath [404] (Aud); (c) [so says IHsh] but [Kh remarks that] the Bdd allow ا from أَنْتَ خُزُّرَ إِنَّهُ to trust, and انتَهِل took a wife from أُهُل wife, family, by conversion of the second Hamza into ت, and incorporation of it into the ت [of إِنَتَخَّبَ] ; and Z transmits إِنْتَخَبَ with incorporation; while IM says that it is confined to hearsay, like إِنْتَخَبَ [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 MIA n (Ts r); (c) [the author of the KF, however, agrees with IHsh, saying] “Do not say إِنْتَخَبَ; though it occurs in some traditions, being perhaps a mispronunciation of the reporters” (KF): (2) a ى after Kasra, as إِسْبَانbelief, [orig. إِسْبَان] (Ts r); (a) the reading [of Al'A'mash, reported by Abû Bakr, the disciple of 'Asim (Ts r),] إِسْبَان فِيْهِمCVI. 2. Their keeping to, [with the second Hamza] sounded true, is anomalous (Aud): (b) Ks allows إِسْبَن [659] to begin with two Hamzas [below], this being transmitted from him by IAmb, who says that it is hideous, because the Arabs do not combine two Hamzas, whose second is quiescent (Ts r): (3) ىٌ
after Damma, as was trusted, [in the pass., orig. (Tsr)]: (a) Ks allows to begin with two Hamzaz, this being transmitted from him by IAmb, who refutes it (Aud) by [the argument] that the Arabs do not combine two Hamzaz, whose second is quiescent: but IAmb mentions this refutation of Ks in connection with his allowing. Bring thou a Kur'an to begin with two Hamzaz [above], not in connection with (Tsr). If the first [Hamza (Tsr)] be quiescent, and the second mobile, [in which case they are not in the position of the or (Tsr),] then, (1) if they be in the position of the or (Tsr), the first is incorporated into the second, [because of the combination of two likes, and is sounded true (Tsr),] as [671, 738] (Aud), with the Hamza doubled, [on the measure of] the intensive [paradigm], denoting the frequent asker (Tsr); and and (Aud), with their second [rad.] doubled, on the measure of the rel. n., denoting the seller of pearls and of heads (Tsr): (2) if they be in the position of the or (Tsr), the second is changed into , unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether it be a final, or not a final (Tsr)]: so that, from read, you say, (a) in the paradigm of [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 \( \text{Tsr}^1 \) from \( \text{Qr}^1 \), as they incorporate in \( \text{Qr}^2 [\text{above}] \): and he replied [firstly] that the two \( \text{es} \) are only homogeneous [369], contrary to the two \( \text{j}s \), as is proved by \( \text{Dr} \) [392] and \( \text{Qrd}^2 [253, 375, 731] \), meaning that the two \( \text{es} \) are therefore more fit for incorporation than the two \( \text{j}s \); and [secondly] that what is not allowable at the extremity is [sometimes] allowable in the middle, as is proved by the succession of two \( \text{s} \) in \( \text{jw} \), which is disallowed in the \( \text{pl.} \) of \( \text{Qr}^2 [683] \) (Sn): (b) in the paradigm of \( \text{Tsr}^1 \) [245, 254, 401], \( \text{Tsr}^1 \), with two Hamzas, having between them a \( \text{i} \) substituted for a Hamza (Aud), which is not a final, \( \text{orig.} \) \( \text{Tsr}^1 \), with three Hamzas, the second of which is changed into \( \text{i} \), 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 \( \text{i} \), unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether the first be pronounced with Fath, Damm, or Kasr (Tsr)]: (2) if the second [Hamza (Tsr)] be not
final, but be pronounced with ٔامم, it is changed into , unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether the first be pronounced with ٔامم, ٤اث, or ٤سر (Tsr)]: (3) if the second [be not final, but] be pronounced with ٤اث, it is changed (a) into ٔا if the first be pronounced with ٣اث or ٔامم; (b) into ٔا if the first be pronounced with ٤سر (Aud). In short, the two mobile Hamzas are either at the end [of the word], or not. In the first case, they are of three sorts, because the first Hamza is pronounced with ٣اث, ٤سر, or ٔامم: and, in the second case, they are of nine sorts, arising from the multiplication of the three states of the first [Hamza] into the three states of the second. The final [Hamza] is changed into ٔا in all of its [three] sorts: and the non-final is changed into ٔا in four of its [nine] sorts, vid. the [one] pronounced with ٣اث after ٤سر, and the [three] pronounced with ٤سر after ٣اثا, ٤سر, or ٔامم: and into , in five, vid. the [two] pronounced with ٣اث after ٣اثا or ٔامم and the [three] pronounced with ٔامم after ٣اثا, ٤سر, or ٔامم (Tsr). The exs. of the final Hamza [after one pronounced with ٣اث, ٤سر, or ٔامم (Tsr) are that you should form, from ١٥٣٤٥٧٩٠١, a word like ٩٠٢٣٥٧٨٩ [392], ٩٠٢, or ٩٠٢٣٥٧٨٩٠١ (Aud), in which case you say ٩٠٢٣٥٧٨٩٠١٩٠, ٩٠٢٣٥٧٨٩٠١٩٠, or ٩٠٢٣٥٧٨٩٠١٩٠, with two Hamzas; and then change the second Hamza into ٔا, because the ٔا does not occur as a final in what exceeds three letters [685, 727]; so that the word
becomes \( \tilde{\ddot{\imath}} \), or \( \ddot{\imath} \), \( \dddot{\imath} \), \( \dddot{\imath} \) : and then, (1) if the \( \ddot{\imath} \) be preceded by Fatha, as in the first ex., it is converted into \( [684, 719] \), and the word becomes abbreviated (Tsr), \( \dddot{\imath} \) (R, A), upon the measure of \( \text{Salma} \) (A), \([du.]\), \( [pl.]\); and \([fem.]\) \( \dddot{\imath} \) (du.]

\( \ddot{\imath} \) (R) : (2) if the \( \ddot{\imath} \) 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 \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( \text{Taqati} \) \( [16] \), becoming defective (Tsr), \( \dddot{\imath} \)

upon the measure of \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( [18] \) (A), \[but with Kasr of the Hamza, because it is defective, as also is the third \[below] \( \text{(Sn)} \) : (3) if the \( \ddot{\imath} \) be preceded by Damma as in the third ex., the Damma is converted into Kasra, in order that the \( \ddot{\imath} \) may be preserved from conversion into \( \dddot{\imath} \), and the word is subjected to the same alteration as \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( \text{Taqati} \) \( [16] \) (Tsr), \[or rather] as \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( [243, 290] \) (A), \textit{orig.}

\( \dddot{\imath} \) \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( [237] \) (Sn), it also becoming defective (Tsr), \( \ddot{\imath} \), upon the measure of \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( [18] \) (A); \[and, with the \textit{art.} \] \( \text{Alboli}\) (MKh), like \( \text{Alboli} \) (IA) : (a) this [third ex.] and that which precedes it are defective, each of them upon this measure \[or \ddot{\imath} \] \( \text{Sn} \), in the \textit{nom.} and \textit{gen.}; while in the \textit{acc.} the \( \ddot{\imath} \) returns, as \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( \dddot{\imath} \) (A); (b) the Hamza of \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( \dddot{\imath} \) \( \dddot{\imath} \) is
pronounced with Kasr, like the Hamza of ֳ‬קָרָם; not, as is fancied, with Damm: this is proved by A’s confining himself to the return of the ֳ‬ in [the Kasr of the of ֳ‬כָּכֶה אִיַּדְיָא עוֹלָמוֹשֶׁנּוּ] XLVIII. 20. And restrained from you the hands of the men (Sn), of Khaibar and their confederates, [the Banû (B)] Asad and Ghaṭafān (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. g. ֳ‬אָמֵּד directed his course towards (Tsr)], a word like ֳ‬פֶּסַע [372, 672] with Fath, Kasr, or Damm of the Hamza, and Kasr of the ֳ‬ in [all three of] them, in which case you say, in the first [ex.], ֳ‬אָמֵּד with two Hamzas, [the first] pronounced with Fath, and [the second] quiescent; and then transfer the vowel of the first ֳ‬,[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 ֳ‬; and afterwards you change the [second (Tsr)] Hamza, [to which the Kasra of the ֳ‬ has been transferred (Tsr),] into ֳ‬ (Aud), because of the preceding [rule] that the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr after one pronounced with Fath, [Kasr, or Damm] is converted into ֳ‬ (Tsr): and thus you do in the [two] remaining [exs.] also (Aud), saying ֳ‬ and ֳ‬; 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 یَمَّ، یَمَّ، or یَمَّ (A). That [action (Tsr)] is necessary [below] (Aud). The regular pl. of مِلَدَر is بِيَبَةَ (Tsr), orig. بِمَمَةَ, like بِمَمَةَ pl. of جَمَار ass [246] (Jrb), by conversion of the [second] Hamza into ی. If you say that analogy requires conversion of the second [Hamza] into ی, because it is quiescent, and what precedes it is pronounced with فَث, [the o. f. being بِمَمَةَ (Jh),] like بِمَمَةَ pl. of بَمَمَة vessel, and بِهَلَةَ pl. of بَمَمَة 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 بِمَمَةُ; and then they convert the second Hamza into a pure ی(Tsr). And [accordingly] فَقَاتِلُوا بِیَبَةٍ اکْفُرُ IX. 12. Then fight against the leaders of unbelief is read (Jh). But, as for the reading of Ibn 'Amir and the KK, [like 'Asim, Ḥamza, Ks, KhA, and Al A'mash (Tsr), and of Rauḥ on the authority of Ya'kūb (B),] بِیَبَةٍ اکْفُرُ 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 ی 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 ی be pronounced?', I say 'With a Hamza followed by a Hamza betwixt and between, i.e., between the outlets of Hamza and ی [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 ی pure, it is not a reading, nor may it be; and he that makes the ی pure is committing a solecism, and mispronouncing'" (K): [while B also declares that] to make the ی pure is a solecism (B). IH too says that both softening and sounding true are correct in such as ی (SH), in reading [the Kur] (R), an objection to the saying of the GG that the second Hamza must be converted into ی [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 ی; and also to sound the two Hamzas true (Jrb): and, in reading [the Kur], conversion of the second Hamza into a pure ی, 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] ٓ where but occur in every [case of] two mobile [Hamzases 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 ٍ after one pronounced with َ, َ, or ٍ (Tsr)] are (1) ُٔٔٔ pl. of ُٔٔٔ [255]: (2, 3) that there should be formed from ُٔٔٔ a word like ُٔٔٔ with َ of the Hamza, and ٍ of the َ, or like ُٔٔٔ [372], in which case you say ُٔٔٔ [below], with a Hamza pronounced with َ or ٍ, and a َ pronounced with ٍ. The o. f. of the first is ُٔٔٔ, upon the measure of ُٔٔٔ [237]; and the o. f.s. of the second and third are ُٔٔٔ and ُٔٔٔ: 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 َ, (1) after one pronounced with َ, is ُٔٔٔ [247, 278, 686], pl. of ُٔٔٔ (Aud), orig.
(974)

(1) ḍādīm (Tsr); (2) after one pronounced with Ḍamm, is ʿaʾūlīm : (a) the second Hamza is converted into ʾ, when pronounced with Fath, and not final, whether what precedes it be pronounced with Fath, as in the broken pl. of ʾdāʿ; or with Ḍamm, as in its dim. : (b) the exemplification by the pl. and dim. of ʾdāʿ [above] is based upon [the supposition] that ʾdāʿ 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 ʿaʿāl, like ʿrāʿ Azzr, [the name of Abraham's father (Jk, K on VI. 74)] ; and in the M [661, 684] that it is Arabic, [orig. ʾdāʿ] with two Hamzas (IY),] upon the measure of ʿaʿāl (Tsr), meaning tawny (Jh, KF). The ex. of the [Hamza] pronounced with Fath after one pronounced with Kasr is that you should form from ʾfāʿ [an ex (Tsr)] upon the measure of ʾṣdūḥ [372], with Kasr of the Hamza, and Fath of the b (Aud), in which case you say ʾyim, with a Hamza pronounced with Kasr, and a ʾ pronounced with Fath, orig. ʾṣṣm ; the vowel of the first ʾ, vid. Fathā, being transferred to the preceding quiescent, as a means for attaining incorporation of the two likes ; and the second Hamza being afterwards changed into ʾ (Tsr). Akh differs about two of these nine sorts, vid.
the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr after Damm, which he changes into ى [instead of ی]; and the one pronounced with Damm after Kasr, which he changes into ى [instead of ی]: but the correct [mode] is what has been mentioned above (A). If you formed a word like ^أَكْرَمُ أَنِينُ from moaning, you would say ٌأَنِينُ; but, according to Akh, ٌأَنِينُ, the dispute being like what we mentioned on such as سُهُلُ [658]. A [Hamza] pronounced with Damm after one pronounced with Kasr is not found in their language, but, if such [a n.] as ٌفُلَعُ, with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm of the ١, occurred from ٣م, you would say ٌمُلُ [above], according to S; and ٌمُلُ، according to Akh, as we mentioned on مُسْتَهْرَكُونَ 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 ٌأَعْمَتُ I directed my course towards and ٌأَنْتَ I moaned, the second may be [changed, as ٌأَرْنُ and ٌأَنْتَ; or (A)] sounded true, as ٌأَرْنُ and ٌأَنْتَ: [firstly] because of the assimilation of the Hamza of the 1st pers. sing. to the interrog. Hamza [below], as in ٌأَنْتَ ٌنُدُرُتُهُم ٌ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 ى [404] (A), after which the two modes are allowable in the Hamza, as in [ يومن يومن] believes from يومن يومن, and [ يومن يومن] makes safe from تأمين [below] (Sn). IA [like IHsh and A] is silent as to the case where the second Hamza is pronounced with Fath [after the aoristic Hamza], as in لبت aor. of أَمِنَ His teeth decayed, and أَمِنَ aor. from أَمِنَ [above]; nor have I seen it expressly mentioned by anyone: but it is covered by the saying of the Aud and the A “when the first of the two [mobile] Hamzas is [an] aoristic [Hamza]”; and so it is covered by the two causes above assigned: and from that the necessary conclusion is that it may be sounded true; or changed into ػ, because of IM's saying “If pronounced with Fath after Damm or Fath, it is converted into ػ,” as أَرُونِ and أَرُونِ (MKh). That [sounding true] is regular in five vs.: so AZ transmits in the Book of the Two Hamzas (Tsr). From this it is understood that change [of the second Hamza into ى or ػ], when the first of the two [mobile] Hamzas is not aoristic, is necessary [above], except in an extraordinary case, as [in the reading of IX. 12.] before mentioned (A). They say that, if the second [Hamza (Jrb)] and the one before it be mobile, the
second must be converted into ى [above], if either it, or the one before it, be pronounced with Kasr, as َى [above] and َج [below]; and into و [below] in other cases, as ْوَادُم [above] (SH). The o. f. of َج [708], according to the opinion of others than Khl, is َجٰ، with two mobile Hamzás, the first being converted, as in ُبَنُى [683], from the ى of the word, which is َى; and the second being the ى of the v. and then the second is converted into ى, because the one before it is pronounced with Kasr; so that the word becomes َجٰ، which is afterwards subjected to the same alteration as َقَاضٰ [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 Hamzás. But, according to the opinion of Khl, that the o. f. is َجٰ، by transposition, َجٰ does not belong to this cat., [because it contains only one Hamza] (Jrb). And hence َخطاَيَا, [which is an instance of the combination of two Hamzás in one word (R)], on the well-founded hypothesis, contrary to the opinion of Khl [below] (SH), because it is pl. of ُخطِيَة fault, sin; and the ى of ُفَعَلْة is converted into Hamza in the ultimate pl. [246], as in ُكِبْرَة crime, pl. ُكِبَآتَرْ: so that it becomes َخطٰثٰى.
according to S; and then the second [Hamza] is converted into ى, as the rule for two [mobile] Hamzas in one word is conversion of the second into ى, when it is final [above]; so that the word becomes خَطَّائِي [below].

The object of IH here is only [to indicate] the combination of two Hamzas in the o. f. of خَطَّائِي [283], according to S, and the conversion of the second into ى: but, as for the conversion of the first into a ى pronounced with Fath [below], it will shortly be mentioned. Khl [above] also says that its o. f. is خَطَّائِي [above], with a ى after a Hamza; but [in order to arrive at this] he transposes, putting the ى into the position of the Hamza, and the Hamza into the position of the ى (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, اللهُمَّ اغْفِرْ لَهُم خَطَّائِي [below], for which, if خَطَّائِي were transposed, as Khl mentions, there would be no reason (Jrb). Two other modes [of pronunciation] occur, in the case of two mobile Hamzas in one word, (1) what is mentioned by AZ about some of the Arabs, that they sound the two Hamzas true together: he says "I have heard those who say أَلْلَهُمَّ اغْفِرْ لَهُم خَطَّائِي O God, forgive me my sins [above], like خَطَّائِي "; and similar is دَرْنَى دَرْنَى pl. of دَرْنَى pl. of خَطَّائِي tilting-ring; and many, vid. the KK and [among the
Syrians (IY)] Ibn `Amir [al-Yahṣābī (IY)], read َجِلَّ يَا[IY].

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 َيِمَلاَيَة [above], you say َيِمَلاَيَة, putting it between Hamza and ٰ, as in َسِمَُّ [658]; and similar are such as َوُمَلَك 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 َوُمَأَيْل [357, 683] and َوُمَيْل [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 َوُمَيْل [below], in order that there may be no combination? How then should the existing ! not be taken into account as a separative? (R). With separation [therefore], the combination of two Hamzas, as in َوُمَأَيْل [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) ٌ، has no effect (A). And, as for the fact that the [first] Hamza of ٌدَوُّ أَكُبُبُ (Jh), must be converted into ٌدَوُّ أَكُبُبُ [246, 278], [orig. ٌدَأَكُبُبُ (Jh)], it is because ٌدَوُّ أَكُبُبُ is one of the ultimate pls.; and because its sing., i. e., ٌدَوُّ أَكُبُبُ [lock of hair (MAR)], has its Hamza, in most cases, converted into ٌ، as is the rule of alleviation [658] in the like thereof, [such as ٌمُرِجَّ] (R). Elision of the second [Hamza (Jrb)] is obligatory in the cat. of أَكُبُبُ I honor [428] (SH), i. e., the 1st pers. sing. [of the aor.] from أَعَلَّل [332] (MASH), another objection to what they say, vid. that conversion of the second Hamza into ٌ، [above] is necessary, if neither it, nor the one before it, be pronounced with Kasr. The o. f. of أَكُبُبُ, with two Hamzas, 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 أَكُمُّ, the aor. [in the 1st pers. sing.] must be أَكُمُّ (Jrb). By rule, the second [Hamza] in it should be converted into ٌ، as in أَوُيَدُمُ [above]: but the word is lightened by elision of the second [Hamza], from frequency of usage, as it is lightened in خُدُّ and كُلُّ [659] by elision; though, by rule, the Hamza [in them] should be converted into ٌ،
And [then (R)] its congeners, [\text{ضَرْأُ كَرَمُ} and \text{يَنِسُ کَرَمُ} (R)], are made to accord with it (SH), as [\text{ُتُكْرُمُ} and \text{ُعَكْرُمُ} (Jrb), although two Hamzas are not combined in them (R). They make conversion of the Hamza, when single, into a ی pronounced with Fath [above], obligatory in the cat. of مُطَبَّاَيَا [283, 726].

And hence حَطَّاَيَا [above], according to the two sayings (SH) of Khl and others (MASH). This predicament is common to (1) what contains two Hamzas, like حَطَّاَيَا, according to the opinion of S: and (2) what contains a single Hamza, like (a) مُطَبَّاَيَا, by common consent; and (b) حَطَّاَيَا, 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 أُلْجَة َيْتَرُجَة\text{citron}, you would say أُلْجَة, with a Hamza pronounced with وَلْم, then a quiescent ٌ, then a Hamza pronounced with وَلْم, then a quiescent ٌ, then a Hamza pronounced with Fath, and then a س of feminization (Sn),] or\text{یَنِسُ یَنِسُ} (A), with five Hamzas, the second and fourth quiescent, the first and third pronounced with وَلْم, 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 Hamzaz in one word, when the first is initial, as in أُرْتَبَتِ and [above] [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 Hamzaz there by an I, whether both be sounded true, or the second of them be softened, as in أُلْعَمَةٌ [above or أُلْعَمَةٌ], 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 قِيَّمَةٌ طَلْبَةٌ أَلْوَعُسَاءٌ [29]; and another says حَرُظٌ إِذَاَّمَا أَلْقَوْمٌ أُبدُوا فِكَاهَةٌ تَفَكَّرَ أَيُّهَا يُعْنِونَ أَمْ تَرَا (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 أَنْذَرْتُهُمْ II. 5. [497, 28], and similarly أَثَنَّكَ لَآَلْتُ يُوسُفُ XII. 90. [581]. Then,
after the entry of the of separation, some, vid. the Banū Tamīm, sound the two Hamzas true: while others, vid. the people of AlHijāz, alleviate the second; and this is preferred by IA1 (IY). When the first is an interrog. Hamza, and the second a conj. Hamza, then the latter, if pronounced with Kasr or Damm [668], is elided, as في أصطفى XXXVII. 153. [669] and في أصطفى Was he chosen?; and, if not, is converted into ُل, 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 AlHijāz, alleviate one of them, deeming it heavy to sound both of them true, as the people of AlHijāz deem it heavy to sound the single [Hamza] true [658] (R). For (S), says he (R), it is not [a usage] of the language of the Arabs that two Hamzas should meet together, and both be sounded true (S, R). Then, if both be mobile [above] (R), (1) some of them alleviate the first (IY, R), not the second, because the first is the final of a word, and finals are the seat of alteration (R); and this is the saying of IA1 (IY, R), who adduces, as proof of that, قَفْتُ جَآء أَمْثِرَاطُهَا XLVII. 20. For already its signs have come [below] and يَا دَكْرِيَّاهُ إِنَا نُبْشِرُنَ XIX. 7. 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 Khal [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 between 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 between and between, because it is pronounced with Kasr after Fatha, [like the Hamza in سَمَّى] (IY), [and] which we have heard so recited by trustworthy Arabs: (a) Khal [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 اسمى [above]; and I have seen IA1 take the Hamzas in اسمى وَيَلْتَنِي أَلْدُ وَأَنَا أَقْبَرْؤَف

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 AlKufa and Ibn ‘Amir, as in the case of two Hamzas in one word: and this is more appropriate here (R), because
the two Hamzas are constructively separate (IY, R), one not being inseparable from the other (IY): (4) the people of AlHijāz alleviate both together (IY, R), as they do with the single Hamza (R), because, if there were only one, it would be alleviated (IY). Those who alleviate the first alone do so in one of the modes before mentioned, vid. elision, conversion, or softening, as was mentioned in the case of the single [mobile] Hamza [658], which should be referred to. And those who alleviate the second alone, treat it like the mobile Hamza after a mobile; so that the nine cases mentioned [658] occur, the rules of which should be referred to, because they are equally applicable here. Thus in يُطْسِلُ إِلَى II. 136. [He guideth whom] He willeth unto [a right way] three modes occur in the second [Hamza, as in the Hamza of سُوْلَ], 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 IA1, as أَوْلَيْكَ أَوْلِيَّاً أَوْلُّبَكَ XLVI. 31. [Nor have] protectors [against Him]: those [are in manifest error], جَأَ الْأَشْرَاطِهَا XLVII. 20. [above], and مِنْ أَلْسَمَ إِلَى XXXII. 4. From the heaven to [the earth]: (2) conversion of the second into a pure letter of prolongation, i. e., into an ِ if the first be pronounced with Fath, 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 AlḤijāz, 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 آْيَةَ أَبَانَ اللَّسْلَمَ Read thou a verse, Make thy father read the salutation, [i. e., Deliver to thy father the (written) salutation (KF),] and لَمْ يَرْدَوْ أَبْوَنِي Thy father was not bad, then, in this case also, there are four methods:—(1) the people of AlḤijāz 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 ﴿ 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 AlḤijāz, who alleviate both together, convert the first into ﴿, ﴿, or ﴿: 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 ج or ج، because that [transfer] is possible: so that they say َأَتْرِي أَيْةً with the ج in the first, and softening in the second; َأَتْرِي بَآَلَ with the ج pronounced with Fath, i.e., with the Fatha of the elided Hamza; and َلَمْ يَرْدُو بُولَ with the ج pronounced with Fath: and, on the analogy of this, you form لَمْ تَرْدُو مُلكَ Thy mother was not bad, and لَمْ يَرْدُو بُلكَ Thy camels were not bad, et cetera. Similarly, if the second alone be quiescent, as in جَمْنِ شَاء أَتْبِنَ 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 أَتْبِنَ 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 [625] (M), the n., as زیدٰالظَریف the smart Zaid; the v., as خذٰآالفقو VII. 198. [428]; and the p., as هِلْالْرَجُلْ فِیآُلْدَارِ Is the man [666] in the house? The concurrence of two quiescents is not allowable: nay, is impossible, inasmuch as the quiescent letter is quasi-pausal, and what follows it is quasi-inceptive; while it is impossible to begin with a quiescent [667] (IY). When the first of two quiescent letters is a sound letter, it is not possible for them to concur, unless you put a Kasra slurred, not impled, upon the first of them. The listener then reckons that the two quiescents concur, and even the speaker shares with him in this notion. But, when either of them is sensitive, he knows that there is a faint Kasra on the first [letter], as in بَکْر Bakr [below], بِشَرْ Bishr, and نَسْر full-grown unripe dates, where the e of the three [words] is mobilized with a faint Kasra, otherwise it would be impossible for you to put the quiescent after it. And similarly, when you assume that the initial of a word, which you mean to articulate, is quiescent, which does not occur in Arabic, at the beginning of a sentence, except with the conj.
Hamza [667, 668], though it is found in Persian [667], as the initial of which is quiescent, as is proved by Hasten and place, the initial of which is quiescent, 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 cconj. 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 [below] and 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 ل [646, 658], because of the prolongation contained in the ل, since it is a [letter of] prolongation only; and, for that reason, such [formations] as مَا كَلَّبَ contended in pulling and تَمْوَدَ stopping up are more frequent than such as أُنْبِذَ [below]. Next after that [in degree of lightness] is when the first of the two [quiescents] is a و or ي preceded by a vowel homogeneous with it, as in تُبْنِيَةُ أَلْقَوْبُ [below]: but no similar ex. with the ي, as سَأَرَ سُورُ [for was privily spoken to, pass. of سَأَرَ سُورَ سِيرَ spoke privily to him], occurs in their language; [though لَيْلَ لَيْلَهُ will be found below]. And the last degree [of lightness] is when the first of the two quiescents is a و or ي preceded by Fatha, because of the smallness of the prolongation contained therein: but such [a combination] occurs only in the dim., as خَوْيَةُ [below]; so that, in يَلَُلُ أَنْعُلُ [shortness of the upper teeth (MAR)] and وَ, affection, you do not say أَوْلُ أَيْلُ and أَوْلُ أَيْلُ, with elision of the vowel of the first ل [and د ], as in أَصِيمُ أَصِيمُ أَيْلُ [below]; but transfer the vowel of the first of the two similar letters, when incorporation is intended, to the ، and ي , as أَيْلُ أَيْلُ having short upper teeth and أَرَ أَرَ more
affectionate, as you do in such as voluntary effort. The \( \ddot{a} \) of the dim. being exclusively characterized by untransferability of the vowel from the following letter to it, when incorporation is intended, because they constitute it quiescent, and it is inseparable from quiescence [274]. And, in addition to the prolongation contained in the letter of softness, [which, in every real concurrence of two quiescents, forms the first quiescent,] one of two conditions is prescribed for the second quiescent:—(1) that it should be incorporated, provided that the incorporated [letter], together with the [letter that it is] incorporated into, be in the same word as the letter of prolongation: (a) that is because, being incorporated into a mobile [731], it is in the predicament of the mobile, because of the closeness of its adhesion thereto, since the tongue removes the incorporated [letter] and the [letter that it is] incorporated into with one movement; so that they become, as it were, one mobile letter: (b) we stipulate that the incorporated should be in the same word as the letter of prolongation in order to guard against such as Fear ye two God, and 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., أَلِفُ Alif, pausing a little, just enough to separate it from the others; and then says بَا Bâ, and so on to the end: (a) you do not see two quiescents concur in these ns., except when the first is a letter of softness, as in دَالُ جَيمُ نُونُ Dāl-Jīm-Nun: (b) similarly in the ejs., as in [used in chiding a dog (MAR)] طِيْحُ [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 ejs. [640], as أَلْفُ المُمْنُونَ and أَلْفُ المُمْمَنُونَ [below],
food and the dead; (b) similarly in *ns.
 enumerated [159], as زیدٰی تُمُودُ سَعیَدُ ِعِمَادُ: for they are constituted to be spoken in syntactical construction; and then the user pauses upon them, either in construction with their *op., as جَآءَ نِی آلُومُمنُونَ The believers came to me; or not in construction therewith, as تُمُودُ زیدٰ Thamūd-Zaid (R). The concurrence of two quiescents is pardonable (1) in pause, unrestrictedly (SH), i. e., whether the first be a letter of softness (R, Jrb), as in the male believers, آلُومُمِینُ, and the female believers [above] (R); or not (R, Jrb), as in بَکَرٰ [above] and عُمَرٰ [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 عُمَرٰ [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 عَمَرُ, because, pause being the place of abbreviating and stopping, that [omission of the vowel] is pardonable in it (Jrb): (b) you already know, however, that in the second [case, where the first of the two quiescents is not a letter of softness,] there is not really a concurrence of two quiescents, since it is impossible when the first of them is a sound letter (R): (c) if the concurrence of two quiescents be in continuous speech, it is not pardonable, except in [the following] cases mentioned by IH (Jrb): (2) in the incorporated [letter], preceded by a [letter of (Jrb, MASH)] softness, [whether it be a letter of prolongation, or not (MASH), provided that both quiescents be (Jrb),] in one word, as حَوْيَّة dear particular friend, [dim. of حَاشِة particular friend (R, Jrb),] and تُحُوْة Al töw. The garment, or cloth, was pulled out, or stretched [above] (SH), pass. of تَبَادَّدَنا Al töw. We pulled the garment, or cloth, one against the other (R, Jrb), i.e., each of us pulled it from the other (R), and أُتْحَاجْوُيَّى VI. 80. [170] (M), read with a single ن [405] by Nafi‘ 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 وَإِذَا تَفَاءَلْا Al töw. VIII. 32.
And when they said "O God", they replied with "O God!" and Solomon: 0.65.

Nor hath He laid upon you any hardship in the faith, where the letter softness must be elided (MASH), as will be explained [below]: (a) the unsound letter [697], when quiescent, is named "letter of softness"; and this, when the vowel of what precedes it is homogeneous with it, is [named] "letter of prolongation" [below]: (b) the ی is always a letter of prolongation: while the ى and ٕ are sometimes letters of softness, as in تقول saying and بيع selling; and sometimes letters of prolongation, as in يقول says and بيع 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 وعد promised and یسر was gentle: (c) thus is it mentioned in one commentary on the م; 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 [اصَمّ وُدَابَ] and مَدَيِّقٍ (K on III 1.), when these two matters are combined, i. e., in pause upon a word like دَوَابَ [256, 646] and rather deaf [274, 281], dim. of deaf (Jrb), and مُدَيِّقٍ [274], dim. of مَدَيِّقٍ [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 عَيْنٌ, ثَافِ, مُيِّمٍ, etc. [321], 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 ص in XIX. 1 [18] (R), [in which case the final is quiescent] because of what has been mentioned above [under pause] (Jrb); and in continuity (SH), as when you join the ع to the ص in the [foregoing] initial monogram (R), [in which case the final is quiescent] to distinguish what is uninfl. for want of the require of inflection, vid. construction [159, 321], from what is
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 مَعْيَنٌ، تَافٌ، مِيمٌ, 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 نَافَ لَامٌ Kūf-Lām; or something else, as in مُرَصَادُ نُمْوَى ambush-Thamūd-chief: and whether the first [quiescent] letter be a letter of softness, as in what we have mentioned; or not, as in عُمْوَى بِكْرٌ '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 \textit{orig.} mobile, and afterwards have their vowel cut off on account of pause, but because these words are \textit{uninfl.} upon quiescence [below]: (f) \textit{Z} says that they are \textit{orig.} \textit{infl.}; yet are not [actually] \textit{infl.}, because they are denuded of the cause of inflection: but this [assertion] of his is marvellous, for how can the \textit{n.} be \textit{infl.} without a requerer 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 \textit{op}.?—or uninflectional, which is not allowable, because the uninflectedness of that \textit{[n.]} in which the cause of inflection does not exist is stronger than the uninflectedness of that \textit{[n.]} in which a preventive of inflection accidentally arises; and the stronger of the two kinds of uninflectedness ought to be accompanied by the \textit{o. f.} of uninflectedness, vid. quiescence [159], because the \textit{o. f.} of inflection is mobility, and the \textit{o. f.} of uninflectedness is quiescence: (g) we say of these words, whether names of letters of the alphabet [321, 635], or \textit{nums.}, like رَأِحَدَب [159, 321, 647], or anything else, like زَيْدُ عَمِّرُ بُلْتَة [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 إنَّاٌ, when you enumerate the nums.; and the conversion of the ا of such as اربعةٌ and ثلاثةٌ into ا, as واحدٌ إنَّاٌ ثلاثةٌ أربعةٌ One-two-three-four, by common consent; whereas the conj. ٌ is elided [669] in the interior [of the sentence], and the ا is not converted into ا 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 كمٌ [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] In the Name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful has no [syntactical] concern with the beginning of the chapter after it, like قُلْ عَلَى اللَّهِ أَحَدٌ CXII. 1, [160], so that you pause upon الْرَحْمَٰن الْرَّحِيمٌ; 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 ی of ﺟَلْلَتْةَ and ﺖَلْلَتْةَ is converted into ی [646]; but, since you join them to what follows them, and do not pause upon them, the vowel of the Hamza in ﺖَلْلَتْةَ is transferred to the ی [of ﺖَلْلَتْةَ], according to what is transmitted by S [321, 647, 648], as it is transferred in ﺲَمَلْةٌ [658] and ﺖَلْلَتْةَ XXIII. 1. [16], and similarly in the saying of the poet [Abu-nNajm al'Ijli (AKB)]

[1 advanced 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) ٣ (AKB)], where the vowel of the Hamza of ﺛَلْلَتْةَ is transferred to the ی of ﺛَلْلَتْةَ: (i) 

Mb transmits from Mz that transfer of the vowel of the Hamza in ﺖَلْلَتْةَ to the [preceeding] ی 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 

\[ زَيْدٌ وَأَحْدَثُ إِنَّنَا قَلَّتُهُ ـ عُمَّرَ وَبَكَرُ \] 

[159], saying that, in what is orig. infl., the nom. may be pronounced with Ishmām [640], as 

\[ زَيْدٌ وَأَحْدَثُ إِنَّنَا ـ \]

with Ishmām of the Damm [on the د of 

\[ زَيْدٌ وَأَحْدَثُ ـ \]

the nom. being pronounced with Ishmām because it is the strongest and earliest inflection [24]; whereas in 

\[ أَلْفُ كَلِمَةً \]

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 

\[ عُمَّرُ زَيْدٌ the manservant of Zaid, \]

when not constructed with its op. (R) : (m) one ought to pause upon the م in 

\[ آَلِمُ أَلْلَهَ III. 1. [321], as \]

one pauses upon 

\[ أَلْفٌ وَلَمَّا \]

and to begin with what follows it, as you say 

\[ زَيْدٌ وَأَحْدَثُ إِنَّنَا [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 

\[ آَلِمُ أَلْلَهَ 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 א to be transferred from the Hamza, because, in that case, [i.e., when the א 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 א, 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 א is in the predicament of pause; [and thus this reading of the text is] like their saying راَحِدٌ أَنْتَانِ One-two, by throwing the vowel of the Hamza upon the ו (B); and for that reason the א 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 א and the י, 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 א with Kasr, two Kasras and a י 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 

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 

Is AlHasan with thee? and 

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 

[599, 667], and secondly with 

[650, 667], since the conj. Hamza is not pronounced with Fath except in them [668]: (b) they permit the concurrence of two quiescents here, because, if they elided the conj. Hamza, saying and 

one would not know whether it was an enunciation or an interrogation; so that they change the [conj.] Hamza into (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 I [656, 661, 669] (R) : [for] some of the Arabs put the conj. Hamza, in what we have mentioned, betwixt and between [658] : the poet [AlMuthakkiib 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 ًالخَيْرُ الَّذِي أَنَا أَبْتَغِيهِ ًأَمْ أَلْسَرُ الَّذِي هُوَ يَبْتَغِيهِ] 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 Kur is read in both ways: (f) when the second [Hamza] is converted into ٰ, two quiescents concur, irregularly, because, in such as ُلاَّ كَسِينٌ [above], the second [quiescent] is neither incorporated, nor paused upon, as we prescribed [above]; while, in your saying ُلَى Is God ?, though it is incorporated, still the incorporated [letter] is not in the same word as the [letter that it is] incorporated into, [because the incorporated is the J of the art., while the incorporated into is part of what the art. is prefixed to (MAR)]: (g) the ٰ converted from the Hamza is not elided [below], lest the same confusion between interrogation and enunciation, from which they escaped [by refusing to elide the conj. Hamza], be entailed upon them; while that [retention of the ٰ, notwithstanding the irregularity in the concurrence of the two quiescents,] is facilitated by the ٰ 's being more powerful in prolongation than its two fellows (R): (5) in such as ُلَا قَمَا ٰلَّl], 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)] إِلَيْ أَلْلَهِ [556, 558] (SH), from dislike that the expression الله [52, 262] should occur pronounced with Kasr of its Hamza, so that its meaning should not be recognized: (a) elision of the َلاَّ َعَا أَلْلَهِ [552], and elision or فَاتِحَةَ of the َيِّ إِلَيْ أَلْلَهِ [558] are allowable (Jrb, MASH), in which case two quiescents do not concur (MASH); so that in إِلَيْ أَلْلَهِ َلاَّ َعَا أَلْلَهِ and إِلَيْ أَلْلَهِ 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 َلاَّ َعَا أَلْلَهِ َلَّيْسُ ﴿ أَلْكَسْنُ ﴾ and [is] likewise [affirmable] in these two, either upon the ground of the well-known method, [vid. conversion of the conj. Hamza into َلاَّ ] 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)] التَّقُرَّبُ [حَلْقَتَا أَلْبِطَانِ] with expression of the َكَ (Jrb)] is anomalous [228, 610] (SH), analogy requiring elision, as in غَلَامَا أَلْبِيمْرُ the two menservants of the governor and دُوبَا أَبْنِكَ the two garments of thy son, where you
do not pronounce the ت: 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] إلتقَتُ آلهَ is said, as a prov., when the evil is great, because the two rings do not meet except when the camel is extremely emaciated, or when the belly-girth is drawn excessively tight. But IH's saying "And حَلَقَتَا الْبَطَانَى is anomalous" ought to come after "and يَرَى الْغَرْضَ " [below], because the ought to be elided, as in يَخَشَى الْقُومُ [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 مُسَلِّمًا Two Muslims and مُسَلِّمون Muslims, where the [16, 228, 234] is
orig. quiescent; and, if the \( \text{،} \) and \( \text{،} \) 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 \( یُسْلُمْنَان \) They two become Muslims, \( یُسْلُمْرُونَان \) 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 حَفُّ Fear thou, تُلْ Say thou, and يُلْ Sell thou [671, 708]: (b) like part of that word, as being (a) an attached nom. pron., as in تَعْكَشَیَّن Thou [fem.] dreadest, تَعْيِزُرَونَ Ye [masc.] raid, and تَرَبْیِمَن Thou [fem.] shootest: (a) their o. f. is تَعْرَیْعُ , تَعْزَرُ , تَعْكَشَیَّ , and تَعْرَبُی ; but, when the quiescent [nom.] prons., [i. e., the ى of the pl. masc. and the ى of the sing. fem.,] are attached to them, the ى s are elided because of the two quiescents: (b) the first of the two corrob. ى s, one of which is incorporated into the other, as ٌأُعْرََٰن Do ye surely raid and ٌأُرَیْمَن Do thou [fem.] surely shoot [below], where the two prons. ى and ى are elided, because the quiescent ى is attached to them [610]: or (c) the initial of a separate word, as in تَعَّقِشَیَّ
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 اضْرِبُ اضْرِبُ strike, strike, [like اذْعَبُ اذْعَبُ below,] except with a preventive, as in لَمْ يَلَدْ [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 a, or ی, 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 ו, there is no question about it, because mobilization of it is impossible, since, in that case, it would not remain an ו [683]. And the reason why the ו is elided from אֶּפֶּרֶךְ, and the כ from אֶפֶּרֶךְ [above], though the corrob. ו is like part of the preceding word, so that, if the ו or כ were left intact, it would be like [the ו in] I. 7. [above] and [the כ of] תְּמוּדָּה אֲלָנָּב [above], is that this ו 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 any one say "Then wherefore is it reckoned like part of the word in אֶּפֶּרֶךְ? De ye two surely strike [below], so that the ו is not elided?", I say "The object is to distinguish between the sing. and the du.: for the ו, 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 אֶּפֶּרֶךְ [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 אִנָּהָרָה Ye did not raid, and אִנָּהָרָה Ye did not raid, Raid thou [fem.] and thou didst not raid, Shoot ye two and
Ye two did not shoot, ُلَمَّ تَرْضَوْا ُئِرْمِيَ َلَمَّ تَرْضَوْا ُئِرْمِيَ Thou didst not shoot, ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا Be ye two pleased and ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا Be ye two not pleased, ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا Be thou [fem.] pleased and ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا Thou [fem.] wast not pleased, are affixed to the v. after the elision of the ُلَمَّ Tَرْضَيْبَا Strike ye two and ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا ُتُقُولُوا ُتُقُولُوا Ye two did not strike and ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا Ye did not say [below], after the apocopation ُلَمَّ Tَرْضَيْبَا or quiescence ُلَمَّ Tَرْضَيْبَا; then the ُلَمَّ are restored on account of their affixion, because with them the apocopation and quiescence are not upon the ُلَمَّ; and then the ُلَمَّ are elided with the ُلَمَّ, on account of the concurrence of two quiescents, after elision of the vowel of the ُلَمَّ; but are not elided with the ُلَمَّ, as ُأُغْرُوا ُأُغْرُوا, ُإِرْمِيَ ُإِرْمِيَ [above], ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا [above], because of the absence of two quiescents. And the ُلَمَّ is not converted into ِلَمَّ in ِلَمَّ above] and ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا Ye two are pleased and ُلَمَّ تَرْضَيْبَا Ye two dread, as will be explained [719] (R). And, [should one say
that the ٌ of خَفُّ, vid. the ل converted from the ُ, and the ل of ِخَشَّي and ِخَشَّوا, vid. the ل converted from the ُ, are elided only because of the concurrence of two quiescents, while this cause is absent (Jrb) in such as خَفِ الله Fear thou God, ِخَشَّوا الله Dread ye God and ِخَشَّي آللَّهُ Dread thou [fem.] God [below], ِخَشَّنَنَن Do ye surely dread and ِخَشَّنَن Do thou [fem.] surely dread, [so that the elided must be restored, IH replies that in them (Jrb) the vowel [of the ج, and of the ُ, and ِ (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. آللَّهُ, [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 كَفِيْا : so that the ل elided on account of the quiescence of the ج, and of the ُ [and ِ ], does not return (R), contrary to [the ل of] such as خَافَا Fear ye two and خَافَنَن Do thou [masc.] surely fear (SH), where the vowel [of the ج] is quasi-original, because what follows it is attached to the word in the same way as a part [thereof], which in خَافَا is obvious; and in خَافَنَن is [equally true,] because, with the pron. latent, the ن is quasi-attached [to the َ] (Jrb). If, then, it be said "Grant that the ن [of
and is like a word separate from the v., because of the intervention of the [prominent] pron. between them, is it not quasi-attached to the pron., in the same way as to the l in حافن ? and therefore, since the vowel of the l in حافن is quasi-original, because of what is attached to it, i.e., the ن, and for this reason the l elided in حفف returns [in حافن], so ought the vowel of the and ل in إشتين and إشرون to be [quasi-original], so that the l elided in them, on account of the quiescence of the، and i attached to them, ought to return", we say (1) that, between the attachment of the ن to the l of the word, and its attachment to the [prominent] pron., there is a difference, because the ن, when attached to the pron. in letter, is not attached thereto in sense, since it denotes corroboration [610] of the v., not corroboration of the pron.: and (2) that the l of the word is radically mobile, so that [even] its accidental vowel is taken into account; contrary to the، and i of the pron., which are radically quiescent. If you say "Is not the ن in such as إضرباي [above] after the [prominent] pron.? Then why is not the l elided, as in إضربالرجل Strike ye two the man?", I say "From fear of confounding the du. with the sing., as above explained". As for the vowel of the l in حافن [above], حائي، and in حافن، 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 نُيَخَفَانَا Let them two fear and نُيَخَفَانُوا Let them fear. Moreover, in the words mentioned, the vowels of the J, although accidental, caused by affixion of the prons. and the ن, are still permanent, on account of the exclusion of the J from being constructively quiescent, as it is in تُمِّ الْلَيْلَ LXXIII.

2. *Rise thou* [to pray (B)] *at night* [below] and لَمَّا يَقْفُمِ الْلَيْلُ He did not rise to pray at night, since, with the corrob. ن attached to the J 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 لَمْ تُقُولَا *Say ye two* and لَمْ تُقُولُوا *Ye two did not say,* لَمْ تُقُولُوا Say ye and لَمْ تُقُولُوا *Ye did not say* [above], لَمْ تُقُولِي *Say thou* [fem.] and لَمْ تُقُولِي *Thou [fem.] didst not say,* without a corrob. ن, the [indication of the mood, which in لَمْ تُقُولُ Thou didst not say is effected by] apocopation [404] or quiescence [431], is shifted from the J to the ن [405, 431], which is after the J [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 ج remain constructively quiescent. Inevitably, therefore, the ج's return. And, on account of the cessation of the apocope or quiescence, the ج's are retained in Do thou surely raid, ليبَغْزِرُونَ Let him surely raid, and خِرَّوا Raid ye two [above]. The reason why the first of the two quiescents, i.e., the ج in حُبْلَى رَمَى خْرَى [and and أَعْلَى] is not elided upon attachment of the ج of the د. in They two raided and رَمِيَا They two shot [719] أَعْلَياَيِ (i.e., the sing., i.e., خْرَى He raided and رَمَى خْرَى He shot, أَعْلَى زَيْدَ حُبْلَى حُبْلَى خْرَى The higher part of Zaid and the pregnant female of 'Amr [684].) But the ج elided in the like of she shot and خُرْتَ She raided is not restored, although the ج is mobilized, in رَمَتَا They two [fem.] shot [607] and خُرْتَا They two [fem.] raided, because, although its vowel is on account of the ج, which is like a part [of the v.], still the verbal ت of feminization is radically quiescent; contrary to the ج of the v. in قُومَا Stand ye two, [which is radically mobile.] as above mentioned: and also because the ت, which ought to come after the ag., because it is the sign of feminization of 1014a
the ag., not of the v., debars the f from complete attachment, as we said of [the prominent nom. pron. in] إِخْشَانٍ and إِخْشَانٍ, [which debars the ن from complete attachment to the v.]. Some, however, allow restoration of the f in the like thereof, citing as evidence the saying [of Imra al-Kais, describing his mare (Jsh)]

لَهَا مَنْثَنْيِي حَطَّانَا كَمَا أَكَبَّ عَلَيْهِ سَاعِيٌّ يَبِيْعُ أَلْبَهُ

(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 حَطَّانَا (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 أَذُهَبْ أَذُهَبْ Go, go [above], لَمْ أُبْلِهْ [below], and آَلِيْمُ أَلْلَهُ III. 1. [above]; and [as] إِخْشَيْ أَلْلَهُ and إِخْشَوْا أَلْلَهُ [above] (SH): except when its mobilization would lead to destruction of the object, as in إنْطَلُقَ لَمْ يَلْدُهُ and [below], as will be explained. The reason why, in the absence of this preventative, 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 [587, 614], which is elided, to distinguish it from the Tanwin [609]: (2) the ن of لَدْنُ [205], which is elided, though anomalously, because, being liable to elision, without a concurrence of two quiescents, as in the saying [of the Rājiz Ghailān (S)]

\[
\text{يُسَتَلَعْ بِ} \text{الْبَعْوَّاتِ} \text{مِن} \text{جَرْبِهِ} \text{مِن} \text{لَدْنَة} \text{لَكْحَيَة} \text{إِلَي} \text{مَنْحُوْرَة}
\]

*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 لَمْ يَكُنْ [270]: (a) the ن of لَدْنُ [450], although it shares with the ن of لَدْنُ in what we have said about resemblance to the لَمْ, and allowability of elision without [a concurrence of] two quiescents, is not treated analogously to it, because elision of the ن of لَدْنُ 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 رَكَاتِمُ أَلْقَاطِيْنِيَ الْحَامِي [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 أُبْلِهْ *I did not care* [above] is *أَبَالْيَِّ* : the ِ‏ is elided because of the prefixion of the apocopative [ُلَمْ ]; then, لَمْ أَبَالْ being frequently used, abbreviation is required; and therefore a second apocopation of the word by the apocopative is allowed, through assimilation of أَبَالْ, on account of the mobility of its final, to what has nothing elided from it, like يَقُول says and يَخَافُ fears; so that the vowel of the ِ‏ is elided; and then the ِ‏, on account of the two quiescents:

and then the ش of silence is affixed, as in لَمْ يَرُهُ *He did not see* and لَمْ يَخَشَهْ *He did not dread* [615], because the ِ‏ 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 *الْخَشُّينَ* and *الْخَشُّونَ* [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 ش in لَمْ أُبْلِهْ [above]; or separate, like
and quasi-separate, like then what sense has his saying "because the \( \text{n} \) is quasi-separate", when the predicament of the attached also is the same? The mobilization of the \( \text{j} \) of determination prefixed to the \textit{conj.} Hamza, as in \textit{the son} and \textit{the name} [669], \textit{the departure} and \textit{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 

\[ \text{He has already extracted} \]

\[ \text{Has he been peculiarly distinguished?} \]

because the \textit{conj.} Hamza with its vowel is elided [669] in the interior [of the sentence]; so that two quiescents, the determinative \( \text{j} \) and the quiescent that follows the \textit{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

\[ \text{In the Name etc. [141], praise etc. [141] is transmitted with Fath of the } \text{m} \text{ in the } \text{r} \text{jim } \text{al-kh} \text{md} \text{ for the } \text{l}. \text{ I. 1. ; and similarly} \]

\[ \text{LXXXIII. 2. [above] is anomalously read with Fath of the } \text{m} \text{ (R), by alleviation [658] (B). And,} \]
according to this, the Kasra of the ل in الاؤبّ and الائيّتیكٍ [above] may be transferred from the conj. Hamza. And similarly the Damm in such as ٌلُقْٔف وقَالَتْ أَخْرُجٔ VI. 10. [540] and ٌلُقْٔف أَسْتَهْرأَ XII. 31. [664]. But [the authority for] this [transfer] is weak: and, if it were allowable, لَمْ يَكُن أَلْدِینٔ XCVIII. 1. [above] and مَن أَلْدِی ی 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 إٌلْتَلَقٔ [with quiescence of the ل, and Fath of the ت (MASH),] and لَمْ يَلْدَةٔ [with quiescence of the ل, and Fath of the د (MASH)]; and as in زٔ and لَمْ يُرْدَةٔ in [the dial. of]Tamîm [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 إٌلْتَلَقٔ Depart thou, orig. إٌلْتَلَقٔ, an imp. from إٌلْتَلَقٔ departure, where, إٌلْتَلَقٔ
being assimilated to لُمُبَدَّةُ in the dial. of Tamīm [368], the ل 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 لُمُبَدَّةُ (R), and [according to Z] بَئْسٍ XXIV. 51. [below] (M): the poet says [505] (M, Jrb), orig. لَمْ يَبْدَّهُ (M, Jrb), which [also (IY)] is assimilated to كَنْفَ; so that the ل is made quiescent; and, [two quiescents then concurring (Jrb),] the د is mobilized with Fath [below]: and hence, [as some assert (Jrb),] the reading of Hafs وَيَخْشَى اللَّهَ وَيَتَقَلِّبَ XXIV. 51. And dreadeth 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 د of support [170]: (c) as for Đamm, one is not reduced to it, in averting [a concurrence of] two quiescents, except for alliteration, as in مَنْ [203, 664]; or because the quiescent [to be mobilized] is the ج of the pl., as in خَشْوَةُ [610, 664]: (d) some say that the second is pronounced with Fath for alliteration to the vowel of what precedes the first quiescent, in addition to Fath's being lighter: (e) the people of AlḤijāz do not incorporate in the
reduplicated [v.] whose Ɂ is quiescent on account of the apoc. or imp., as ٍٔ ُّ َٰٓ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُّ ُ
mobilized, since, the two quiescents being, upon this hypothesis, inseparable one from the other, [because the measure is supposed to be ] if the first were mobilized, one measure would be confounded with another, as in [206] and [above], where the [206] is mobile therein : (a) [the mobilization of the second quiescent in] آمٍّسٍ أَمْسٍ [206, 321, 666], كَيْفَ [207, 321, 666], and حَيْثُ [202, 664, 666] may be attributed to [fear of] the like [confusion], and to [dislike of] the heaviness of a vowel upon the unsound letter, if the latter be not converted [684, 703]; while, if it were converted, that [conversion] would be a liberty in an indecl. [n.] (R). But the reading of Ḥafs يَتَّقِه XXIV. 51. And feareth Him [above] does not belong to this [cat. (Jrb)], according to the soundest (SH) saying, because the ّ 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 يَتَّقِهٍ [above] (MASH). This is a refutation of Z, who says that يَتَّقِهٍ is orig. يَتَّقِهٍ, with the ّ of silence [615] affixed thereto; so that [the termination of] it becomes like كَيْفَ [above]; and then the vowel of [the medial, i. e.,] the ق is elided, as is [the practice in] the dial. of Tamīm (R), like [the vowel of the in]
(1024)

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 [Jj, whose opinion is adopted by (Jrb)] IH, says, which is the truth, that the s here is [an objective pron. (Jrb)] relating to "وَيَخضُّ الْلَّهُ الله" [above]; and that كَنَّف, being like كَنْف, is lightened by elision of the Kasr of the ق; and then the conj., i.e., the ي, which follows the s of the pron., is elided, because it is elided when the s follows a quiescent, as in [161], عَنْهُ, and عِلَيْهِ (R): so that there is no concurrence of two quiescents, nor any mobilization on account of such (Jrb).

§. 664. The general rule in every concurrence of two quiescents is that the first of them should be mobilized with Kasr, as بَغَتِ الْأَمْة. The handmaid committed fornication and كَامِتِ الْبَجَارَى. The girl stood (IV). Since you know that, in some cases [663], mobilization [of one quiescent] is unavoidable, IH points out that
(Jrb) the o. f. [of mobilization (Jrb)] in a concurrence of two quiescents is [with (Jrb)] Kasr (SH). The reason why the o f. in mobilizing is Kasr, (1) in the case of the first quiescent, is what we have mentioned about one's own nature [663], when one is not forced to [employ] another vowel: (2) in the case of every quiescent whose mobilization is needed, both this [quiescent] that we are discussing [663-666], and the conj. Hamza [668, 669], is said to be that quiescence is substituted in the v., i. e., the apoc., for Kasr in the n., i. e., the gen. [404]; so that, when a vowel replacing, and annulling, quiescence is needed [in the v. or elsewhere], Kasr is substituted for quiescence by way of retaliation: (3) in the case of the first quiescent, is said to be that it occurs only at the end of a word, and therefore likes to be mobilized with a vowel not liable to be mistaken for an inflectional vowel; so that Kasr is most appropriate, because it is not an inflection except with Tanwin after it [16], or with a subst. therefor, vid. an art. or a post. n. [17]; and, when no Tanwin is found after it, nor any subst. therefor, it is known not to be an inflection: whereas Damm or Fath is sometimes an inflection without Tanwin, or any subst. therefor, as يَضُرْبِ [408] and ِرَأَيْتُ أَحْمَدَ ِجَاءَ َنَى أَحْمَدَ [17] and لَنْ يُضَرِّبَ [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 لَّهُمَا الْبُنَادُورُونَ 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 عَلَيْكُمْ (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 IA1 بِبَيْنِ الْأَشْبَابِ 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 بِبَيْنِ الْأَشْبَابِ II. 161. and عَلَيْكُمْ أَلْقَاتَالُ 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 دamma, whether upon the ا, as in عَلَيْكِمْ أَلْقَاتَالْ IV. VIII. 4. They are the believers and in the reading of حمزة [161] عَلَيْهِمْ أَلْقَاتَالِ IV. 79. [above],
or upon any other [letter], as in XXXV.

16. *Ye are the needy,* *لَنَّمُ ۖ أَلَبْوَمَ* VIII. 50. *For you to-day,* and *يَا بِكُمْ أَلَّهَةُ* 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) مُذِّلِّيْلُوْمُ (SH), as مُذِّلِّيْلُوْمُ [203, 510] (MASH), because, its o. f. being مُذِّلِّيْلُوْمُ, they mobilize [the ء ], in case of need, with the original vowel (Jrb) : (a) Damm of the ء of مُذِّلِّيْلُوْمُ, 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 مُذِّلِّيْلُوْمُ is said to be orig. مُذِّلِّيْلُوْمُ; or for alliteration [in the vowel] of the ء to [that of] the م; or because it is like the finals [201] : (c) نَحْنُ [161], in order that the Damm may indicate plurality, as in مُذِّلِّيْلُوْمُ, and مُذِّلِّيْلُوْمُ (R) : (2) the preference for Fath in such as *آَلِيِّمَ اَلِلَّهُ* 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 *آَلِيِّمَ اَلِلَّهُ* III. 1." is relevant only on the
assumption that the vowel of the م 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 ميم is not on account of pause; and, on that assumption, the reasons for adopting Fatha, in preference to Kasr, as the vowel of the م, 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 ميم is on account of pause, says that] the Fatha of the م 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 Fatha [on the final of the v.] in such [formations] as

Do thou surely strike and لیضربن 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 Fatha [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 ن] be infl., [as in لیضرب Let him strike,] or uninfl., [as in

لیضرب strike thou,] because, by affixion of the ن, the v. is estranged from resemblance to ns. [404]; and therefore reverts to its o. f., vid. uninflectedness [402], the
v. f. of which is quiescence; 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 ۵ in IH): (3) the allowability of ۰amm when the second of the two quiescents is followed by an original ۰amma in the same word [with the second quiescent (R, Jrb)], as ۰ُقَالَتُ أَخْرَجَ XIII. 31. And she said "Come forth" [663] (SH), وَعَدَّا اِبْنَ آَرْكُنَ XV. 45, 46. XXXVIII. 40, 41. [609], وَعَيْيَ عَنَ آَدَ خُلُوهَا And she said "Come forth" [663] (SH), And she said "Come forth" [663] (SH), and تْلُ آَنْظُرْوا X. 101. Say thou, Consider ye [666] (IY), in [all of (IY)] which ۰amm is [allowable (Jrb)] for alliteration (IY, Jrb), the ۰amma of the ت in ۰ُقَالَتْ being an alliteration to the ۰amma of the ر in أَخْرَجَ, since there is no barrier between them, except a quiescent letter; and similarly [the ۰amma of] the Tanwin [in ۰ُعَدَّا] being an alliteration to the vowel of the ل [in ۰ُرْكُنَ], since there is nothing between them, except the quiescent ر: and similarly [as] أَرْكُنَ LXXIII. 3. Or deduct [666, 668], except that the ۰amma here is for two reasons, one being the same as in XXXVIII. 40, 41.
[above]; and the other being assimilation to the, of the
pron., on the principle of لَوْ آَشَفْطَعْنَا IX. 42. [below], where ِdamm is allowable, although the ت after the س is pronounced with Fath (IY): and [similarly (Jrb)]

قَالَتْ آَخُرُی She said "Raid thou [fem.]" (SH), because the original vowel of the ز is ِdamma, since the س is affixed to ُآَخُرُی with ِdamm of the ز (R): contrary to such as ِآَمَرْوُا IV. 175. [16, 591] (SH), because the ِdamm of the ز (R, Jrb) is not original (Jrb), [but] is an alliteration to the accidental ِdamm of inflection, while an alliteration to an accidental [vowel] is accidental (R); and to ِآَرْمُوا She said "Shoot ye" (SH), because the original vowel of the م is kasr, since the ز is affixed to ِآَرْمُوا with kasr of the م (R); and ِآَلْحَكْمَ VI. 57. Judgment belongeth not [666] (SH), because the ِdamm of the ح, though original, is not in the same word as the second quiescent, since the art. is one word [599], and ِحُكْمَ 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 ِحُكْمَ XV. 45, 46. [above], and XXXVIII. 40, 41. [609] (IY): (c) Mb does not approve of ِdamm (IY, R) of the first
quiescent (R) here (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) مَرْيَمُ الَّذِي L. 24, 25. Suspicious [of God and His religion (K, B)], who is read with Fath of the ن, for an escape from the succession of Kasras (M), upon the principle [666] of IV. 97. [89]; but the reading of the majority is مَرْيَمُ الَّذِي with the Tanwin [of مَرْيَمُ ] 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 تَلَّى أَضْرَبْ Say thou "Strike"; and تَلَّى الَّذِي 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 Fath by some, as إِضْعَ الْخَيْر Do thou good (R) : (4) the preference for 106a
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 

XXXI. 31. They call on God, being sincere (Jrb), contrary to IX. 42. [below] (SH): (α) [the of the pron. in] [above] is pronounced with Damm to distinguish it from the, in such [words] as (a) and [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 or ,] (Jrb),] pronounced with Damm has been elided [here] before the, [of the pron.] (IY, Jrb), the o. f. being (a) [and ] (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
in the concurrence of two quiescents, since there is then no elided vowel, wherewith it might be mobilized (ΙΥ): (b) [610, 663], in order that the vowel of the letter preceding the ِ may be similar in all conjugs., as اِحْضُرَنَّ (α) (610) and اِحْضُرَنَّ, أُحْضِرَنَّ, [810] أَضْرَبُنَّ: it may be said that they intend to distinguish the ِ of the pl. from any other [ـ], as in IX. 42. [below]; while the ِ of the pl. is more worthy of ḏamm, in order that the letter preceding the corrob. ِ may be made to keep one vowel in all conjugs., as just mentioned (R): (b) similarly in the ِ of the pl., [when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath.], in the ِ. [161] (R); [for] they treat the ِ of the pl., [when so preceded,] like the ِ of the pron., because each of them indicates the pl. masc., and has a letter pronounced with ḏamm, vid. the ِ of the word, elided before it (Jrb), as مَصُفَّفُ أَلْلَّهِ the elect of God (R, Jrb), [which is so pronounced] in order that it may correspond with such as ضَاِرْبُو أَلْقَوْمَ the strikers of the people (R): (α) in other cases, the ِ [preceded by a Fatha] is pronounced with Kasr (Jrb); [so that] Kasr is preferred in the ِ of لَوُلَثَ anāつَلْغَتْ (R), as لَوُلَثَ أَطْلَغَتَ XVIII. 42. If we had been able (R, Jrb), [and أَوْ آَنْفَصُ LXIII. 3. above] (Jrb), according to the o. f., because there is no such inducement to ḏamm as there is in
the of the pl.: (b) the of the pl. is sometimes assimilated to the of such as لَرَ and ؛، and is therefore pronounced with Kasr; and similarly the of such as لَرَ [and ؛،] is sometimes assimilated to the of the pl., and is therefore pronounced with Ḍamm (R): [thus] لا تنَسْوا الْقَضَلِ II. 238. [above] is read with Kasr of the [of the pl.] (K): while لُرَ أَسْتَطَعْنا IX. 42. [above] is read with Ḍamm of the [of لُرَ], by assimilating it to the (K, B) of the pron. (B) of the pl. [masc.] in فَتْسَأْلَ الْمُوَّتَ II. 88. Then wish for death (K), [and] in II. 15. [403] (B); and [similarly] لُرَ أَطْلَعْتَ XVIII. 17. [and لُرَ أَنْفُصُ LXXIII. 3. above] [K, B]: but both of these [variations] are rare (R): (c) as for the ی 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. إِخْشَى أَلْرَجِلَ 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 ی homogeneous with the، which is treated here as the، is treated there; while, if you treat it like [the in] لا تنَسْوا الْقَضَلِ II. 238. [above], you [still] pronounce with Kasr: so that in every case it is pronounced with Kasr: (d) the ی in مِنْ مُضْطَفَيْنِ is [treated] like that in إِخْشَى، as
from the elect of God (S): (c) in حُبِّ [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 ٍ Restore thou and

He did not restore, contrary to such as ٍ 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 ٍ [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 [ٍ], and then a [second] concurrence thereof in two words [ٍ] 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 دُمْ ٱلْمُتَنَزَّرَٰلّ آحَرَ [171] (M, Jrb), also related دُمْ with Kasr (Jrb); and as نَفَقَ أَلْطَرَفَ آحَرُ [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 e (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 ع (MASH): (c) when the Banū Tamīm, and those who imitate them, incorporate, as we have mentioned [663], in such imps. and apocs. as these, they adopt [three] several methods [of mobilizing the second quiescent]:—(a) some pronounce it with Fath, as in لَمْ يَبْلُدَهُ إِنْفَطَلَقٌ [663], from regard to its being a v., in which it is more proper to avoid a permanent Kasra; whereas in أَرْدُدَ أَلْقَوْمَ [above] the matter of the Kasra is softened by its being accidental: so that they say مُدْ draw, عَصَّ bite, and عَرَ be mighty; and, according to them, the Fath of عَصَّ is not for alliteration, otherwise they would say مُدْ with Damm, and عَرَ with Kasr: (b) some flee from Kasr to alliteration, as in مُنَدْ [203, 663]; so that they say مُدْ عَصَّ, مُدْ عَرَ, and مُدْ عَصَّ; and, according to them, the Kasr in عَرَ is not because the second quiescent is [properly] mobilized with Kasr, otherwise عَصَّ and مُدْ also would be pronounced with Kasr: (c) some, vid. Ka‘b and Ghanī, keep all [three] pronounced with Kasr, which is the o. f. in annulling [a concurrence of] two quiescents; and, according to them, the Kasr in عَرَ is not for alliteration, otherwise alliteration would take place in مُدْ and عَصَّ also: (d) the
Arabs, Ḥijāzīs and others, unite in adopting incorporation, together with Fath, in "آَلْعَمَ" [189], because, "لَمْ يَكُن" being compounded with "ما", they lighten it by the necessity for incorporation, and the necessity for Fath: (e) if this apoc. or imp. be contiguous to a quiescent after it, as "رَأَيْتَ أَبْنَكَ Restore thy son and ]َنَمَّا فَرَّ عِلَمَ 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 عِلَمَ 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

" 나는ُقَّضٌ الطَّرِفَ إِذْنَكَ مِنْ نُمْأَرِ فَلا كَبِيْبًا بُلْغَتْ وَلَا كَلَّابًا [above] (R), by Jarir (IY, Jsh) Ibn 'Atiya atTamimi, addressing 'Ubaid Ibn Ḥuşain an Numair, the poet cognominated Ar Rā‘î, Then lower the eye: verily thou art of Numair; so that neither Ka‘b hast thou reached, nor Kilūb (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 غَفَّصُ, 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 Ḍamm [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 رَدَّهَا Restore thou her (SH), for affinity to the | (Jrb): (a) the Arabs are all agreed upon the necessity for Fath when a s followed by an l is attached to this imp. or apoc., as رَدَّهَا [above], عَضْبَها Bite her, and إِسْتَعِدَهَا Make her ready (R), because the s is faint (R, Jrb); so that the l, as it were, follows immediately after the [letter] incorporated into; while the l is not preceded by any [vowel] but Fatha (R): (b) Damm in such as ُرَدِّهُ Restore thou him, [for affinity to the ، (Jrb),] according to the chastest [usage]; while Kasr [in سَرَ (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 ُهُأَ [below] (MASH): (a) when the s denoting the sing. masc. is pronounced with Damm, all of them pronounce [the letter incorporated into] with Damm, as رَدَّهُ [above], عَضْبَهُ Bite him, and إِسْتَعِدَهُ Make him ready, because the ، [161], as it were, follows immediately after the [letter] incorporated into, since the s is faint, as though you said رُدُّهُ، عَضْبُهُ، رَدُّهُ، إِسْتَعِدُهُ، إِسْتَعِدَهُ، while the Damm in رَدُّهُ is not for alliteration to that [vowel] which precedes it, otherwise عَضْبَهُ and إِسْتَعِدَهُ 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 and غِلَامُهِ [161], so that the $ is converted into ء; 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 Fāṣḥ, 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 $[above], عَصَمْ$،، and إِسْتَعِيدَة $: 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 طَوْلُ $ saying and superiority (R): (c) Fath in the ن of من أَلْرَجِلِ [of determination (Jrb)], as من أَلْرَجِلِ from the man, Kasr being weak; contrary to من أَبْنَكِ 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 دابَة beast and شابَة 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 'Amr came to me and جَآَإ قَآَرُو I passed by 'Amr, in which case the first is mobilized with the vowel of the second, [as مَعَرُو,] 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 s of the masc. [648], as in ضَرْبَتْهَا كَيْدَة strike him, مَنَة, and ضَرْبَتْهَا كَيْدَة, the vowel of the s may be transferred to the preceding quiescent, as ضَرْبَتْهَا [641], مَنَة, and ضَرْبَتْهَا كَيْدَة; but some of the Banù Tamîm, vid. the Banù 'Adî, elide the vowel of the s, and mobilize the first [quiescent] with Kasr, as ضَرَبَتْهَا [641] and آْحَدَتْهَا She took him, as you say ضَرَبَتْ آْمَرَة The woman struck: (2) when the second quiescent is incorporated, and the first is an l [below], as in I. 7. [663], in which case the l is converted into a Hamza [683] pronounced with Fath, as in the
anomalous reading \( \text{I. 7. [539, 656]} \) transmitted from Ayyub es Sikhtiyani; and in \[641, 656]\) and transmitted from him by AZ, who cites

\[\text{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., } \text{\( \text{زامَهَا أَن تَدْهِبُ} \) } \text{\( \text{فَدْهِي} \) } \text{\( \text{فَقَالَ} \) } \text{\( \text{سَمْعَة} \) } \text{\( \text{مَرْحَبَة} \)} \text{[677] (R)}}

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 \( \text{ٰ} \) is made into a Hamza pronounced with Fath, since the metre of the verse would not be correct with \( \text{ٰ} \), by reason of the combination of the two quiescents; and in the reading of [HB and (K)] ‘Amr Ibn ‘Ubaid \text{\( \\text{فَيُؤْمِنُونَ} \\text{لا يَسَأَلُ} \\text{عَن} \\text{ذِنْبِهِ} \\text{إِنَّ} \\text{وَلَا} \\text{جَان} \\text{سُرْوَة} \text{[683]}; and that, since they convert it
into a quiescent Hamza, which cannot be followed by a quiescent, as the $l$ 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 $l$, because both are from the throat:

(d) if the $l$ have an o. f. mobile with any vowel, the Hamza is mobilized with that vowel, as in the saying [of the Rājiz (Jh)]

(R) O abode of Mayya (a woman's name) in the low-lying sands, sands mixed with stones and earth, (give me) patience, صبرًا being governed in the acc. by a v. understood, i. e. َأَعْطِينِى صبِرًا , while Jh has the version َسْقَبْيَا 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 $l$ [above], one escapes from the concurrence of two quiescents by converting it into a mobile Hamza; but not when it is a $w$, as in تَوْنَى [663] and تَأْمُرُونَى XXXIX. 64. Do ye bid me?, [with incorporation of the $n$ (K)]; or a $i$, as in حَمْيَتُّى [274] and حَمْيَتُّى [663]: because of the frequency of the [concurrence of] two
quiescents when the first of them is an ٰٰ, not when it is a َٰ (R): (f) they do not alter the ﷺ in XXXIX. 64. [above], because, [says Jrb.] the Hamza is remote from it; and because, [if ﷺ ﷻ were said,] the Damm upon the Hamza, together with what precedes it, would be heavy (Jrb): (g) ﷻ ﷺ is read in XXXIX. 64. [by Ibn 'Āmir, with the two ﷺ s displayed (B)], according to the o. f.; and ﷻ [by Nāfi' (B)], with elision of the [second (B)] ﷺ (K, B), which is often elided [170, 405] (B).

§. 666. The ﷺ of ﻠ, (1) when the ﷺ of determination [599] is conjoined with it, is most commonly pronounced with Fath, because the ﷺ of determination frequently occurs after ﻠ, and the succession of two Kasras is deemed heavy when frequent: (a) that [Fath] is not because the vowel of the [conj.] Hamza [in ﷺ ] is transferred [to the ﷺ ], otherwise ﷺ ﷺ [663] would be allowable: (b) Ks says that they pronounce [the ﷺ ] with Fath in such as ﻠ ﻠ[664] because ﻠ is orig. ﻠ, but he produces no argument in [support of] it; and this is as he says that ﻠ is orig. [2] when a quiescent other than the ﷺ of determination follows immediately after it, is commonly pronounced with Kasr, according to the o. f., as ﻠ [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 $\mu$ (R)] with Fath (S, R) with [a quiescent] other than the $\mathfrak{j}$ of determination (MAR), to escape from the [succession of] two Kasras (R); so that they say من آبَنَیْبَن from the Muslims (S). And [they assert that (S)] some of the Arabs [also (R) say من آلِ الله from God; so that they (S)] pronounce it with Kasr, [which is not common, with the $\mathfrak{j}$ 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] آیَن [206, 321, 663] and $\mathfrak{سّ}$ [207, 321, 663], in order to escape from the combination of two likes, i. e., the $\mathfrak{s}$ and Kasra, [which would ensue] if they pronounced with Kasr, according to the o.f.; and because Damma after the $\mathfrak{s}$, if they pronounced with Damm, would be heavy. But حَیِّبٌ 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 $\mathfrak{سّ}$ and $\mathfrak{سّ}$]; (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 عَن 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 مَن [above] (R). And عَن آلِ آرَجُلٍ from the man, [quoted by Akh (R)] with دَامِم, is weak (SH); and, says he, is bad (R). He likens it to their saying قُلُ اَنْظُرِوا X. 101. [664] (IY, R) and اَوْ اَنْقْصُ LXXIII. 3. [664, 668] (IY), meaning that the نِ is mobilized with دَامِم for alliteration to the دَامَمَم of the ج, the incorporated ر not being taken into account, [so that عَن آلِ آرَجُلٍ is reducible to عَن آلِ آرَجُلٍ ]: but this [explanation] is weak, because دَامِم is not allowable in VI. 57. [664], notwithstanding the دَامَمَم 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] دَامِم, as in عَن آلْحَكْمِ from the judgment; or by a letter [interposed] between them, as in عَن آلْعَضَلٍ from the upper
arm (R). But ṣanā‘a’l-rūjūlī 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).
§. 667. It is common to the three kinds [625] (M), the ẞ., the кции, and the $p.$, because each of them may be inceptive [658], as ғذمُرْ زَيْدُ كَأَمَّهُ [24], ژَيْدُ كَأَمَّهُ [20], and ژَيْدُ كَأَمَّهُ [517] (IY). One begins only with a mobile, as one pauses only upon a quiescent (SH). The inceptive letter is only mobile (IY, Jrb), because the articulate [quiescent] letter is supported either, like the of 'Amr, upon a neighbouring vowel; or, like the of دَابِئ of خَوْدَةُ [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 'شَتَر' camel and 'سَتَام' saddle-ornaments. Apparently, however, it is impossible; and beginning with a mobile is unavoidable: but, since that mobile in such as 'شَتَر' and 'سَتَام' 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" (ι').

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 (ΙΥ). 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 (ΙΥ, Jrb) non-inf. (M)] ns., [limited in number (ΙΥ),] i. e., "son, ابْنُ daughter, ابْنُ [i. q. ابْنِ (Jrb)]", اثْنَانِ two [masc.], اثْنَانِ two
[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)] ts [in the pret. (Jrb)] are followed by four or more (M, Jrb) letters [668], as (a) [332, 482] (M), like [668] (IY); like had power [483, 668, 671]; and, like these three being of one measure and one paradigm (IY): (b) [332, 482] (M), like [332, 432, 493, 668]; like [432, 496]; like [432, 496]; like [482, 494]; and, like [494]; these five also being of one paradigm, [to which belong three more formations, whose inf. ns. are mentioned below, vid. (a) [482] (M), like [482, 495, 496, 668]: (c) [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) [332], [إِفْعَالُ, إِفْتَعَالُ (Jrb, Tsr, MASH)], [إِفْعَالُ (M, Jrb, Tsr, MASH), (Tsr, MASH), (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), (IY), (Tsr, MASH), (Jrb, Tsr),] and [إِفْعَالُ (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), as (IY),] [إِفْعَالُ (IY, Tsr), (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), (IY, Jrb),] [إِفْعَالُ (IY, Jrb, Tsr), (Jrb, Tsr), (Tsr), (IY), (IY, Tsr)] [إِفْعَالُ, إِفْعَالُ (IY), (Jrb),] [إِفْعَالُ, إِفْعَالُ (IY), (Tsr), (Jrb),] (γ) hence [إِفْعَالُ [757], *inf. n.* [332], [إِفْعَالُ (M, Jrb), as (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 *إِطَابٍَر,*] whether such *vs.* be in the *pret.*, as *إِنْطَلَقَ (departed)* [above]; or *imp.*, as *إِنْطَلَقَ (depart [668] (Jrb): (b) the paradigms of the *imp.* [of the 2nd pers. (M)] in the [unaugmented (M)] *tril.* (M, Jrb), as *إِضْرَبَ (strike) and *إِذْهَبَ (go)* [428,
668] (M), when neither the ف nor the خ of its aor. is unsound; for, if either of them be unsound, the conj. Hamza is not needed, as َعِ promise and َفَ 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 ج., except a few irregular ns. vid. the ten [668] mentioned [above]; nor in the ت., 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 َعِ morrow [153, 275], َيِ [231, 260, 275, 306], and ْجَرَ vulva [275, 306]. Since, then, these [ten] ns. are afflicted with transformation, which ought to be in the ت., 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 [306]. The finals of [16, 306],
[16, 306], and [650], are not [actually] elided,
the m in being a subst. [687] for the J', i.e., the m,
[which is therefore like the expressed]. But, since the
vowel of the w and the r, in and 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 of is, [however, sometimes said to be (R)] aug., [for corroboration and intensiveness (Jrb, Tsr),] as in (R, Jrb, Tsr) and [below], the J being [actually] elided.

And, as for [650], since the w is often elided,
as [651], and the oath is the position of abbreviation, the expressed w becomes like the non-existent,
[so that it too is virtually elided] (R). The o. f. of [275, 277] is [or (KF)] (IY, R, Jrb, A, Fk),
[since] the measure of is [orig.] with two
Fathas (Tsr), like pen (A), with Fath of the and
(IY, R, Fk), because its [broken (Jrb, Fk)] pl. is
[307] (IY, R, Jrb, Fk), upon the measure of (Fk),
as V. 21. We are the sons of God and
I being regular in \( \text{فَعَل} \) (R, Jrb) with Fatha of the \( \text{ع} \), like \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{أَجْمَال} \) [237]; and [not] in quiescent in the \( \text{ع} \), [except] when \( \text{فَعَل} \) is hollow [237], like \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{أَبَنَا} \) and \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{أَبْيَات} \) [242]; while may not be like \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{أَجْدَاع} \) pl. of \( \text{فَعَل} \) [237], nor like \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{أَجْدَاع} \) pl. of \( \text{جَذَع} \) trunk, because \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{بَنُون} \) indicates Fatha of [the in] its sing. [307] (R), for which reason they say in the rel. n. \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{بَنْوَى} \) [306], with Fatha of its \( \text{ف} \) (IY). The proof of the Fatha of the \( \text{ن} \) is its pl. \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{بَنُون} \) and its rel. n. \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{بَنْوَى} \), with Fatha thereof (A) in the pl. and the rel. n.

"But," says the author of the Msb, "its o. f. is said [by some] to be \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{بَنُو} \), with Kasr of the \( \text{ب} \), like \( \text{جُمَل} \) load, as is proved by \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{بَنت} \) 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 \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{بَنت} \) (Sn).

And the proof of the mobilization of the \( \text{ع} \) is its pl. \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{أَنْعَام} \) [above], \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{فَعَال} \) being pl. of \( \text{فَعَل} \) with mobilization of the \( \text{ع} \); while the proof of the vowel's being Fatha is that \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{أَنْعَام} \) is more frequent in [the pl. of] the [\( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{فَعَال} \)] pronounced with Fatha of the \( \text{ع} \) than in [the pl. of] the [\( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{فَعَال} \)] pronounced with Damm of the \( \text{ع} \), like \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{عَضْد} \) pl. of \( \text{عَضْد} \) upper arm, or with Kasr of it, like \( 
olinebreak[4]
\text{كَبَان} \) pl. of \( \text{كِبَان} \) liver [237] (A). Its \( \text{ل} \) [below] is elided (Jrb, Tsr,
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)] ی is [said to be (Tsr)] (1) ی (IY, R, A, Tsr), which is correct (Tsr), not a ی [below] (A), (a) because the ی of those ین, in which the ی is elided, [and the Hamza made a compensation for it (Tsr)], is a ی (A, Tsr), in most cases (A), [i. e.] in the case of all but [یبَّنَّی، یبَّنَّی، اییبَّنَّی، اییبَّنَّی] [below] (Tsr), not a ی (A); (b) because they say in the fem. یبَّنَّی [above] (IY, R, A), substituting the ی for its ی (IY, A), and substitution of the ی for the ی is more frequent than for the ی [689] (IY, R, A); (c) because of [their saying (A)] یبَّنَّی sonship [below] (R, A), while یبَّنَّی youthfulness [243] from یبَّنَّی a youth is irregular (R): (2) ی (A, Tsr), as ISh reports to be held by some, who derive یبَّنَّی from یبَّنَّی پَیْمَرَةَ (A), because the son is the effect of the father's going in to the mother (Sn); [or] from یبَّنَّی 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 یبَّنَّی [above], because of یبَّنَّی, which is from the ی (IY, A), since they say یبَّنَّی in the du. [229, 326], and یبَّنَّی and
in the pl. [243, 246, 257] (IY). And Zj allows both the modes [of representing the J] (A). The o. f. of [below] is ُمَّعَجَّةٍ [234] (R, Jrb, Fk, Sn), like ُمَّعَجَّةٍ tree (Jrb, Fk), because it is fem. of ُبْنَٰءٍ (R, Jrb, Fk); and its predicament is [like] that of ُبْنَٰءٍ (Jrb). As for ُبْنَٰءٍ [above], it is ُإِنْ مَّعَجَّةٍ augmented by the م [668] for intensiveness (IY, A, Fk) and corroboration (IY), as in ُزَعْرَمْ intensely blue (IY, A) and ُسَقْهُمَّ big in the rump [671, 676] (IY). It has been heard (Fk), as

وَعَلِّيَ لَوْنَ أَمْ غَيِّرُهَا إِنَّ دَكْرُهَا ﻦَ أَّبَيَّ اللَّهُ إِلَّا أَنَّ أَكُونَ لِيَّا أَبْنِيَ (IY, A, YS), by AlMutalamms, 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 ﻦَم [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 [prefixied as] a compensation [for the J] (Fk). The o. f. of [16, 313, 314] is ُتْنَبِّيٰنَ (IY, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), with Fath.
of the \( \text{ف} \) and \( \text{ع} \) (A), like \( \text{ذَتِبَانِ} \) [above] (R), (1) because it is from \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) [313] IY, A, Fk), an explanation of the reason for the \( \text{ل} \)'s being a \( \text{ى} \) (Sn): (2) because they say in its rel. n. \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) [295] (R, Jrb, A, Tsr), with two Fathas (Jrb, Tsr, Sn), an explanation of the reason for the Fath of the \( \text{ف} \) and \( \text{ع} \) (Sn); whereas, if the \( \text{ث} \) were pronounced with Damm or Kasr, that would appear in the rel. n.; and, if the \( \text{ع} \) were quiescent, they would say \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) with quiescence, like \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) [302] (Jrb): but this is open to the objection that their saying \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) does not prevent quiescence of the \( \text{ع} \) in the o. f., because, in the rel. n. of \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) [below], you say \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) [306], with Fath of the \( \text{ف} \) and \( \text{ع} \), according to the correct [opinion as to Fath of the \( \text{ع} \), when orig. quiescent, in such ns.] (Sn). The \( \text{ل} \) is elided, the \( \text{ف} \) made quiescent, and the [conj. (Tsr, Fk)] Hamza put (Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk). And the o. f. of \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) [below] is \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) (Jrb, Tsr, Fk, Sn), like \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) (Jrb, Tsr, Fk). The o. f. of \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) [and \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) (below) (Fk, Sn)] is \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) (A, Fk) and \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) (Fk, Sn), which are another dial. var. (Fk). \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) is a complete n., nothing being elided from it, except that, since its Hamza [in the o. f. \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \)] may be elided by transfer of its vowel to the quiescent [\( \text{ز} \)] before it with the art. [below], as \( \text{ذَتِبَتٌ} \) the man, they transform it
because of that, and from frequency of usage. And 

ٍ is made quiescent, and then the conj. Hamza is added to them, although they are of three letters, because their J is a Hamza, and they are subject to abbreviation, as ٍ and ٍ [658]; so that they are treated like ٍ and ٍ [above] (Fk). For ٍ is abbreviated by transfer of the vowel of the Hamza to the ر; then the Hamza is elided, and the conj. Hamza put as a compensation therefor, [the م 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 J, by transfer of its vowel to the quiescent before it with the art., as in the Tsr (above), and then by elision of it (Sn),] is always permissible, so that the expected [alleviation (Sn)] is treated like the occurring. As for the fems. of ٍ [above], ٍ, ٍ, [i.e., ٍ, ٍ, and ٍ (Sn),] the discourse on them is like the discourse on their mascs. [668]: and the ٍ in ٍ and ٍ is for femininization [263], like the ٍ of ٍ [264]; contrary to the ٍ in ٍ and ٍ [277, 295, 307], which is a subst. for the J of the word [689] (A). The o. f. of ٍ ٍ [275, 277, 306] is, (1) [according to the BB (Jrb, Tsr, Fk),]
(IY, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), upon the measure of قُلُبٍ, with Kasr of the ف (IY), as S says (IY, A), like قُلُبٍ, [as is said (A),] like قُلُبٍ (R, A), as is proved by their also saying قُلُبٍ without a conj. Hamza, whence

By the Name of Him whose Name is in every chapter of the Kur'an, they (the camels) have arrived upon a path that they know, He [the herdsman (MAR)] has turned loose among them a nine-year-old he-camel, that he reserves for covering; and he (the nine-year-old) will follow with them a path that he knows, because he is accustomed to that work (N, MAR), i. e., covering (N), related by AZ, says AHS in the commentary on the M, with Kasr and Damm of the س (MAR), meaning أُسْمَى (AZ): [and by other evidence also] because its [broken (Fk)] pl. is أَسْمَاء (Fk, Sn), أَسْمَاء being a pl. for these two measures, like جَذَعٌ, pl. أَجْذَاعٌ, and قُفْلٌ, pl. أَقْفَلٌ [above] (Jh); and its dim. is سَبَيْ [277] (Fk, Sn); and its v. is سَمَتْ I named [below]; orig. سُمِّيَ, أُسْمَى, and سَمَتْ, 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 أَوْسَمُ, [as the KK say (Sn),] its pl. would be أَوْسَمُ, and its dim. أَوْسَمُ, [and its v. أَوْسَمُ (Sn),] the assertion of inversion [below] being improbable (YS, Sn): (a) A's phrasology necessarily implies that its o. f. is not said by anybody to be أَوْسَمُ with Fath of the ی, the reason being that أَوْسَمُ with Fath does not form the pl. أَوْسَمُ [237] (Sn): (b) it is derived from سَا النَا was elevated, because it elevates, and gives notoriety to, its named, which, but for the name, would be obscure (R): (c) its measure is أَقْفُ (Jh, IY), the [letter] gone from it being the ی (Jh): (d) its ی (A, Tsr, Fk), the ی (IY, Jrb), is elided (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), for lightness (IY, A), as in أَنَبِيَة [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 م is transferred to the س (Jrb, A, Fk), because of the alternation of those vowels upon it (Jrb, Fk): and [then (Fk)] the [conj. (Jrb)] Hamza is put (Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk) at its beginning (Fk), as a means of accomplishing [the articulation of the quiescent]; and (A) as a compensation (A, Tsr) for the [elided (Sn)] ی (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. ﷲ سَمْر ِي إِسْمِي or ﷲ سَمْر ِي إِسْمِي [306] (A), with Kasr or دامم of 
the س, and, in either case, with فامى, though some 
allow quiescence, of the م (Sn) : (e) others than س transmit ﷲ اسم 668] with دامم of the conj. Hamza (R) : (2) 
according to the KK, ﷲ اسم (R, Jrb, A, Tsr, YS), with 
فامى of the م (YS), meaning ﷲ عَلَامَة mark (Jrb), because 
the name is [like (R)] a mark upon the named (R, 
Jrb, A) : (a) its ﷲ is elided (R, Tsr); and the ﷲ remains 
quiescent, so that the conj. Hamza is put (R) : [or] it is 
inverted, its ﷲ 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 ﷲ, 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 ﷲ أَسْمَآء and ﷲ أَسْمَآء [above], and 
others, like ﷲ نَامِسَة namesake on the measure of ﷲ حَليْفَ ﷲ نَامِسَة 
confederate, and ﷲ تُسْمَيْت I was named and ﷲ تُسْمَيْت [above], refute that; unless they say that the n. is 
inverted by putting the ﷲ into the position of the ج, 
when they intend to lighten the n. by elision, since the 
[usual] position of elision is the ج; and that then the م 
is elided as forgotten; but is restored in its variations,
vid. the dim., broken pl., etc., in the position of the ١, since it was elided in that place (R): (c) the preferable opinion is the first (Jrb). As for ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١, it is orig. ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١(ΙΥ, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), upon the measure of ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١ (ΙΥ), with Fath of its first and second (Tsr, Fk), like ١١١١١١١١١١١١١ (Jrb, Tsr); and is curtailed of the ١, i.e., the ١(ΙΥ), as is proved by (1) [its pl. (ΙΥ, Jrb, Fk)] ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١[260] (ΙΥ, R, Jrb, A, Fk), which may not be like ١١١١١١١١١١١ which may not be like ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١[above], because of the rel. n. ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١[306](R); (2) [its dim. (ΙΥ, Fk)] ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١[275, 277] (ΙΥ, A, Fk); (3) their saying ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١(Ζαιδ is bigger in the rump than ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١
according to the KK, because, according to them, it is
plural of  بَيِبَتُ oath; whereas, according to S [and the other
BB (Sn)], it is a sing. n. from بَيَسُ, i.e., تَرَكْتَ blessing
(A). The BB hold that [the pre. n. in
[650] is a sing., upon the measure of أَنْعُل [372], upon
which the sing. does sometimes occur, like أَرجُ [256, 628] and أَنُك [255, 256], as in the tradition مَيْ آَسْتَبَع
إِلَى قَبْيَةٍ صَبَّتِ فِي أَذْنِيَّ الَّذِينَ Whoso listeneth to a
singing female slave, into his two ears shall lead be
poured (Jrb). And, since its ن is elided, as أَيْمُ $	ext{اللّه}$
[651], they put the Hamza at its beginning as a com-
pensation 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

أَوْ قَلِّمْ أَوْ مُنْ بِالْتَّنَلْيَتِ قَدْ شَكَّلَ

The Hamza of (1, 2) and (3, 4) [with Damm
of the م (YS, Sn) in both (Sn)] then pronounce thou
with Fath and Kasr; or say (5) مِإْمْ [with Kasr of the
Hamza, and Damm of the م (Sn)]; or say (6-8) مِإْمْ or
(9-11) [with Damm of the ن, and (Sn)] with triple vocalization [of the م (Sn), referring to [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 آین be pronounced with Fath, the م must be pronounced with Damm [below]; but, if the Hamza [of آین] 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) آیَن with Fath of the Hamza and م, instead of آیَن 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 آیَن pronounced with Fath of the Hamza. From that aggregate, fourteen dial. vars. result (Sn). It is mentioned in the FB that they are twenty-two: and that is imported by the language of the KF, the text of
which is "And [the pre. n. in] (1-4) Spacer, and Spacer, the initial in both of which is also pronounced with Kasr; and (5, 6)  Spacer with Fath of the  and Hamza, [the latter of] which is also pronounced with Kasr; and (7)  Spacer with Kasr of the Hamza and  [the l (in all) of which is said to be a conj. l (KF):] and  Spacer with Fath of the  and Damm of the  and (9-11)  Spacer with triple vocalization of the  and (12, 13)  Spacer with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm or Fath of the  and (14)  Spacer with Damm of the  and Kasr of the  and (15-17)  Spacer with triple vocalization of the  and  and (18-20)  Spacer with triple vocalization; and (21, 22)  Spacer and  Spacer; and (2) an imaginary elision, vid. in  and
an elision occurring at times, vid. in \( \text{إِمْرَّة} \) (Tsr). The Hamza in the *du.* also of such of these *ns.* as are dualized, vid. \( \text{إِمْرَّة} \), \( \text{إِبْنَة} \), \( 
abla \text{إِبْنَاتِي} \), \( 
abla \text{إِبْنَاتِي} \), \( 
abla \text{إِسْمَانِي} \), \( 
abla \text{إِسْمَانِي} \), and is a *conj.* Hamza (Jrb). The Hamza of \( 
abla \text{جُل} \) is similar [668] (IM), i. e., is a *conj.* Hamza, whether \( 
abla \text{جُل} \) be determinative [599], conjunct [176], or *red.* [599]. The determination is by the \( 
abla \text{ج} \) alone, the Hamza being *aug.* [672], because, if the Hamza were intended, it would not be elided in continuous speech [669], as the Hamza of \( 
abla \text{أَن} \) [541] and \( 
abla \text{أَن} \) [571] is not elided: and because the *Tanwin* [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 \( 
abla \text{جُل} \) 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 \( 
abla \text{ذُسُر} \) [575] in the case of *ns.* ; 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 \( 
abla \text{جُل} \) 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. Hamz as (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 ی فرَأ حَمَدَ. Ahmad took fright, where the Hamza of ی فرَأ حَمَدَ forms a barrier between the ی and the ح, disjoining one of them from the other. And for this reason it is named حمزة قطع Hamza of disjunction, [commonly rendered as if it were حمزة بطنية disj. Hamza, which also occurs]. But the conj. Hamza is dropped [below] in the interior [of the sentence], so that it conjoins what precedes with what follows it, as یكتبُ أَسْمُكَ I have written thy name, where the Hamza of یكتبُ أَسْمُكَ is dropped, so that the ی is conjoined with the اسم. And for this reason it is named حمزة ِ وصلية 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
This is the correct [opinion]; but it is said that possibly its o. f. may be the !, since it is expressed as an ! in such as  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 !; 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 [669] (MKh). Expression of it in the interior [of the sentence] is disallowed, except for poetic licence, as in [669] (A) Now I shall not believe any two to be better in temper against the mishaps of fortune than me and than Juml, the name of a woman [18] (MN). It is [therefore defined by IHsh and Fk as] a prosthetic Hamza [at the beginning of the single word (Tsr)].
found in the beginning, lost in the interior, [of the sentence] (Aud, Fk). The cause of its being named 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 سُلْمُ آلتِسْالِ 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 رَمَضَ [to رَمَضْ] 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, رَمَضَ being the inf. n. of the trans. رَمَضَ conjoined, if one said “so that the speaker conjoins what precedes with what follows it”, this would agree with the name رَمَضَ (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 [657], because it would necessitate importation of the conj. Hamza (YS): nor (2) in any p. other than [the determinative (Fk, Sn) or red. (Sn)] J̣ī (Aud, A, Fk), according to [the opinion of] S [667] (Tsr): (a) like the J of determination are (a) its m in the dial. of Tayyi and Himyar [599, 667, 687]; and (b) the conjunct [176] and red. [599] J̣ (Fk): (b) as for the conjunct [J̣ī], 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 J̣ī] is rad., being made conj. from frequency of usage (Fk): nor (3) in any pret., [either] tril., [like commanded and took (Aud)]; or [numerically (Tsr)] quad. [483, 488] (Aud, A, Fk), like Āmr. Āhḳāl
honored and أَعْطَى 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 إِنْطَلَقَ [667] (Aud) and إِقتَداَر (Tsr): or the sex., [which is of two sorts, the tril. containing three augs. (Tsr)], like إِسْتَخْرَجَ [667] (Aud); and the quad. containing two augs., like [667] (Tsr): and (b) in their imp. (Aud), quin. and sex., like إِحْرَنْجَمَ, إِسْتَخْرَجَ (Tsr): and (c) [in (Tsr)] the imp. of the tril., [the second of whose aor. is literally quiescent (Tsr)], like إِضْرَبَ [428, 667] (Aud); contrary to such as قَلَّ هَبِب, and [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 إِنْطَلَقَ إِسْتَخْرَجَ [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. إِنْطَلَقَ إِسْتَخْرَجَ إِنْنَاتٌ إِنْمَأْيَّةَ إِمْرَةَ إِمْرُوُ، إِبْنَةٌ إِبْنُ (Tsr), and the
peculiar to the oath (Aud); while they ought to add [the conjunct ġ and (Aud)] a diaL. var. of āin ʿim (Aud, A), so that the non-inf. ns. are twelve [above] (A), vid. the ten ns., ʾesm, etc. [above], the conjunct ġ included in IM's saying "The Hamza of ġ is similar" [667], and ʿim (Sn): (a) if they say [of ʿim (Tsr)] that it is āin ʿim with the ġ elided [651], we say "And ābin is ʾeim with the m 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 m, alliteration of the n to the m in the vowels [of inflection], according to the ops., accrues to ābin [16], which therefore becomes so like an original word that the KK even say that it is infL. in two places; contrary to ʿim, which does not undergo this process: and moreover there is no special appropriateness in the mention of ābin for [the purpose of] comparison, since the fems. of these ns. are their mascs. [667] with the ʾ 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 m accrues to ābin also by reason of the defectiveness; so that, in both ābin and ʿim, the place of the inflection is altered; but in the first becausE of
the addition, and in the second because of the defective-ness; and their difference, in this respect, is immaterial:  

(d) *أَمْلَى* not *أَمْلِى* [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 *dialect. var*. of the word, he ought to say "And *أُمْلِى*, a *dialect. var.* of *أُمْلَى*, according to Tayyi," who change the determinative *ل* into a *م* [above], saying *لرَجُلُ* for *الرَّجُل* *(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 *أُمْلِى* [176] because of the dispute as to its being a *n.* [345], and because of its resemblance to the determinative *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 ُبُدْلَتُ became hidden, when the *تُبُدُّل* of ُبُدْلَتُ is intended to be incorporated into what follows it, its vowel being transferred to the *ف* [756]; so that ُبُدَّلَتُ [with Fath of the *س*, and doubling of the *ت* (Sn)] is said, [the difference between this and the *hid* from ُتُسْبِيرَ being apparent in the *aor.* and *inf. n.*, because you pronounce the aoristic letter from
this with Fath, and from the second with Damm; while you say سَّلَار, with Kasr of the س, in the inf. n. of this, and ُكُسْتَمْبَر in the inf. n. of the second (Sn): except [in the case of] the determinative َل, when the vowel of the Hamza in such as ُتُلْحَمْرَ َقَآئِمَ AlAhmar is standing; while ُلْحَمْرَ َقَآئِمَ is weak: the difference [between this case and that of ُسَّلَار] being that incorporative transfer [of a vowel] is more frequent than non-incorporative transfer (A); so that, with incorporation, that [conj. Hamza] which was before the transfer is not regarded (Sn). There is a dispute [among the BB (Sn)] as to whether the conj. Hamza be orig. quiescent or mobile, the first being th opinion of F, which is adopted by Shl; and the second the opinion of S, which is apparently correct, because every inceptive п. must be mobilized, like the َل 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. َل [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 اذْهَبَ اضْرَبٌ [428, 667]; while, in such as أُخْرَجَ [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 اذْهَبَ اضْرَبٌ, and Damm in أُخْرَجَ; while, Fath being disallowed in أُخْرَجَ اذْهَبَ 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 اذْهَبَ اضْرَبٌ, and Damm in اَسْكَنَ dwell are for alliteration to [the vowel of] the third [letter]. The absence of Fath in 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 ِاعْلَمُ ٍwould, in *pause*, produce confusion with the aor. [ِاعْلَمُ *I know*], and with the *pret.* [ِاعْلَمُ *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 ٍالْجُلُوٍ [663] (Aud, A), like ٍالْجُلُوٍ *the man* (Tsr), from frequency of usage (Tsr, Sn): (2) necessity for Damm, [vid. (A)] in (a) such passives as ١ُنْتِلَقَ ٍهُنْمٍخُرَيْجَ [486]: (b) the *imp.* of the *tril.* *orig.* pronounced with ٍدَامَم of the ٍعَ, as ٍأَكْتَبُ *kill* and ٍأَقْضَى *write*, [from dislike to the transition from Kasr to Damm, because the quiescent barrier is not insuperable (Tsr, Sn)]; contrary to ٍإِمْشَواَعَُو walk *ye* (Aud, A) and ٍإِقْضَواَعَُو judge *ye* (Aud), where the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr, because the ٍعَ is *orig.* pronounced with Kasr, the *o.* *f.* being ٍإِمْشَيْوَاَعَُو, ٍإِقْضَيْوَاَعَُو (Tsr, Sn) and ٍإِقْضَيْوَاَعَُو (Tsr): (a) sometimes the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr before an original ٍدَامَم: 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 ٍدَامَم 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 *dialect. var.* (Sn): (3) preponderance of Ðamm over Kasr, [vid. (A)] where the Ðamm of the ِع is accidentally made Kasr, as in *أَخْرِي* [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 َس of the 2nd *person. sing. fem.* must be pronounced with Ishmām (Aud, A), which here means what, according to Fr, is named Raum [640], vid. *that the Ðammas 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 َس ] being necessary (Sn) for a notification of the original Ðamm (Tsr, Sn); and (b) the Hamza [must be pronounced] with pure Ðamm, [without Ishmām (Tsr)]: (b) IM says in the Tashil that the *conjunction* Hamza is pronounced with Ishmām before the Ðamma 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 Ðamm of the Hamza (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (4) preponderance of Fath over Kasr, [vid. (A)] in *أَيْمَنُ
and *\( r^{n} \) [663] (Aud, A), because of the heaviness of the transition from Kasr of the Hamza to Damm of the \( m \), and afterwards of the \( n \) (Tsr): (5) preponderance of Kasr over Damm, [vid. (A)] in the word *\( e^{r} \) [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 *\( :d^{r} \) and *\( h^{r} \) when put into the pass. [436] (Aud, A), as [\( ^{d} \) and *\( ^{h} \) with Damm, and (Tsr) *\( ^{d} \) and *\( ^{h} \) 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 \( ^{a}_{n} \) *\( ^{c}_{t} \) IV. 69. [below] and *\( ^{a}_{t} \) *\( ^{c}_{t} \) LXXIII. 3. [664, 666] (A). In IV. 69. Saying, Kill yourselves, or go forth from your homes, IAl and Yaʔkūb read \( ^{a}_{n} \) *\( ^{c}_{t} \) with Kasr of the \( n \), according to the o. f. of mobilization [664]; and *\( ^{a}_{t} \) *\( ^{c}_{t} \) with Damm of the \( m \), 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 آتَلُموا 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 جَاءَ زُرُ أَلْحِم [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

\[
\text{ولا يُبَادَرُ فيِّ الْسَّتَائِنَ وَلِيدُّنا ﷺ أنَّيْلُدُ يُنْبِلُّهَا يَعْبُرُ جَعَالِ}
\]

112a
(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, 'in ' from thy name. And the saying [of Kais Ibn AlKhaṭīm (IY, MN)]

إِذَا جَآَوَّ مَا أَلاَّنَّ يِنِى سَرٍّ فَاقِهُ ٍبَكِّيْرٍ وَإِنْسُأَ الْكَدْيِبٍ قَمِينُ

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

بَكِيْرٍ وَكَتْبُمْ أَلْوَشَاةٍ قَمِينُ

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 نَسْبَ أَلْبَيْوَمْ أَلْحَمْ [105], where he expresses the Hamza of 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, ineffectively (IY). But the Hamza of the art. alone [below], when it occurs after the interrog. Hamza [581], is not elided [661], being [usually] converted into I [below]
Is God better, or what they asso-
ciate [with Him]? (IY), because its elision would lead to confusion (M) of inquiry with announcement, since both [Hamzas] are pronounced with Fath; so that, if it were elided, one would not know whether the Hamza [sounded] was the interrog. [Hamza] or that [conj. Hamza] which accompanies the determinative ل [667]. For that reason, then, it is retained, [though in a modified form]; and is assimilated to the ل of أَجْرُ red [658], because of its permanence: the poet says أَجْرُ أَلْهَيْنَى [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 Aَصْطَفَى أَبْنَابِي عَلَى أَبْنِيَيْنِ 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] (IY).

[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 chaster
of which is making the Hamza an ٌ, while the second is putting it betwixt and between, as in ۤאָלַכֵּחַר ָאָלָּל הָאָלָם
[663] (R). [Nor is this treatment of the conj. Hamza confined to "the Hamza of the art. alone", as Z states above: for] in interrogation, [when the interrog. Hamza is prefixed to it (Aud), the conj. Hamza pronounced with Fath (663,668) (Aud, A), which is (Sn)]

the Hamza of ُأُ [and its subst. ُأُ in the dial. of Himyar (Sn), and of ُأُ and ُأُ in (Tsr, Sn)] is (1) changed into a [letter of] prolongation (IM), i. e., an ٌ [497,668] (Aud), which is the more approved [method] (A): (a) IHKh says that F and many, [among whom are Z and IY,] 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 IA1 that this ٌ is not a modification of the conj. Hamza, but] is an [extraneous] imported for separation, like the ٌ of ُأُ بَنَانِ ٌ [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 آلكسن عَدَن [below], which, but for the regard paid to its original vowel, would not be allowable, contrary to إضرَّ بناي [above] (Tsr): or (2) [sometimes (Aud)] softened (IM) between Hamza and! (A), with abbreviation (Aud, A), which, [though less approved (Sn),] is agreeable with analogy, because change [into a letter of prolongation (Sn)] is the property of the quiescent (Tsr, Sn) Hamza [684-686]: (a) so in the Tsr, [where it is intended to account for the use of this inferior method in the readings cited below]: but our master the Sayyid says "It should not be imagined, from softening's being less approved, that it is not used in reading, since there is no incompatibility between its being less approved and its being chaste; while Sd distinctly declares, in the Glosses on the K, that the Readers sometimes agree upon a less approved, strange mode, as in LXXV. 9. [21]” (Sn): (b) IBsh says that this [method] is easy in comparison with what the school of S mention by “change” [above]. There is no difference in that [respect] between the Hamza of جل and the Hamza of آيمُ (Tsr). You [therefore (A)] say آلكسن عَدَن and أَيَّمَنْ آللَّهِ يَمِينُكَ عَدَن [663], with prolongation, [by change (Aud),] more approvably; and with softening, less approvably, [but agreeably with analogy, as before mentioned (Sn),] whence
(1084)

( Aud, A ), by Ḥassān Ibn Yasūr at Taghlabī (MN), Is it the truth, if the abode of ArRabāb (the name of a woman) be distant, or a cord of love be severed, that thy heart is flying away (MN, J) (with thy beloved, named ArRabāb)? (J). And both modes are read [among the Seven (Tsr)] in [various passages of the Kur (A)], such as VI. 144, 145. [above] and X. 91. [497, 663]. It is not elided [656, 661, 663], as the [conj. (Tsr) Hamza (Aud)] pronounced with Kasr, [which is the o. f. (664, 668) (Aud),] is elided, as أَتَّخَذُ نَاهِمٕ سَخْرِيًا XXXVIII. 63. What! did we make of them a mockery? [in the reading of others than IA1 and the Two Brothers (Tsr), this text being read with the interrog. Hamza by the two Hijāzīs and Ibn ‘Āmir and ‘Āṣīm (B)]; and [as (Tsr)] أَسْتَعْفَرَتْ لَهُمْ LXIII. 6. [581, 543] (Aud, A), in the reading of all [the Seven]: the o. f. being أَتَّخَذَ نَاهِمٕ and أَسْتَعْفَرَتْ; with an interro. 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 أَضْطَرْ لَرَجُلُ Was the man constrained? (A, Tsr), the o. f. being أَضْطَرْ 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 أَلَّا لَا أَرَى آخَرَ [668] (Aud).

§. 670. When preceded by something spoken, no mobile initial of a word, besides the conj. ! [669], is elided or altered, except the s of حَمْرَةٌ [161], which, when preceded by a , or ف, or by a ل [of inception], is [often made] quiescent, as زُهْرَةٌ دا بُيب And he is going, لُهْرَوا خِيرُ مَنْكَ Assuredly he is better than thou, and نَفُخُو Then he is standing, and similarly with وَهَي [319].

But many of the Arabs leave the s with these ps. in its [original] state. And they do the like of that to the imp. ل with the و and , as in your saying قُلِّ يَبْنِيَ تُمَنْرَ Then let him look and وَلْيَصْرِبْ And let him strike; while those who leave the s of حُمْرَةٌ and حُمْرَةٌ in its [original] state leave the Kasra of the ل in its [original] state (S).

As for the quiescence of the in دَهُو and دَهُو [above], and دَهُو, and دَهُو, it is accidental, [but] elegant (SH), i.e., used by elegant speakers, contrary
to II. 282. [below], and to such as مُنتَصِبًا [below], from the frequency of its usage in the first [set of exs.] (R). And so is [the quiescence of] the imp. ۳۱۳۳۲۴۹۱۵۱۵۷۲۹۱۵۷۲۷
[three ps.] mentioned, because, though not so frequent, it is unil.; and similarly what contains تّمٌّ, because it is copulative, like the ﷽ and ﷺ [538]: 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 ﷽ طُمٌّ and ﷻ يعيّ with the copulative ﷽ and ﷺ, and [with the ل of inception and] the interrog. Hamza, and similarly the imp. ل that is preceded by a ﷽ or ﷺ, 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 رَهْوَرَهْوَرَهْوَ with the copulative رَهْوَرَهْوَرَهْوَ and فَهْوَ فَهْوَ to عَصْدٍ, and such as فَهْوَ فَهْوَ كِتْئِفٍ; and so is it said of [the imp. ل in] ﷻ ﷻ ﷻ 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 إِسْمٌ notwithstanding that ﷻ إِسْمٌ occurs, and similarly إِسْتِ and إِسْتَ [667]? He ought therefore to say
that the Hamza is not imported [in ًءْم, 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 ُهُوَ and ُهُوَ َهُوَ and ُهُوَ َهُوَ; and, for this reason, the alleviation [of the ُ by elision of its vowel] is rarer in their case: while ُهُوَ and ُهُوَ َهُوَ and ُهُوَ َهُوَ, alleviation of the ُ being allowable in them, according to what is read in the Kur (R). As for ُلِيُؤُو فُوا َهُوَ َهُوَ XVIII. 18. [1] and ُلِيُؤُو فُوا َهُوَ َهُوَ XXII. 30. [above], this is the imp. ل [419, 429, 603]: it is orig. pronounced with Kasr, as is proved by the fact that, when you begin, saying لَيَقُمْ رَيْدٌ [603], you pronounce it with Kasr, not otherwise; but, when you prefix the ُ or ي to the phrase containing it, the ل may be made quiescent (IY). But in such as لَلِيُؤُو فُوا َهُوَ َهُوَ And in order that he may do, with the ل of كُيّ [411, 599], alleviation is not allowable, from the rarity of its usage (R). If ُمّ occur instead of the ُ or ي, quiescence is not as good as with the ُ or ي, because ُمّ, 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 s, by assimilation of the detached to the attached [con.] (B). But Ks and others read XXII. 30. Then let them fulfill [603] their purification, with quiescence of the imp. ل, by assimilation of تُمُّ to the ف, because it is a con., like them; while the BB deem that inelegant, because تُمُّ is independent, [susceptible of being] paused upon (R). Those who say XXII. 30. [above], with quiescence of the ل, assimilate the second of تُمُّ to the ف and م, treating تُمُّ as on a par with فَلَيْقُضُوا; and this is like their saying I see thee puffed up, meaning the مُنْتَفِخًا, the كَفْفُ, and the فَلَيْقُضُوا therefore made quiescent; and like it is

نيَّات مُتْنَفَقَة وَمَا تَكُرَّكَـسَا

Then it passed the right erect, and did not contract [above] (IY). And II. 282. [above] is read anomalously, with quiescence of the s, by treating [in بَلْ هُوَ]
like عُضُدُ : but it is inelegant, because بَيَضَلَ is an independent word, and cannot be assimilated to the con., as ثم is; and the saying نَبَاتُ مُنتَضِبًا آلْحُمَ [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 هُمَّ and هُمَّي after the ل [of inception], and after the , and ف , as likewise mobilization of the imp. ج after the two [latter ps.], is the o.f.: S says "It is excellent, superlative" (R).
CHAPTER VIII.

THE AUGMENTATIVENESS OF LETTERS.

§. 671. It is common to the n. and the v. (M). As for the ps., there is no augmentation in them, because it is a kind of plasticity, which is not [found] in ps. [497]. The meaning of augmentation is adjoining to the word some letters that do not belong to it, either to import a meaning, like the of ٕضَّارٍ and the of ٕصِّرٍوب [369]; or for a kind of extension in the vocabulary, like the of ٌجَمَّار [374, 401], the of ٌعَمُوٰد [246], and the of ٌسَعِيد [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 ٌقَرْقَر [a rugged place (Jrb)] is co-ordinated [375, 731] (SH) with ٌظَعُفر
[392], for which reason they say جُعَفَانُ [253] and قرِّيْدَنَ [274], as they say جَعَفَانُ [245] and جُعَفَانُ [274] (Jrb). But such as مَقْتَنُ [333, 361, 372, 676] is not co-ordinated, although مَقْتَنُ and مَقْتَنُ 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 أَفَعَلْ [488], فَاعِلَ [489], and فَاعِلَ [490] (SH) are not co-ordinated [483] (Jrb), for the same reason (SH), vid. that the augment is proved to be regularly put for a purpose other than co-ordination, i. e., to denote the meanings mentioned for these conjugs. [488-490] (Jrb); and because their inf. ns. occur different (SH) from the inf. n. of دُخُرَجَ [483], being مَعَاَعِلَةٌ، فَعِبَالُ، and إِفْعَالَ مَعَاَعِلَةٌ، دُخُرَجَ، not مَعَاَعِلَةٌ دُخُرَجَ [332] (MASH). The meaning of co-ordination [673] in the n. and v. is that you add one or two letters to a combination—not regularly, in importing a [particular] meaning [below]—in order that such combination, by means of that addition, may become like another word in (1) the number of letters: (2) the special vowels and quiescences, each in the same relative position as [its counterpart] in the standard [word]: (3) its variations vid. (a) the pret., aor., imp., probib., 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 حَوَّلُ aged, impotent is different from that of حَوَّلُ corn in the blade, and the meaning of شَمَّل [483] is different from that of شَمَّل included, and similarly كَوْنُ [below] is not i. q. كَبْرَ 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 greater and أَفْضُلُ [351] denotes superiority [354]; and the aug. م in مَفْعُولْ denotes the inf. n. [333], or the time or place [361], and in مَفْعُولْ 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 
[332, 490] (A): (2) co-ordination, as in (a) [the
of (A)] [below] (A, Tsr) and جَعْفَر [369, 374, 675],
the of [373] and [374], the of آرَطَى [below] and
[673], and the of جَكْحَّنْفَل [below] and
[375, 677] (A): (a) co-ordination [above], as [defined by
IM] in the Tashlīm, 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 commensurabil-
ity in appearance, since, in reality, the measure is
different; for the measure of جَعْفَر [above], e. g., is
[392], while the measure of كُوَّدَر [283, 675] is
[373]: (b) is applied to denote several meanings,
among them much good and a river in Paradise (Sn):
(3) prolongation (A, Tsr), as in كِتَاب book [673] (Tsr);
and hence the of ضّكِيَّة [246], the of رِسالَة [246],
and the of جَلْوَة [267] (A): (4) compensation, as in
[the of (A)] [265] (A, Tsr) and إِتَامَة [265,
338], the of سَ يَسْطِيعُ [680], and the of مَالله [52, 56]
(A): (5) magnification of the sense, and (Sn) multipli-
cation (A, Tsr) of the letter (Sn), as in the of مَاللْهِ and
عَبْرَة and إِبْنِ [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 كَبْعَتْرِي [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 عِ 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 l ] plain (A, Tsr), as in سُلْطَانِیَّةٌ LXIX. 29. [615, 648] (Tsr); and hence the s of silence in such as مَالِیَّةٌ LXIX. 28. [648, 679] and يَا زَيْدَةٌ [48, 55, 679], which is added to make the vowel plain [in the former (Sn)], and the l [perfectly (Sn)] plain (A) in the latter (Sn): so says IU (Tsr). The letters of augmentation (IY, SH), [i. e.] the aug. letters (M), are [ten letters, vid. the Hamza, the l, the ى, the ُ, the ٣, the ص, the م, the و, and the l (IY), comprised in the (mnemonic) phrases (M, Jrb)] (1-3) [يا أَوْسَ عَلَى ۸۹۸۷] and لَمْ يَأْتِنا سَهْمُ (M, SH), which somebody has combined in a verse, vid

بيَّا أَوْسَ عَلَى ۸۹۸۷ وَلَمْ يَأْتِنا سَهْمُ فَقَالَ أَلِیْمَمْ تَنَسَّاهُ

O Aus, hast thou slept, when negligence has not overcome us? Then said he, “To-day thou dost forget it” (Jrb): And Solomon came to him (M), 114a
which is not good, because it contains a duplication of the \( I (IY) : \) \[370\] (M, SH) : (a) it is said that a pupil asked his master about the letters of augmentation, and he said \( سَلَّمْ نَوْزُبِيْهَا \) Ye 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 \( آَلِيَّمْ تُنْسَاهُ To-day thou dost forget it \) [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) : \( أَلْسِبَانَ \) (6) \( شُؤِبَتُ (M, SH) : (a) it is said that Mb asked Mz about the letters of augmentation, and he recited

\[
[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 \( عَوْبِتْ أَلْسِبَانَ \) : (b) Z [followed by IH] says \( أَلْسِبَانَ عَوْبِتُ \), making \( أَلْسِبَانَ \) 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) 

\(\text{اَسْلَّبَنَى وُتَأَّهِ} \)  

He left me, and lost his way: (8) 

\(\text{لَمْ يُتَسَاءَلٌ} \)  

Death forgets him (IV): (9) 

They question one another: (10) 

What thou hast asked is light: (11) 

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

Ye have asked my abasement. 

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

\[
\text{سَأَلَتُ الْخُرُوفُ الْزَّارِدَاتِ عِنَّي أَسْبِيْا}
\]

\[
\text{فَقَالَتْ وَلَمْ يُبْعِكْ أَمَانُ وَتَسْهِيلُ}
\]

(R) I asked the augmentative letters about their name; and they then said, nor begrudged saying, "Those letters are collected in \(\text{أَمَانُ وَتَسْهِيلُ [below]}\)" (Jsh). The meaning of their being letters of augmentation is not that they are only \(\text{aug.}\), since there is no letter among them that is not \(\text{rad.}\) 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 \(\text{قَرْدُنُ [above]}\); or non-co-ordinative, as in \(\text{عَبَرُ interpreted [489]}\); where the \(\text{د and ب}\) are not letters of augmentation. The reduplicative
letter, notwithstanding its augmentativeness, is [taken] from all the letters of the alphabet, [except the I, as shown below,] whether letters of augmentation, as in

\[433, 482\] and \[amassed\]; or others, as in

\[489\] and \[set free\]: and is co-ordinative, as in \[731\]; and non-co-ordinative, as in \[above].

But that [aug. letter] which is co-ordinative, yet not reduplicative, is [taken] only from the letters of \[above], as in \[369, 374, 675\], \[above], and \[681\] (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 \[above\] 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 \[above\] and \[385\]: (2) the \[, (a) with union, as in \[slaughtered\]; (b) with separation by an aug. [between them (Tsr)], as in \[384, 677\]: (3) the \[ and \[, as in \[370\]: (4) the \[ and \[, as in \[370, 385\] (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 صَبَّاحِمْ [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 مَرْمِرسِس [above], the third and fourth, i. e., the second م and the subsequent ل: and some adduce as evidence of the augmentativeness of the first ح in صَبَّاحِمْ, and of the second م in مَرْمِرسِس, their elision in the dim., as صَبَّاحِمْ and مَرْمِرسِس [283]. But it is transmitted from the KK that the measure of صَبَّاحِمْ is فَعَلْلَ, its o. f. being صَبَّاحِمْ, where they change the middle ح into م (Tsr). As for that [duplicate] which resembles the ف alone, as in فَرْقَه [wine (Tsr)] and سَدْس [thin silk brocade (Tsr)], or the خ separated [from its duplicate] by a rad., as in حَدْرَت Hadrad, [a man's name (Jh, Tsr), whence Abū Hadrad alAslamî, a Companion (KF), while no other فَعَلَ, with repetition of the خ, occurs (Jh, KF, Tsr), and الْحَدْرُ رَدُّ meaning the short—so in the CT (KF),] it is rad. And, when the quad. is formed of two letters, then, (1) if its third be not omissible, the whole are rad., as in سَبْسِم [311, 674, 677] (Aud), the measure of which is فَعَلْلَ [392], because the radicalness of the two letters is certain, and there must be a third to complete the [number of] rads.; 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 ُنَفَّظُ فُ، it ف being repeated; but this is improbable (Tsr): (2) if its third be omissible, as in *لَبْلَمْ* i. q. *رَئِنَتْ* reunited it, that third is, (a) as the KK say, an *aug.* substituted for a letter resembling the second (Aud), the o. f. of *لَبْلَمْ*, according to their saying, being *لَمْ*، 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 ُتَعِلْلَة* for its *inf. n.* [332]; whereas, if were *orig.* [a *tril.*] reduplicated [in the medial], its *inf. n.* would occur on [the measure of] ُكَفِيعْلُ [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 ُلَبْلَمْ a repeated [formation] agreeing in sense with the reduplicated *tril.*, as the BB say of its similars, like ُتَضُّقَضْتُ I crushed, ُبَكَرْتُ *I restrained,* and ُكَفَكْفَكْتُ 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

I congratulate and I restrained, and 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

(Aud), i. e. (1) in ُتَسْلِيمٌ ُتَسْلمَتْ *Congratulation and
(1101)

salutation (are a matter that), (2) in َنَهَايَة أُنْسِهَلَة، (3) in مَسْؤُولٍ an utmost craving (of desire), and (4) in ُتَسْهِیْل protection and facilitation [above] (Jsh).

And they ought to reckon the ُشُ in such as اُکْرَمْتُکُشْ ُنَش‌ in the 2nd pers. fem.; for, if they say “This is peculiar to pause”, we say “And so is the ِس of silence” [615, 644, 679] (Tsr). Mb omits the ِس 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 َكَ and ِسَ are heavy, it is [said of them] in relation to the َكَ [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 َكَ in outlet [732], and is convertible into a soft letter upon alleviation [658]; (2) the ِسَ also is adjacent to the َكَ in outlet [732] (Jrb, Tsr), while Akh asserts that their outlet is one; and it is faint; and is sometimes substituted for the َكَ in ُعَنْتَة [690], and for the ِسَ in ُعْنَة [171, 174, 275, 648, 690] (Jrb); (3) the َم is [uttered]
from the outlet of the ج [732], vid. the lip; and contains a nasality [akin to the softness of the soft letters (Jrb)]:

(4) the ن [also (Jrb)] contains nasality [270]; and is prolonged in the upper part of the nose, like the l in the throat: (5) the ت is a surd [734] letter; and is substituted for the ج in the نجاة (Jrb, Tsr) and ترات [689] (Jrb):

(6) the س is a sibilant [734], surd, letter, [whose surdity is akin to the softness of the soft letters (Jrb)]; and its outlet is near to that of the ت [732] (Jrb, Tsr), for which reason they substitute it for the latter, saying اَسْتَخْذَ [759], the converse of which is سَتِْ, orig. سَسِْ [307, 316, 689, 758] (Jrb): and (7) the ل, though a vocal [734] letter, resembles the ن; and is near to it in outlet [732] (Jrb, Tsr), for which reason the ن is incorporated into it [749, 751], as بِسْ لَدْنْتِ [170], as with its like in لُعْلِي and كَنْي (Jrb). Measurement [of words] is also named exemplification (Aud), from the resemblance of the letters of the measure to the letters of the measured in number and conformation. The use of measurement is to explain the states of the formations of words in eight matters, (1) vowels, (2) quiescences, (3) rads., (4) augs., (5) priority, (6) posteriority, (7) elision, and (8) absence of elision. And the measure is the crude form of قَعَلَ
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 *فعلَ (Tsr).* because it is the most general of the *vs.* in sense, and may be employed for every act, as *فعلَ الْضَربَ* He did striking and *فعلَ الْنَصْرَ He did helping*, whence... XXIII. 4. And who are doers of almsgiving, i. e., مُزْكَوْن الْرَكْوَة almsgivers (Jrb), where *الْرَكْوَة* is meant to be an abstract *n.* [3], vid. the deed of the almsgiver, i. e., التَرْكِيْة almsgiving (K). What is intended is the crude-form of *فعلَ (above)*, not its conformation, since the measure does not always keep to this conformation (Sn). The *rads.* are represented [in the measure] by the ب, [then (Aud)] the ع, and [then (Aud)] the ج [368, 369,] (SH, Aud), in the order imported from the word "then" (Tsr); and such [rads. (R, Jrb)] as exceed [three (R, Jrb)] by a second or third ج (SH); the letters of the measure being (Tsr) given such [original (Tsr)] mobility or quiescence as belongs to their measured (Aud). This means that, when you want to measure a word, [in order to know its *rad.* and *aug.* (A),] you represent its *rads.* by [the letters of *فعلَ*, the first by (A)] the ب, [the second by (A)] the ع, and [the third by (A)] the ج (R, A), i. e., 115a
you put, in the measure, these three letters in place of the *rad.* letters (R), making the measure and the measured equal in vowel and quiescence [253] (A), as you say "ضْرَبٌ فَعُلٌ" [*below*] (R). You, therefore, say (1) [with quiescence of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] [368] (Aud, A), among *ns.* (Tsr): (2) [ذُرُعُلْ (Aud, A), with Fath of the [ ف and (A)] ع (A, Tsr), for [the measure of (Tsr)] صَرِبَ [above] (Aud, A), among vs. (Tsr); and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] [نَامَ [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 [قَوْمَ [403, 684, 703] and [شَدَدَ [731]: (3) [with Kasr of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] [عَلِيمَ [432, 440, 482]; and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] [مَلْلُ [in the hollow (Tsr)] and [عَدِبَ [403, 684, 703] and [مَلْلُ loathed, was weary of [731] (Tsr, Sn), with Kasr of their second (Sn): (4) [ذُرُعُلْ [403, 684, 703] and [ذُرُعُلْ [with Damm of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] [ظَرِفَ [331, 432, 482]; and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] [كَبَبْ [432] and [كَبَبْ [476] (Aud, A), because their *o. f.* is [كَبَبْ [403, 684, 703] and [كَبَبْ [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 ٥٧٨١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ٥٧٨١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ [392]: (2) a second and third [ J (Tsr)] in [the measure of (Tsr)] the quin., saying ٥٧٨١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ٥٧٨١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ [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 [measure of] be [392], as the BB say, or \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \) with the \( \text{\textit{ا}} \) \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \) with the \( \text{\textit{ف}} \) \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \), or what it is be not known, there are four [different] sayings (Tsr). And the \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \) is represented by its own [original] letter, [in order that it may be differentiatated from the \( \text{\textit{رَادِي}} \) (Tsr)], so that one says (1-3) \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \), and for [the measure of (Tsr)] [332, 332, 482, 674], and \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \) [482, 675] (Aud), with the \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \). Hamza, \( \text{\textit{ى}} \), and \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \), respectively (Tsr): (4) for [the measure of (Tsr)] [667] (Aud), with the \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \). Hamza and \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \) (Tsr); and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] [692, 756] and \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \) [693, 756], because the \( \text{\textit{أُتْرَبَ}} \) and \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \) for [the measure of (Tsr)] [332, 482, 483, 493] (Aud), where the numbers of the \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \). and \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \). are equal (Tsr). When, however, the \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \) is a repetition of a \( \text{\textit{رَادِي}} \), [whether co-ordinative or not (Tsr),] it is represented, (1) according to the majority, by what that \( \text{\textit{رَادِي}} \) is represented by (Aud), because, repetition of the \( \text{\textit{رَادِي}} \). 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 \( \text{\textit{دَّاً}} \), and therefore imitates it in its inflection, so this [repetitive \( \text{\textit{مَعْلَمْ}} \)] is measured by the same measure as the \( \text{\textit{رَادِي}} \), in order to make known that
this is a repetition of what precedes (Tsr), as in your saying إِفْعَوْلُ، نُعُلُوُلُ، نُقْلِيِّلُتُ، for [the measure of (Tsr)] سُخَّنُونَ [385] جَلْبِيَّتٍ [beginning of rain and wind (Tsr, Sn)—so says SBd (Sn)], and إِفْعَوْلُنَّ [482, 483, 675] (Aud), respectively, the [second] ت in جَلْبِيَّتٍ and ن in سُخَّنُونَ being for co-ordination with خَصْرُوف cartilage [396], respectively; while the [second] د in إِفْعَوْلُنَّ 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 إِفْعَوْلُنَّ، نُعُلُوُلُ، نُقْلِيِّلُتُ for the measure of جَلْبِيَّتٍ [above], سُخَّنُونَ، and إِفْعَوْلُنَّ جَلْبِيَّتٍ [above] respectively (Tsr). The aug., (1) when it is not one of the letters of أَمَانُ وَتَسْهِيْلُ [above], is a duplicate of a rad., like the ب in جَلْبِبَ [above]; (2) if it be one of them, is (a) a duplicate, as in ستَال [661, 738]: (b) not a duplicate; but having the semblance of a duplicate, though some evidence, [like the extraordinariness of without repetition of the ف and ع (Sn),] indicates that reduplication is not intended by it, in which case it is represented in the measure by its own letter, as in سَمْنَان Samnān, a [place wherein is (Sn)] water belonging to the Banū Rabī‘a, the measure of which is نِعَلَانُ، not نِعَلَانِ، because نِعَلَانِ is an extraordinary measure,
no instance of which occurs without repetition [of the ḫɐṟɤ'ul] (Sn), as in ḫɐṟɤ'ul [273, 332, 396], except ḫɐṟɤ'ul [396] and ṣɐ̲ for denoting [hard (Jh, KF)] stone, [to which the KF adds ṣɐ̲ dust and ḫɐṟɤ'ul oats (Sn).] while Bahrām and Shahrūm are foreign (A) proper names: (c) not a duplicate, nor in the semblance of one, like the Hamza in ʿarkəm [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 ʿa' and for the measure of ḫə [331] and repelling, respectively, because their o.f. is ʿa and (A); and similarly, as before mentioned, قام and ʿabab; and so ʿa and ʿabab, ʿa and حب [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) للع [pret. of يناء (Tsr), a dial. var. of i.q. بعده was far away (Jh)], because it is from َنٰي (Aud), the o.f. being َنٰي; but the َ، vid. the َ، being transferred to the position of the َ، vid. the Hamza, so that it becomes َنٰي; and the َ، then converted into َل [684, 703], because mobile, and preceded by a
letter pronounced with Fath; so that it becomes َنْاَلْفَة with prolongation (Tsr): (2) ۡعَلِفَ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ۡحَدَةٌ ‘Al-*hādī ۡرَأَو اِجُدُ عِلَيْتَ uni*ty (Aud), the o.f. being ۡفَ، but the ۡوُ، being transferred to the position of the ۡج، and the ۡحُ then made to precede the ۡج، with which it is impossible to begin, so that it becomes َأَلْكَادِرُ; and the ۡحُ then converted into ۡيَۡلَيْلُ [685, 721], because occurring as a final after Kasra; so that it becomes َأَلْكَادِرُ (Tsr): (3) ۡيَۡلَيْلُ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ۡيَۡلَيْلُ ۡدَيِّهِبُ [482, 699] (Aud), the o. of which is elided, the o.f. being ۡدَيِّهِبُ، because it is orig. with Kasr [of the ۡع، and is afterwards pronounced with Fath because of the guttural letter; so that the elision is from ۡيَۡلَيْلُ with Kasr: so says Sd on ۡيَۡلَيْلُ [482] and its congeners (Tsr): (4) ۡفُلْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ۡبَعُ [703] (Aud), imp. of ۡبَعُ، the o.f. being ۡبَعُ، but its ۡعُ being elided because of the concur*rence of two quiescents [663] (Tsr): (5) ۡبَعُ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ۡبَعُ ۡتَاغِ ۡقَآَسِ [16] (Aud), the ۡجُ of which is elided, the o.f. being ۡقَآَسِ، but its ۡجُ being elided because of the concur*rence of two quiescents [663]. The measurement of some words is impracticable, like
and Jil/M [382, 679, 680], because we consider the original vowel and quiescence; and, the في those [words] being orig. quiescent, while the س and س [also] are quiescent, a concurrence of two quiescents would ensue in the measure; so that the right course is to say أفعالٍ for their measure, because they are orig. أطِعَ, the س and 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 ت of أَحْتَذِيَ [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 ت of أَحْتَذِيَ, which is aug., because it is elided in some of the variations (Tsr), since you say حَدَّا حَدَّوَة (A, Tsr), i. e., as in the KF (Sn), did as he did (KF, Sn); so that, by the elision of the ت in حَدَّوَة and حَدَّوَة, you know that it is aug. in أَحْتَذِيَ was imitated, or was put on or worn (A). إِحْتَذِیَا is imitation; or putting on, or wearing, sandals (Tsr). One says إِحْتَذِیَا بِهِ imitated him (A), [and] إِحْتَذِیَا مِتَالَةً imitated his example (Jh, KF), i. e. إِتَّدَى بِهِ (Jh, KF, A); and
[also (A)] put on, or wore, sandals, i. e., ֶּכְתֵּב יִתְכֵּבּ הַקָּנִי אֲרַוְעֵי

where

The foot-sore barefooted man puts on any sandal, ֶּכְתֵּב יִתְכֵּבּ הַקָּנִי אֲרַוְעֵי

being a sandal [329] (Jh, A). But [both (Tsr)]
the definitions require consideration:—the first [defi-
nition, vid. that of the rad. (Tsr),] because the of ֶּקְוִּבּ
[253, 373] and the of ֶּקְרְנֵל נ [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 ֶּקְרַא, the of ֶּקְאַל, and the of ֶּקְאַל
are rads., notwithstanding that they are elided in ֶּקְאַל
[482, 699], ֶּקְל [663, 703], and ֶּקְמִיֵּגְר [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 ֶּקְר
is excluded [from it], while such as the of ֶּקְרְנֵל 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
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rad., when elided for unsoundness, [like the \textsuperscript{9} \textit{يَعُد} (A),] is constructively present, [contrary to the \textit{aug.} (Tsr)]; while the \textit{aug.}, when inseparable, [like the \textit{ن} of \textit{قَرَنْفُل} and the \textit{و} of \textit{كَوْكَب} (A),] is constructively elided. And therefore the \textit{aug.} is said to be what is elided, really or constructively, in the original constitution (A, Tsr). The indications of the augmentativeness of a letter are ten:—(1-3) elision from (a) an \textit{o. f.}, like the elision of the \textit{ل} of \textit{صَارِب} [343, 369, 373] in its \textit{o. f.}, i. e., the \textit{inf. n.} [331]; (b) a \textit{deriv.} form, like the elision of the \textit{ل} of \textit{كَتَاب} [above] in its \textit{pl. كَتَب} [246, 256]; (c) a counterpart, like the elision of the \textit{ي} of \textit{اَيْطَلَل} [674] in \textit{إِطَلَل} [368], [which is like \textit{اَيْطَلَل} in sense and crude-form (Sn)]: (a) the condition requisite, in order that elision of the letter from an \textit{o. f.}, a \textit{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 \textit{و} of \textit{يَعُد} [above], or in \textit{عَدَة} [401, 482, 699], it is not a indication of augmentativeness: (4, 5) the letter’s occupying, in the \textit{non-deriv.} [word containing it (Sn)], a position wherein it is \textit{aug.} in the \textit{deriv.}, (a) invariably, like the \textit{ن} [673, 677], when it occurs as a quiescent, unincorporated, third, and is followed by two letters, as in \textit{رَتَتَل} [675, 677], which is \textit{an evil}, \textit{[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 [393, 395] from جَحْكَنْفَلِ [677], which in the solid-hoofed [animal] is like شَفَة lip in man, جَحْكَنْفَلُ 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 أُنَّكُلُ [18, 249] and [249, 372] is judged to be aug., because made to accord with [the Hamza of] a word whose derivation is recognizable, as حَمْرُ [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)] كَنْتَأَوِ (A), with which كَنْتَأ [380] is synomymous (Sn); and of such as سَدُّابَوِ, جَنْطَا, and كَنْتَأَوِ سَدُّابَوِ [301, 380], كَنْتَأَوِ جَنْطَا, 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 ﺜَﻛْفُ ﺜَﻛْفُ [372, 678] with Fath of the first ﺕّ, and ﺪامachment of the ﻳّ, meaning the young of the fox; for its [first] ﺕّ is aug., because, if it were held to be rad., the measure of ﺜَﻛْفُ ﺜَﻛْفُ would be ﻧَﻛْفُ ﻧَﻛْفُ [392], which is not found: (b) the counterpart of the word to which that letter belongs, as in ﺜَﻛْفُ ﺜَﻛْفُ [372], according to the dial. of those who pronounce the [first] ﺕّ and the ﻳّ with ﺪامachment; for its [first] ﺕّ 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 ﺕّ were held to be rad., the measure of ﺜَﻛْفُ ﺜَﻛْفُ would be ﻧَﻛْفُ، which is found, as ﺜَﻛْفُ ﺜَﻛْفُ [392], still unprecedentedness does ensue in its counterpart, i. e., the dial. var. with Fath; so that the ﺕّ, when its augmentativeness is established in the dial. var. with Fath, is judged to be aug. in the dial. var. with ﺪامachment also, since the rule [in dial. vars.] is identity of crude-form: (9) the letter's indicating a meaning, like the aoristic letter [369, 404] and the ﺟّ 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 ﺞَﻛْفُ ﺞَﻛْفُ [394, 677], [according to the dial. of those who pronounce the ﺕّ with ﺪامachment, as is proved by what follows (Sn),] since its measure, upon the assumption of the radicalness of the ﺕّ، is ﻧَﻛْفُ.
[with Damm of the second َ (Sn)], like ُسَفِرْجَلُ with Damm of the ََ، which is not found [401]; and, on the assumption of its augmentativeness, is ُتَعَمَّلُ [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 ُأَذَّبُ [249] أَصْعُ [671] and أَكْفُ [671] ُأَحْمَرُ, ُأَنْكُلُ I go and ُأَجْلِسُ I sit (IY), and ُأَكْرُمَ [671] (M): (a) that is because the Hamza, when initial, is prevalently
and frequently aug. in those words whose derivation is recognizable, as in أَحْمَرْ [above], أَعَرْ [249], أَخْبَرْ and أَجْلَسْ [above], إِخْرَيْطٍ and إِجْفِيلٍ [379], from خَضْرْة redness, صَفْرَة yellowness, and خَضْرَة greenness, جَفْلَ التaking fright and fleeing, and حُرُط defoliation; and is therefore decided to be aug. in those words of that class which are uncertain [in derivation], as أَرْتَبْ [above], أَيْدَعْ [below], أَبَيْلَة (IY), n. un. of أَبَيْلَم [372] (Jh), and مضَع [372], by making them accord with the more numerous [division of the class], which is making the unknown to accord with the known (IY): (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 أَفْكَلْ is said by them to be like جَفْلَ [392]: but S refutes them by the argument that أَفْكَلْ [18], if used as a name, would necessarily be diptote; whereas, if it were جَفْلَ [392], it would be triptote: and also that, if it were جَفْلَ, a formation whose initial is Hamza would be allowable in the conj. of جَفْلَ, aor. جَفْلَ, inf. n. جَفْلَة (R): (c) thus the Hamza is judged to be aug. in all of that [class] (IY), except when something intervenes, which requires (a) that the Hamza should be rad., as in جَفْلَة [374] and إِمْعَة weak-minded (M), because there is no cp. like جَفْلَة; while, if we judged
the Hamza in them to be *aug.*, the word would be of the cat. of ^ةُدُنُيَّةُ كُوُّرَكْمُ [٣٥٧, ٦٧٤], which is rare, not to be acted upon (IY): (b) that both matters should be allowable, as in ^أُرِئٓأُّيْدَعُ [below] (M): (α) the Hamza, if accompanied by a letter that may be *aug.*, as in ^أُدَعُّيْدَعُ [٢٤٩, ٦٧٤] and ^أُصَّرُأُيْدَعُ a short tent-ropes, 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 ئ; 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 ئ when second: so that in ^أُدَعُّيْدَعُ the Hamza is *aug.*, because of what we have mentioned; and because they say *يَدَعُعْتُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُ
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 أُنْعَى [673] and أُنْدَعَ [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 أُلْقَى أُرْطَى and أُلْقَى [below] is judged to be *rad.*, according to those who say أُدِيمُ مَأْرَطُ [673] and مَأْلُوقُ [below]: (γ) such as أُرْطَى [673] is excluded [from the presumption that the Hamza in such a position is *aug.*], since مَأْرَطُ and مَأْلُوقُ have been heard for dyed with [the leaves of *Jh* on أُرْطَى] مَأْرَطُ: he that says مَأْرَطُ makes the Hamza *rad.*, and the | *aug.*; while he that says مَأْرَطُ makes the Hamza *aug.*, and the | a subst. for a *rad.*: and, according to the first, the measure of أُرْطَى is نَعْلَى, its | being *aug.* for co-ordination; so that, if used as a name, أُرْطَى [18] would be diptote, because of the quality of proper name and [the | of (Sn)] quasi-feminization, [which is the | of co-ordination (Sn)]: while, according to the second, its
measure is ًنَعْلُ; 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 مَأْرَطَط are more numerous [than those of ُأَرْطُطَ], since they say ُأَرْطُطَ I dyed the hide with [the leaves of] ُأَرْطُطَ, and ُأَرْطُطَ The camels ate, [act. part.] ُأَرْطُطَ, as our Master has written after it (Sn),] and ُأَرْطُطَ The land produced ُأَرْطُطَ; while ُأَرْطُطَ The land produced ُأَرْطُطَ, [inf. n. ُأَرْطَا, as in the KF (Sn),] is also said : (8) similarly ُأَرْطُطَ [above] (A): as for ُأَرْطُطَ [above] (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 ُأَلْقَ أَلْرَجُ The man was demented, [a pass. formation (Sn), i. q. سِجْنَ (A),] pass. part. مُقَالْوَق demented (IY, A), upon the measure of مَفَعُول (Jh), which is a proof that the Hamza is rad., and the , aug. (IY); and its measure then is مُقَوَّعُ (IY, Sn), like جُوَّر [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 مَقَالْوَق [above]; while in the Hamza may be orig. a ُأَلْقَ, which is converted into Hamza because pronounced with Damm, as in أَجْرَة. 117a
for ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨ (IY): and [it is said that (A)] may be [٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢] from ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨ (IY), [an act. formation (Sn),] i. q. hastened (IY, A), whence ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨ 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 بِهِ عَنس مِنَ الْعَسَامِ تَلْقَ

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 ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨ (A); so that, if used as a name for a man, it would be diptote [٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨]: moreover they say ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨ and ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨ for a swift charge, which shows that its ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨ is sometimes Hamza, and sometimes , as in ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨ (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 ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣ (Sn),] oscillates between two measures, ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٢] like ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣ (381); and ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨ (380) (A): (2) rad., (a) when it [occurs as an initial, but] is followed by two rad. letters, as in ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣ (A) [a shirt without sleeves (IY)] and ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٢٣٩ (IY) ] and a waist-wrapper, [the paradigms of which one ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٢٣٩ (IY) ] ; or by four, as in ٥٣٣٥٦٨٣٩٨٢٣٩٨٣ (IY) stable
[283], [which, IAl says, is not of the language of the Arabs (Jh),] and ْإِصْطَلْحْرُ ْIṣṭakhr (M), the name of a territory (Jk, MI) in Persia (MI), which also is foreign (Jk), the paradigm of both being جَرَدُ حَلْلٌ, like [401]; and hence إِسْبِعْيُمُ إِنْبِرْهَمُ [283, 291], the measure of which is فَعَّالَ لِبَيْلٍ (IY): (b) when it occurs as non-initial, and nothing intervenes to necessitate its being aug., as in (a) شَمَّالُ ْلَرْيِحُ [374] (M), where the Hamza is aug., because they say شَمَّلَتْ آَلُرْيِحُ [373, 681. A] from ْنَبْذُلَانِ night winds [below] (IY); (b) [or ْنَبْذُلُ] nightmar, where the Hamza is aug., because they say ْنَبْذُلَانِ with the ى, and Damm of the ؤ, the elision of the Hamza being an indication of its augmentativeness (IY)]; (c) جَرَرُ آَنَضُ [384] (M), i. e., a bulky camel, where the Hamza is aug., because they say, in the same sense, جَمَلُ جَرَرَهُمْ a strong he-camel, i. e., شَدِيدُ (IY); (d) ضَهْيَاً (M), i. e., that does not menstruate, where the Hamza is aug, because they say ْإِمْرَأَةُ ضَهْيَا a woman that does not menstruate, without Hamza (IY). The language of [Z and] IM intimates that the Hamza, when medial or final, is not judged to be aug., except by reason of some indication, as in (1) شَمَّالُ [681. A], where the indication is elision of the Hamza in some of its dial. vars., of which there are ten, (a) شَمَّالُ [374]; (b) شَمَّالُ
[373]; (c) شمَل [above], upon the measure of قَدَل [246]; (d) شمْول, with Fath of the ش; (e) شمْل, with Fath of the م; (f) شمل, with quiescence of the م; (g) شمْل, upon the measure of صيقل [253]; (h) شمَل, upon the measure of طريل [246]; (i) شهر, upon the measure of كتب [246]; (j) شمَل, 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) جُوْهُر شُومُل, like شومَل [369] (Sn): (a) IU and others adduce, as evidence that the Hamza of شمَل is aug., their saying شمَلَت الْبَيْحُ [above], meaning blew northerly; but it is objected that شمَل admits of being orig. شمَلْت, [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) إِحْبَنَطَا [he was swollen in his belly (Sn)], where the indication is the elision of the Hamza in حِبط [681. A], as حِفَط بَطْنُهُ 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
contrary to [the Hamza of (Tsr)] such as ﮯользовاء and ﮯользовاء [326, 683] (Aud), where the ﮯ is preceded by one rad. (Tsr); and ﮯ a building [683] and ﮯا ﮯa [667] (Aud), where the ﮯ is preceded by two rads., not by more: and contrary to such as ﮯ نبأ tidings, where the Hamza is not preceded by an ﮯ (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 ﮯ 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 ﮯ separated from the ﮯ by a double letter, as in سلا ﮯ [prickles of the palm-tree (Sn)] and ُحرا ﮯ [below], or by two letters, one of which is a soft letter, as in ﮯا ﮯ and ﮯ توبا [273], admits of two alternatives, that the Hamza should be rad., and one of the two similars [in such as ﮯا ﮯ (Sn)], or the soft letter [in such as ﮯا ﮯ and ﮯ توبا (Sn)], should be aug.; or the converse. If, then, the Hamza be made rad., سلا ﮯ is نعال [from سلا ﮯ I pulled off the prickles of the palm-trees (Jh)], and ﮯ حواية snake-charmer is نعال from حواية collecting; while, if it be made aug., سلا ﮯ is نعال [from سلا ﮯ pulled out (KF)], and ﮯ greenish black or
blackish red, [and Eve (MAZ, Nw, KF), Adam's wife (KF), the mother of mankind (MAZ, Nw),] is \( \text{فَعَلَةٌ} \) from \( \text{حَرَّةٌ} \) (A) blackness inclining to greenness or redness inclining to blackness (Sn). If, however, one of the two alternatives be strengthened by some indication, it is adopted, and the other neglected: and, for that reason, the Hamza of \( \text{حُرَّةٌ} \) is judged to be \( \text{aug.} \) when \( \text{حُرَّةٌ} \) is diptote (A), because the diptote declension indicates that it is the Hamza of femininization [263, 683], which is \( \text{aug.} \) (Sn); and \( \text{rad.} \) when \( \text{حُرَّةٌ} \) is triptote, like \( \text{حُرَّةٌ} \) denoting one that charms snakes: while the preferable [alternative] in \( \text{سعَلُ} \) is that its Hamza should be \( \text{rad.} \), because, in plants, \( \text{فَعَلَةٌ} \) is more numerous than \( \text{سعَلُ} \) [273]. If, then, IM had said "more than two rads", [as IHsh says in the Aud above,] it would have been better. The Hamza is made \( \text{aug.} \), in the n., when (1) first, as in \( \text{حُمْرُ} \) [372, 671]; (2) second, as in \( \text{شَامِلٌ} \) [373]; (3) third, as in \( \text{شَامِلٌ} \) [above]; (4) fourth, as in \( \text{حُمْرَةٌ} \) [384], i. e., short; (5) fifth, as in \( \text{حُمْرَةٌ} \) [385]; (6) sixth, as in \( \text{عَقَرَبَا} \) [273, 399], which is \( \text{α} \) country; and (7) seventh, as in \( \text{بَرَّ نَاسَةٌ} \) [273, 400], i. e., mankind (A).

\$ 673. \text{And that accompanies more than two rads.} is [judged to be (IA, A)] \( \text{aug.} \), without any lie (IM), as
in [below] (IA, Aud), [248, 250], and (Aud) with Damm of the س, small bones in the fingers and toes (Tsr), because in most words, where the ل 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 قَال [below] and عَرَى [719] (Aud), where the ل is not aug., because it does not accompany more than two rads. (Tsr). IM [here (MKh)] means the soft ل [668]; and, as for the [mobile ل, which is named] Hamza, it has been mentioned [672] (Sn, MKh). The [soft] ل 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 كَبَّار [247, 373], جَبَلَّة [below], عَبْدَالٍ [396], and [below] (M). If it accompany two rads. only, it is not aug.: but is [either rad., as in لَو (below); or (IA)] a subst. for a rad. [ي or (A)], as in قَالَ and بَاب [703] (IA, A), رَمَى and نَاب [684], and قَصَصَ [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 † is not judged to be aug. (A, MKh), with more than two rads., as in [501, 540] and [181]; or to be a subst. for another [letter], with less than two rads., as in [500] and [206]: but it is rad., unconverted (MKh): and similarly in foreign [676] names, like [672] (A, MKh) and Isaac (A): because that [augmentativeness or substitution] is recognizable only by derivation, which is lacking (A, MKh) in what is [here] mentioned (MKh). The † is made aug., (1) [in the n. (A).] when (a) second, as in [671]; (b) third (IY, A, Tsr), as in [below] (IY, A); (c) fourth (IY, A, Tsr), as in [below] and [above] (A); (d) fifth (IY, A, Tsr), as in convolvulus (Jh); (e) sixth, as in [below] (IY, A, Tsr) and [671] (IY); (f) seventh (A, Tsr), as in [272] (Tsr): (2) in the v., when (a) second, as in [490]; (b) third, as in [482, 483, 487, 678]; (c) fourth, as in [482]; (d) fifth, as in [The horse (Sn)] was of dark chesnut color; (e) sixth, as in [432, 496] (A). But [the †, when it accompanies more than two
"rads. in (Tsr)" the reduplicated quad. \[674\], [whose first \( \text{j} \) is homogeneous with its \( \text{ً} \), and whose second \( \text{j} \) is homogeneous with its \( \text{ع} \) (Sn),] such as ﺻَرْوَﺿُي \[674\] (A, Tsr) shouted in battle (Sn), and 

\[674\] (A) chid sheep, saying \( \text{حَيَأَت} \) or \( \text{حَيَأَت} \) or \( \text{حَيَأَت} \) (Sn), is excepted [from IM's language (A)]: for the \( \text{l} \) here [i.e., the \( \text{l} \) of ﺻَرْوَﺿُي, as also each of the two \( \text{l} \)s, the first and the second, of ﺻَرْوَﺿُي (Sn),] is a subst. for a rad., [their measure being ﺖَفْلَل (Sn)]; and is not aug. (A, Tsr). When the \( \text{l} \) 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 \( \text{l} \) is aug.; and, if it be assumed to be aug., the \( \text{l} \) is non-aug.: but, if the ambiguous be an initial Hamza \[672\] or ﺤ[676], as in 
viper \[672\] and ﺹوَسَي razor \[676\], [not Moses, the name of the Prophet, because it, says Dm, is foreign (Sn).] or a quiescent \( \text{ن} \) third \[671, 677\] in a quin., as in 

\( \text{عَقْنَقَى} \), [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 \( \text{l} \) to be converted from a rad., so long as no indication shows these letters to be rad., and the \( \text{l} \) to be aug., as in ﺟَرْأَي [below], according to those who say ﺟَرْأَي ﺛَمَّ ﻤَأَرْوَط, meaning a hide dyed with ﺟَرْأَي [672]; and in ﺟَرْأَي [below], because of their saying ﺟَرْأَي ﻤَأَرْوَط; while, if the ambiguous be any other
letter than these three, we judge it to be rad., and the to be aug. (A). The | does not occur as a co-ordinative, except when final, as in محمد [below] (M), سلقت [482], and جعفري 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 كتاب [671] is not said to be co-ordinated with دمتس silk (K), like عذابر [392] (KF); nor عذابر [395, 677] to be co-ordinated with فداهيل [401]: because the unsound letter, when it occurs as a medial, and is preceded by a vowel homogeneous with it, like the of عايكوز and the of سعيد [369], is treated as a prolongation of the vowel; and does not co-ordinate one formation with another, the co-ordinative [unsound letter] being only what is not for prolongation. When final, the | is made an aug. of three kinds, (1) co-ordinative, as in أرْطَّى [248, 272, 326, 375, 671, 672] and معزى [272, 375, 671, 676], which are co-ordinated by the | with جعفر and ديرهم [392], respectively: (a) what indicates that the | is aug. in أرْطَّى is their saying في [above], the elision of the | in مُعَزًى being an indication that it is aug.; while their saying مُعَزًى [above] and مَهَّر [255, 257] is an indication that the | is aug. in مُعَزًى: (b) their saying أرْطَّى and معزى with Tanwin indicates
that the \( \text{l} \) is not for femininization, since the \( \text{l} \) of femininization prevents triptote declension [18]; so that Tanwin is not affixed to it [17,609], as \( \text{ستَرَى} \) and \( \text{حُبْلِي} \) [below]:

(a) moreover \( \text{لي} \) [258], has been heard from them, with affixion of the \( \text{s} \) of femininization; whereas, if the \( \text{l} \) were for femininization, another sign of femininization would not be affixed to it, so as to combine two signs of femininization: (b) one indication that the \( \text{l} \) in \( \text{مَعَرَى} \) is not for femininization is their making it \( \text{مَسَكَى} \) [249], their qualification of it by the \( \text{مَسَكَى} \) being an indication that it is \( \text{مَسَكَى} \); whereas, if the \( \text{l} \) were for femininization, it would be \( \text{فَمَ} \). (c) it is proved, then, by what we have mentioned, that the \( \text{l} \) here is \( \text{أَعَج} \). otherwise than as a denotative of femininization: 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 femininization, as in \( \text{سَكَرُى} \) [18,248,272,375], \( \text{حَبْلِي} \) [248,272], and \( \text{يُجَامَّد} \) \( \text{جمَادَى} \) \( \text{جَمَادَى} \) \( \text{جمَادَى} \) [328]: (a) what indicates that the \( \text{l} \) here is \( \text{أَعَج} \). is the derivation, since \( \text{حَبْلِي} \) is from \( \text{فَخْدَة} \) pregnancy, \( \text{سُكَرُى} \) from \( \text{سُكَرُى} \) drunkenness, and \( \text{يُجَامَّد} \) from \( \text{يُجَامَّد} \) being frozen: (b) what indicates that it denotes
femininization is the impossibility of Tanwin’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 قَبْعِّثَرَى سُمَّانَى [272, 326, 401, 497, 671], كُبْثَرَى بَأَتِلِّى [311], and quail, a kind of bird: (a) the ' 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 بَأَتِلِّاء a bean and سُمَّانَة 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 قَبْعِّثَرَى كُبْثَرَى (IY) it is like the ' of كَتَابٍ [401], because it exceeds the limit (M). Z means that the ' in كُبْثَرَى 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 كَتَابٍ and جَمَار [671] (IY).
§. 674. The ى [below] and ٧ [675] are similar (IM) to the ٜ [673], in that each of them, when it accompanies more than two rads., is judged to be aug. (A), as in تَتَيَّل [269, 347] and مَقَامُ [347] (Sn), if they do not occur [repeated (A),] as they are in بَيْوُرُ (IM), the name of a bird [of prey (Jh),] having talons, that resembles the ٞكَاشَق sparrow-hawk (A), and ٦خَوَع (IM), i.e., made a noise, in which sort [of formation] all the letters are judged to be rad., like the letters of سُسْسِم [671] (A); and if they be not initial, the ٧, unrestrainedly, according to the majority [675]; and the ى before four rads., in any [formation] other than the aor. [below], as A will mention (Sn). The division previously made in the ٜ [673] applies here also, so that we say:— the ى and ٧ have three states: for, (1) if either of them accompany two rads. only, it is rad., as in بَتُّ [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 ى or ٧ to be rad., as in أُيَدَّع [672] and مَزَوَّر [676], [like مَنَبَر (372), the bag for the traveller's provisions (Sn),] unless some indication shows (a) the
initial to be rad., and the ی or ْ to be aug., as in "أَوْلَئِكَ مَالِعْوَْئ وَلِإِلَيْ" [672] according to those who say لق and لق or ْلِإِلَيْ [671], because of their saying إطْلُل" or (b) the whole to be rad., as in مَرَّمْ Mary [the mother of Jesus (Nw),] and مِدَيْن مidian [a well-known district in Syria (Bk),] their measure being ْمَعُّلْلٌ; not ْمَعُّلٌ, because it is not [found] in the language; nor ْمَعُّلٌ [below], otherwise transformation [of the unsound letter] would be necessary (A), since مَرَّم and مَدَيْن [712] would be said, by transferring the vowel of the ی to the preceding quiescent, and then converting the ی into ٍ because orig. mobile, and now preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath: (α) this requires مرَّم to be an Arabic name, otherwise no judgment as to radicalness or augmentative-ness 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.) مَرَّم is ْمَعُّلٌ [above] (Jh, K, B), according to the GG (K), from رَأَم ْمَعُّلٌ [bq. ْمَعُّلٌ] quitted, aor. يَرَمَ (Jh), because ْمَعُّلٌ [with Fath of the ف (K)] is not found (K,B) among the formations, as عَثِّب ْمَرَّمُ and ُعْلَيْبَ [374] are found (K): (γ) [some say that] مرَّم is a foreign name (ID, Jk), there being no ْمَعُّلٌ, with Fath of the ف and ی, in the language of the Arabs (ID): (b) if the ambiguous be any [letter] other [than the
initial Hamza and $\mu$ (Sn)], it is judged to be rad., and the $\iota$ or $\j$ to be aug., so long as no indication shows the contrary of that, as in (a) $\mu\dot{\iota}$ [with the $\r$ doubled (Jh, Sn)], which is hard stone; and says IS, one of the names of $\aleph\beta\alpha\dot{\iota}l$ the vain, unreal, naught; and is said to be the mirage, as $\mu\dot{\iota}$ is Falser than the mirage (A): (α) IS says that they sometimes add an $\j$ to it, saying $\mu\dot{\iota}$ [272] (Jh, Md, A): (β) the letter which, but for the indication of augmentativeness, would be ambiguous, is the first $\iota$ (Sn): (γ) the first $\iota$ is decided to be aug. (A), [so that] $\mu\dot{\iota}$ is Falser (Jh, Md), because $\mu\dot{\iota}$ is not found in the language (Jh, Md, A), while there is no obscurity about the augmentativeness of the $\iota$ in such as $\mu\dot{\iota}$ is red (A): (δ) the $\iota$ s are not both rad., because $\iota$ is not rad. with trils. in the non-reduplicated: nor are they both aug., because a $n$. is not formed of two letters: nor is the second $\iota$ the aug., because $\mu\dot{\iota}$, with Fath of the $\f$, is not found in the language; while $\mu\dot{\iota}$, which is found, has Kasr of the $\f$; so that, if the second $\iota$ were aug., $\mu\dot{\iota}$, with Kasr of the initial, would be said, like $\dot{\j}h\dot{d}i^\mu$ [374] and $\dot{\j}h\dot{d}i^\mu stan$ skilful: and therefore the first must be the aug. (IY): (b) $\mu Izwit$ [675], which is the name of a place; and is said to be also [an cp., meaning] short: (α) the
is decided to be rad., and the ی [below] and ٠ aug. because its measure cannot be ّفُرْيَلٌ، since this is not found in the language; nor ٠فعْليِلٌ، because the ٠ is not rad. in quads. [675]; nor ّفَرْيَتٌ، because the word becomes without a ٠: so that its measure must be ّفعْليِلٌ، like ّعِفْرِيَتٌ [646] (A): (β) A's mention of the ی [in ّعِفْرِيَتٌ] 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 ُهَلْسَ بٰبٰ ْيَضَرِبٰ [below] and يَضَرِبٰ ْيَلْمَعٰ [404]; or in the middle, as in ُرَجْحِمٰ [349] and ُقَلِيِقٰ [calamity (MAR)]; or at the end, as in the nights [255]. And similarly with four or more rads., when the ی is non-initial, as in ُسُلْسُبْيِلٰ [398], ُسُلْسُبْيِلٰ [368, 401], and ُسُلْسُبْيِلٰ [399]: whereas, if it be initial, with four rads. after it, then, if the word be a v., like َيْدَحْوَرٰ ْيُدَحْوَرٰ rolls down [404], in this case also the ی is aug.; but, if not, it is rad., as in [below] (R). The ی is made aug., (1) in the n., when (a) first, as in َهَلْسَ بٰبٰ ْيَلْمَعٰ [mirage (Sn)]; (b) second, as in ُتَسَيَقٰمٰ [373]; (c) third, as in َضَيِصٰبٰ [385]; (d) fourth, as in ُجَذَرْيَةٰ [385]; (e) fifth, as in ُسُلْسُبْيِلٰ [above]; (f) sixth, as in ُمَغْفَنَاطِيِس magnet, lode-stone, [which is arabicized (Jh, KF)]; (g) seventh,
as in [with a single \(^{9}\) خُنْرَةٍ انْتِيَةٍ \(^{9}\) ] meaning pride (Sn)]; (2) in the v., when (a) first, as in يَضْرِبُ [above]; (b) second, as in [671]; (c) third, according to those who authorized \([482]\) among the formations of vs., as [\(^{6}\) تَلْسَيْتُ رَايَةٌ \(^{6}\) ] His judgment was unsound and (A on the Augmented Triliteral Verb)] (A), i.e., عَلِطَاً 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.] رُهْيَةٍ, 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 \([675]\), where \([482]\) also is said (Sn); (e) fifth, as in I put on him a [675], where \([482]\) also is said (Sn); (f) sixth, as in (A), i.e., I slept on my back (Sn). The following are [additional] exs. of the aug. یُّبْرَمَعٌ [372]; and, in the v., يُّبْقَعُd sits [482]: (2) when second, صَيْرَفٌ [373]: (3) when third, سُعْيَدٌ [671]: (4) when fourth, دِهْلِيرُزٌ [385], زَنِيَّةٌ vestsible, [which is Persian (Jh, Jk), arabicized (Jh),] and [396]: (5) when fifth, عَتْتَرِيسٌ [283]: (6) when sixth, عُتْتَرِيسٌ 119a
and ُعَنَنَا كَرْيَبَتُ dim. and broken pl. of ُعَمَّكَبُوَتُ [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 صَوْصِيَّة 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 ِصَوْصَيَّة 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 ِحَاجِبَتُ I called [goats (Jh, KF)] [673], where the ی is rad., because it is the first repeated; while their measure is ُقَعْلَتْ, the o. f. being ُحَيِّيَكَبُتُ and ُعِيَقَيْتُ, but the first ی being converted into ی because of the Fatha before it, as they say یَيِجَّلُ for یَيِجِّلُ [684]. And similarly I clucked and ُضَوْصَيْتُ [673], where the second ی is rad., because it is the first [و] repeated, their o. f. being ُضَرْصَوْتُ and ُتَوْقَتْ, the second [و] of which is converted into ی, because it occurs fourth, as in ُأَنْ عَيِّتْ أَعْرَيْتُ [629]. If it be said “Then why is it not aug., as in َجَعْيَتْ and ُسَلَقَيْتُ [673]?”, the reply is that, if this were so, ُضَوْصَيْتُ and ُتَوْقَتْ would become of the cat. of َوَلَرْتُ ُفَلْقُدْتُ was agitated, flurried and ُسَلَسُنَ was loose, slack, which is small, while the cat. of ُنَرْتُ and ُفَلْقُدْتُ [332] is
more numerous, and only the more numerous is acted upon. And, if it be said "Then make the \( \text{aug} \), as in \( \text{I collected} [675] \) and \( \text{I collected} [482] \)"; the reply is that, if this were done, they would become of the \( \text{cat. of} [357, 671] \), whose \( \text{is} \) and \( \text{are} \) homogeneous, which is smaller than \( \text{the cat. of} [\text{above}] \) and \( \text{[above]} \) (IY). When the \( \text{is} \) is initial, then, if followed by three \( \text{rads.} \), it is \( \text{aug.} \), as in \( \text{[above]} \) above; but, if followed by four \( \text{rads.} \), in any \( \text{formation} \) other than the \( \text{aor.} \) \( \text{[above]} \), it is \( \text{rad.} \), like the \( \text{is} \) in \( \text{[401, 678] (A)} \), upon the measure of \( \text{[401] (Sn)} \), because the derivation does not indicate augmentative-ness in such cases, except in the \( \text{aor.} \) \( \text{[404, 497] (A)} \), like \( \text{[above]} \) (Sn). \( \text{[in the poem of} \text{'Urwa (Jh) Ibn AlWard al'Absi, who says} \\
\text{I obeyed those who bade (me) to part from Salma: then they fled away into the regions of AlYasta'ur (ISk),] is the name of a place (Jrb, A), a district (R) in AlHijáz (R, A), near the stony ground of AlMadina (Jrb), remote, entered by hardly any one (ISk): and it is [also the name of (A)] a tree, [the wood of] which is used for tooth-picks (Jrb, A), its tooth-picks being extremely good (KF'); and a cloth put upon the crupper of the camel; and one of the
names of calamities (Jrb); and [i. q. the vain, unreal, naught, because (R)] *ذَهَبَ فِي آْلىْسَعْعُور* He, or *It, went into, i. e., came to, naught* is said (R, Jrb), i. e., *فِي الْبَاطِل* (Jrb). As for *يَا ُجَجُّ* Yo’jaj, which is the name of a place [eight miles from Makka (MI)], the *ى* at its beginning is *rad.*, that being indicated by the display of the reduplication; whereas, if the *ى* were *aug.*, *يَا ُجَجُّ* would be from *أَِّ جَ، aor. يَا ُجَجُّ*; and it would be necessary to incorporate, and say *جُوْجَ [482]*, like *is choked* and *يَغْضُّ lower*: so that, since they do not incorporate, this indicates that the last *ج* is *aug.*, for co-ordination with the paradigm of *جَعْفَر* [392]; for which reason they do not incorporate, since, if they incorporated, the object would be nullified, and the commensurability would cease. But some of the Traditionists pronounce the [first (Bk, MI)] *جَ،* with Kasr, saying *يَا ُجَجُّ*: and, if what they transmit be correct, the *ى* is *aug.*, because there is no *جَعْفَر*, with Kasr of the *ف*, in the language; and the display of the reduplication is anomalous, of the same class as [in] *مَكْبَثْ* Mahbab [4] (IY).

§. 675. The *, like the t [673], is not made *aug.* when initial: and their saying *ذَرْنَتْلُ [671, 677]* is like *جَكْسَفُلْ* [671] (M), the *ى* in it being part of the word
itself; while the د [677] is aug., co-ordinating [it] with سَقّرَعْنَل [393, 401], its measure being مَعَنَّل [395] (IY). The opinion of the majority [674] is that the د 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 حمزة [683]; and similarly when pronounced with كسر, although conversion of the د pronounced with كسر into حمزة is less frequent; and, when pronounced with فتح, it would be liable to conversion into حمزة, because the initials of the n. and v. are pronounced with دامم in the dim. [274] and pass. [436, 482], respectively: so that, since making it aug. at the beginning would lead to its conversion into حمزة, they avoid doing so, because conversion of the د into حمزة would sometimes occasion confusion (A) with the word whose [initial] حمزة is original, unconverted, as in كْل left, which, in the pass. [كْل was left], is liable to conversion of the د into حمزة, in which case it would be confounded with كْل was eaten, the حمزة of which is rad. (Sn). Some, however, assert that the د of زْرَنَنْل [above] is aug., extraordinarily, because the د is not rad. in quads.: but this is weak, because it leads to the formation مَعَنَّل, which is not found; while the correct [opinion] is that the د is rad., and that the د is aug., as in مَهْبُجَل i. q.
a mode of walking with the toes turned in, and the heels turned out (A), or, as A afterwards says, i. q. [681] (Sn), and in i. q. [a worn-out garment (Sn)], since there are precedents for the augmentativeness of the ج when final, contrary to the augmentativeness of the ج when initial (A). When not initial, [but medial, with three or more rad. letters (IY),] it is only aug., as in وَسَجَّح جَّوَّرَ [373] and حَرْقَل [482], قَسَّرَ a lion [253] and [threw into a pit (IY)], ضَرَّفُوْان [283, 385]; َعُفْفْوُان [283, 389], and تَلْفَسُوْة [254, 390, 674], except when that [indication of radicalness] intervenes which is [found] in عَزْوَيْت [674] (M). In that [position as medial, with three or more rad.,] it occurs (1) second, as in جُوْر [369] and صُوْمَا [674]; (2) third, as in جُدْوُل [671] and رَهْـيْـل آَرْجُل The man swaggered in his walk; (3) fourth, as in جُوْرَ and ضَرَّفُوْة [above], إِخْرَوْط [482]; (4) fifth, as in عُفْفُوْان [368, 401] and مَنْكَجُوْن [398, 676] (IY). The ج is made aug., (1) in the n., when (a) second, as in جُوْر [671]: (b) third, as in عَكْمُوْز [369, 673]: (c) fourth, as in عَرْطُوْة [248, 301]: (d) fifth, as in تَلْفَسُوْة [above]: (e) sixth, as in أَرْبَعَارَى [272] (A), with دَامَم of the Hamza and ب, as in the KF; but with فَث of the Hamza on the authority of سُت and دُم (Sn): (2)
in the v., when (a) second, as in حَوْتَلّ [above]: (b) third, as in جَهْوَرَ جَهْوَر [482, 671] (A), i. e., raised his voice: (a) as for Jahwar, like جَعْفَر [392], it is the name of a place (Sn): (c) fourth, as in إِغْدُودَةٌ [482, 671] (A).

§ 676. The case of the م, in respect of augmentativeness, is [exactly (IY)] like that of the Hamza [672]. For the position of its augmentativeness is [mostly (Jrb)] where it occurs as an initial in trils., because the Hamza is [uttered] from the first outlet of the throat, vid. what is next to the thorax [732]; while the م is [uttered] from the lips, which are the first outlet from the other end [of the vocal organs]: so that the م [like the Hamza] is made aug. when initial, in order that their two outlets may correspond to the position of their augmentativeness (IY, Jrb). And, when non-initial [below], they are not judged to be aug., except when some indication shows them to be so (Jrb). But [the Hamza is made aug. in the n. and v.; whereas (Jrb)] the م is made aug. only in the n. [253] (IY, Jrb). The م is not made aug. in the v., [being one of the augments of ns., wherein vs. have no portion (IY)]: and, for that reason, [the saying of 'Umar (ID, Jh, IY, KF), according to Jh, but, rightly, of the Apostle of God, transmitted by Abū Ḥadrad, the Companion (KF),] Imitate the sons of Ma‘add is cited as evidence that the م of مَعَد [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 سبَحَلِ اللَّهِ [41] and He said حَسَدَ اللَّهِ 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 مَنبِيجُ Mambij [below] the name of a city, is aug., and ن rad., since you may not make them both rad., because there is no جغفر with Kasr of the ف among o. fs.; nor both aug., because the infl. 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). مَنبِيجُ [below] is made to accord with مقتَنل [671] and مَسرِب [333, 361] the unknown being made to accord with the known. And, as for مَعدُ [above] and مَعَزَى [375, 673], their predicament, and their variance from this rule, have been already mentioned (R). The derivation of مَعدٍ is from [one of] two things, مَعدٍ being either مَعُدٌ from عَدَدٌ number, as though it were مَعدٌ,
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 ٰ صلابة hardness (ID). As for مَعَرَى, [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 م part of the word itself (Jk)]: so that its م is rad., because of their saying مَعْرِب and مَعَرَى ٰ [673], which are ٰ نَهْل and نَعْل; whereas, if the م in مَعَرَى were aug., and those paradigms were formed from it, مَعَرَى ٰ and مَعَرَى ٰ 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 مَسْعَد [361] and مَبْيِج [above], [which, says Jh, is the name of a place (Tsr),] contrary to such as (a) سَرْغًا [lion, because the م is not initial (Tsr)]; (b) مَهْدِ [cradle, because the م is not followed by three rads. (Tsr)]; (c) مَرْجَوش [or مَرْجَوش (below)] (Aud), i. q. مَرْدَقَوش marjoram, [the arabicized form of مَروش 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) \[\text{soft wool (Tsr)}\], because they say �_loghُ \text{a garment made of soft wool}, retaining the \( \text{مُسْرَع} \) [inseparably (Tsr)] in derivation (Aud), with which [argument] IM refutes the saying of S that the \( \text{م} \) in it is \text{aug.} [below]. It is also a condition of the augmentativeness of the \( \text{م} \) that its word should not be a \text{quad.} composed of two letters [repeated], like \( \mu^\circ \text{مُرْمَر} \text{marble, alabaster and مَهْمَة} \text{vast desert (Tsr)}. What fulfils the conditions mentioned is judged to be \text{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 \( \text{م} \) of \[\text{a comb, and a cooking-pot of stone or copper (Sn)}\], \( \text{مَغَفُور} \text{manna, [a thing, like honey, exceeded by the ُثَمَام panic-grass, عُمْشُر gigantic swallow-wort, and رَمْثُر dwarf-tamarisk (Sn),] and مُرْرَع} \text{[272] (A) or مُرْرَع} \text{[above] or مُرْرَع} \text{[273], with Kasr, and sometimes Fath, of the \( \text{م} \) in all (Sn), which is judged to be \text{rad.}, although it is followed by three \text{rads.} [only]. As for مِرْجَلُ [above], the opinion of S and most GG is that its \( \text{م} \) is \text{rad.}, because of their saying مِرْجَلُ آلْمَكْاَثُك آلْتَوْبُ The weaver wove the cloth decorated with figured work called مَرْجَلُ [below] (A); whereas, if the \( \text{م} \) were \text{aug.}, they would say رَجَلُ by eliding it (Sn): IKh says "The مُرْجَلُ is a cloth.
worked with circles like the مَرَاجِل [above], which are cooking-pots of copper" (A), or of stone (Sn). But AAMr holds that the مَرَاجِل مَرَاجِل is aug., relying upon the rule mentioned; and pronounces its retention in derivation to be like the retention of the م in [above] from مَسْكَنَة lowliness, مَتَدَأَل from مَدْرَعَة [379], and مَتَدَأَعَ put on the مَدْرَعَة tunic, where the م is aug.; though he has no argument in that, because the most frequent [formation] is مَسْكَنْ [483], مَتَدَأَل, and مَتَدَأَع, which, Mz says, is the most frequent in the language of the Arabs. As for مَغُفرُ [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 دَعَوْا يَمْغُفُرُون They went gathering مَغُفرُ [above], which is [here said by A to be] a kind of truffle. And as for مُرْجِز [above], S holds its م to be aug. [above]: but some, and among them IM, hold it to be rad., because of their saying كَسَاة مُرْجِز wrapper made of مُرْجِز, not مُرْجِز (A); while IM, says IUK, avers that S is bound to agree that it is rad. in مُرْجِز, 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) دلَّمِص 384, 681.A] (R,A), دُمَّٰلٌص; دُمَّٰلٌص [below] (A) in some MSS, but, in other MSS, دُلْص [below], and دُمَّٰلٌص, [all with Damm of the first, Fath' of the second, and Kasr of the penultimate (Sn),] because of their saying دَرِع دَلَّامِص 246] or دُلْص, and كَلَّسَتة أَنا I made it glitter: (a) Mz holds that the م in دلَّامْص [and its fellows, adds IUK (Sn),] is rad., although دلَّامْص agrees with دلَّاص in sense; so that according to him, it is of the cat. of سِبْط long, extended and سِبْط [245, 392, 679, 681] (A), i. e., of syns. agreeing in the bulk of the letters, the not being aug., but rad., since it is not one of the letters of سَمْتُمْبُونِهَا 671, nor a duplicate of a rad. (Sn): (b) as for حِمْارِص sour, as لَبَنُ حِمْارِص sour milk, as though it يَخْرُصُ أَلْسَانَ 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 إِنْتَقْحَل 382] are aug., because of their saying رَهَمُ فَتْحٌ and رَهَمُ فَتْحٌ 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 هَرَمَاس 331 also,
which, according to what As transmits, is a name of the lion, is *aug.* its paradigm being *فرَصَال،* because it is from *غَرْس* 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 *غَرْسُ* [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 *m* is *aug.* here (IY): (2) *قَرْطَمُ* [below] (R,A) and its cat., [i. e., every tril. to whose final *m* is added for multiplication of the letter, and intensification of the sense (Sn).] as *دِلْقُمُ* [an old woman, and an aged she-camel whose teeth are broken (Sn)], *ضَرْزُمُ* [like *جَعْمُرُ* or *ضَرْزَمُ* (392), a she-camel aged, or having some remains of youth in her, or old and giving little milk (Sn)], *[عَشْكُمُ* [a spacious place, and a man easy in mind (Sn)], and *دِرْدُمُ* [with Kasr of the two *س* s, a woman that comes and goes by night, and an aged she-camel (Sn)], because they are from *رَقَةُ* blueness, *إِنْدَلََانِ* coming out, *نِرْزُ* niggardly and *إِفْسَاحُ* a she-camel giving little milk, *نَافِعَةُ* being spacious, and *كَرَِّدُ* losing one’s teeth, becoming toothless, the qual. from which is *أَذْرُ* toothless and
On the measure of $\surd^4$ (A), when the $m$ precedes three letters, one of which admits of being $\text{rad.}$ or $\text{aug.}$, the $m$ is judged to be $\text{aug.}$, and that ambiguous [letter] to be $\text{rad.}$, unless some indication exists to the contrary: and therefore the $m$ of $\text{moses}$ [673] and $\text{moroon}$ [674] is judged to be $\text{aug.}$; while, as to the $m$ of $\text{mike}$ [shield (Sn)], two sayings are transmitted from S, the sounder of which is that it is $\text{aug.}$: but, if some indication shows the $m$ to be $\text{rad.}$, one judges in accordance therewith, as the of $\text{mahdad}$, [a woman's name (Sn),] and $\text{ajaj}$ Ma'jjaj, [a place (Sn),] is judged to be $\text{rad.}$, and one of the two similar letters to be $\text{aug.}$, since, if the $m$ were $\text{aug.}$, the measure would be $\text{mufall}$, so that incorporation would be necessary [712]; though Sf allows the $m$ of $\text{mahdad}$ and $\text{ajaj}$ to be $\text{aug.}$, their dissolution [of incorporation] being anomalous, like that of $\text{alaaj}$ in $\text{allah} \text{alulai alajjil}$ $\text{alawee}$ $\text{alfast}$ $\text{alwoeh}$ $\text{almaejjil}$ (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 $m$ precedes four or more $\text{rads.}$, as in $\text{zarrejoush}$ (above) or $\text{marjoram}$, [the arabicized form of $\text{moose-ear}$ (KF),] it is judged to be $\text{rad.}$, except when the word containing it is one of the $\text{ns.}$ connected with $\text{vs.}$ [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 J; the word being quad. in origin, but the second ن being repeated in order that it may be co-ordinated with عضَرَ فوضَ [368,401]; and its paradigm being مَثْكَنْيٌّ مُفَعَّلَلُوُ. And, as for مَكَانْيَة ballista, the م in it is rad., and the ن after it aug., because they say in its pl. مَكَانْيَة, 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 مَثْكَنْيٌّ [382] and [387]. This is the opinion of S and Mz; and, according to them, its measure is عَنْتَرِيْس, like مَثْكَنْيٌّ, فَنْعِيَْلَلُ. Others, however, say that the first ن and the م are augs., together, inasmuch as some of the Arabs say جَنْقُناَهُم meaning: We shot them with the ballista; while AU transmits from some of the Arabs مَاتِنَا نُكِنِّق. We have not ceased to shoot with the ballista; and, according to this, its measure is مَنْفَعِيْلُ: but the correct
opinion is that of S, because of their saying, in the broken pl., مَكْجَانِيْقُ [above] (IY). The مَرْحَبٌ spaciousness [60]: (2) second, as in دُلْيَصً [above]: (3) third, as in دُمَلِصً [above]: (4) fourth, as in ّزَرَّتُم [above]: (5) fifth, as in ُضَبَارَمُ sturdy, strongly made, because it is from ُثَرَبُ, which is strength of make; but IU holds that in ُضَبَارَم١ it is ṭad.: (a) Jh says in the ۸ا۴ٽ: “The ُضَبَارَم١ in the strongly made lion” (A).

§. 677. The ن, (1) when final, is made aug. upon the two conditions [672] (Aud) mentioned for the final Hamza, vid. that it be preceded by an ل, and that this ل be preceded by more than two ṭads. [below], the substantive and ep. being alike in that respect (Tsr), as in ٌعُتْبَان٢ [250, 274, 385] and ُعَضْبَان٢ [250, 348]; contrary to such as ُأَمَا٠ protection and ُسِنَان٢ spear-head (Aud), where the ل is preceded by two ṭads., not by more than two (Tsr); (a) it is prescribed as a [third] condition for augmentativeness of the [final] ن, in addition to what has been mentioned, that the excess of what precedes the ل over two letters should not be a reduplication of a ṭad., [i.e., of the في, not of any ṭad. 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 جنَّجان [with Kasr of the first ج, orig. جنَّكِن head of a rib, like سِسَم (below) (Sn),] is rad., not aug.: and this condition is imported [above] from IM's saying "And judge [all (IA)] the letters of سِسَم [671, 674] to be rad." (A), because جنَّجان is orig. جنَّكِن, like سِسَم, 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 ی and ن to be affixed to the cps. whose fem. is ُعَضَبَان [272], as ُعَضَبَان [above], سَكْرَان [250, 348, 385], and ُعَطْشَان [250], because cps. 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 [ی and ن in substantives, such as عُمَأَرْ [4] and ُعَطْشان [above] is because they are made to accord with cps.: (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 مَرَأَن [with Damm, a tree of which spears are made (Jh on مر), spears, n. un. مَرَأَن (Jh on مر),] is rad.; and that مَرَأَن is [فعَال (Jh)] from مَرَأَن (Jh)] from لِبَيْن (Jh) [softness, smoothness: (a) مَرَأَن Marrān, with Fath [of its first (Bk)] and doubling [of its second (Bk)], is the name of 121 a
a place (Jrb), [a journey of] two nights from Makka, on the road to AlBaṣra, wherein is the grave of Tamīm Ibn Murr (Jh): (e) as for قِبْطَان [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 قَنَّن [branch (T), lock of hair, tress]; and similarly in حُسَان Hassān [below] and حِمَارُ قِبَانِ [7], when triptote, we recognize, by the triptote declension, that the ن is one of the three rads. (R): (f) حُسَان [below] is either from حَسَّ الْقَوْم meaning Killed the people quickly, aor. يَحِسُ, inf. n. حَسُ; or from حَسَّ beauty: and, if it be from حَسَّ, the ن is rad.; but, if it be from حَسُ, the ن is aug. (ID): analogy requires the ن to be aug., and حَسَّان حُسَان جَمِّارَ قِبَانٍ [7] is properly جَمَّارُ قِبَانِ [from قِبَان فِي الْأَرْضِ فَعَلَنَ] went away through the land, i. q. ذَهَبَ (IY on §. 7), and diptote: but it may be derived from حَسَ, in which case the ن is rad., and it is triptote: (g) the حِمَارُ قِبَانِ is properly قَبَان فِي الْأَرْض فَعَلَن [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 न to be clearly *aug.* in the case where a double letter, as in ख़िसान [above] and रमान [below], or a [sound] letter and a soft letter, as in उक्षीन *superscription, title* are interposed between the । and the न; and this looseness is in agreement with the opinion of the majority, who judge the न in such as उक्षान and उक्षान to be *aug.*, unless some indication shows it to be *rad.*, because the diptote declension of ख़िसान in the saying of the poet [Umayya Ibn Khalaf alKhuza’i, satirizing Ḥassān (MN, Sn) Ibn Thābit alAnsārī (MN),]

*Now who will be conveying to Ḥassān from me a message carried from town to town, that will creep to ‘Ukūz? (MN, Sn)] shows its न to be *aug.*; but in the Tashīl and the Kāfiya he holds the न 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 न when final, vid. that it should not be in a न. whose first is pronounced with Դamm, and whose second is doubled, when [such न. is] a name of a *plant*, as रमान [above], in which case they make it *rad.*, because नुमाल in names of *plants* is more frequent.*
than \(عَلَانٍ\); and IM adopts this [opinion] in the Kāfiya: but it is refuted by the fact that augmentativeness of the \(ل\) and \(ن\), when final, is more frequent than the occurrence of [the name of] a plant upon [the measure of] \(عَلَالٍ\); while the opinion of Khl and S is that the \(ن\) of \(مَّالٍ\) is \(عَلَّ\). S says "I asked him", i. e., Khl, "about \(مَّالٍ\) 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 \(ل\) and \(ن\) (Sn),] 'since it has no meaning whereby it is recognizable', [i. e., because it has no sign whereby the state of its \(ن\) is recognizable (Sn)]: (j) Akh, however, says "Its \(ن\) is \(رَادٌ\), like [the final of] طَرَّاضٌ [chamomile (Sn)] and حَمَاضٌ [384], because \(عَلَالٍ\) is more frequent than \(عَلَالٍ\), 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 \(ل\) and \(ن\), when final, is more frequent than the occurrence of (the name of) a plant upon (the measure of) \(عَلَالٍ\); but because the \(ن\) is retained in derivation, as \(أَرْضٌ مُّرَمّنة\) [364]; whereas, if the \(ن\) were \(عَلَّ\), they would say \(أَرْضٌ مُّرَمّنة\) (A): (2) when medial, is made \(عَلَّ\) 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)*, *quiescence* [384, 671], *quiesce* [283], and *quiesce* [671, 675]; contrary to *ambergris*, [where it is preceded by one letter, and followed by two (Tsr)], *quiescent*. *stork, crane, [an aquatic bird, long in the neck, where it is mobile, not quiescent (Tsr),]* *unincorporated, as in [lion (Tsr)*, *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 *unincorporated* [below] (Aud) *a bulky, [hardy, strong (KF)] he-camel, where it is incorporated (Tsr): (a) the *n* 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 *y* of *sidex* [395], the *y* of *kades* [395], and the *a* of *addar* [395, 673] and *kades* [395]; (b) that it is mostly interchangeable with the soft letter, as in their saying *sharaa* [671] and *sharite* [395], *like thick, corpulent (Sn),* for *thick in the hands, bulgy, and burly,* [with Fath of the *q* and *re*], *quiescence of the *n*, and Fath of the *c* (Sn)] and *quiescence* [400] for a *plant;* (c) that it is found to be *aug.* in every [word] whose derivation or variation is known, [such as *jikena* (671) (Sn),] with which the others, [like *sharite* (Sn),] are made to accord (A): (b) they say *unincorporated* [392, 395], where the [first] *n* 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 ً صَلْبُ ً عَرَنَّدَدٌ 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. ٍ عَرَْدٕ (below)]; while the last د also is aug., co-ordinating ً عَرَنَّدَدٌ [401] (IY): (d) the first restriction [mentioned by IHSh above, vid. that the ن should be medial,] excludes the ن occurring as an initial [below], which is rad., as in ً ْنُهَشٌ [wolf (Sn)]; unless some indication decide it to be aug., as in ً نَرْجِسٕ narcissus, [681. A], because, if the ن were rad., its measure would be ٍ دُقَّلٓ [with Kasr of the first ل (Sn)], which is not found [392]: (e) the second restriction, [vid. that the ن should be exactly in the middle between four letters,] excludes such as ً ٌ قَنْطَأ رٕ a hundred weight, ً خَنْدٕ رِيْسٕ عْنَقُودٕ [253, 396, 674], ً ٌ ٌ دُيْلٕ a bunch, ً خَنْدٕ لِيْبٕ [253, 401], and ً عَنْدَلِبٕ nightingale, where it is rad.: unless some indication decide it to be aug., as in (a) ً عَنْبَسٕ ْلِيْبَسٕ lion, because it is from ً عُبْوسٕ frowning; (b) ً حَنْطَأْلٕ [254, 681, A], because of their saying ً حُطَّلَتْ آَلَا بُل [The camels ate much colocynth (Sn)]; (c) ً عَنْسَلَ ً عَسْلَلٕ [373], because it is from ً عَسْلَانَ going swiftly; (d) ً عَرْنَدٕ [374], because it is from their saying ٍ شَيْ ٍ عِرَدٕ a hard thing
[above], i. e., صلب كَنَّهَل (394, 671), [with Fath or Damm of the ب (Sn),] because they say, in place of it, كَنَّهَل [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 نَعَلُ with Damm of the doubled ج, so there is among them no نَعَلُ with Damm of the first ج (Sn)]: (f) the third restriction, [vid. that the ن should be quiescent,] excludes such as غرنيق [above], which is [an aquatic bird, and (Sn)] the exalted chief خُرْنُوب a kind of tree, and كُنا بِل 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 نَعَلُ or نَعَلُ in the language: (g) the fourth [restriction, vid. that the ن should not be incorporated,] excludes such as عَكَجَّس [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 عَكَجَّس is held to be نَعَلُ [396], like عَدَبَّس [strong (Jh, KF, Sn), firmly made (Jh, KF)]: but AH says "What I hold is that the two
as augmented (A, Tsr); and the proof is that we find the two ْنَس is to be augmented in those words whose derivation is recognizable, as ْنَسَقَط [with a double ْن (Sn), fat, flabby (KF)], and ْنَزَّنَك [short and mean-looking (Jh)], which are from ْنَسَـعْطَة [bigness of belly (Sn)] and ْنَزَى [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 augmented in the aor. [404] (Aud), as ْنَصْرَب We strike (Tsr). The ْن is regularly made augmented in (1) the aor., as ْنَصَـْر [above] and its variations, like ْنَصْرَـْلَق [332, 667], [ْنَصْرَـْلَق], (382), etc.; (2) ْنَصْرَـْلَق [and its variations], like ْنَصْرَـْجَم [332, 667], [ْنَصْرَـْجَم] (495), etc.: and the reason why IM is silent about them is only that they are manifest. He does not mention the Tanwín [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 augmented when (1) first, as in ْنَصْرَب [above]; (2) second, as in
(1159)

[above]; (3) third, as in ^ضَيَّعُ[above]; (4) fourth, as in ^عُضَّنَّ[375, 671]; (5) fifth, as in (A, Tsr) ^عُضْنُ[above] (A) [and] ^سَرْحَانُ[250] (Tsr); (6) sixth, as in ^عَبْوُ دُرْانُ[283, 399]; (7) seventh, as in (A, Tsr) ^عَبْيُثْرَانُ [283, 400] (A) or (Sn) ^عَبْيُثْرَانُ [400], which is a sweet-smelling plant (Tsr, Sn). In other cases it is rad., except in such as (1) ^عَنْسُلُ[above]: (2) ^عَفَرْنَى [253, 378] (M), which is one of the names of the lion, as though he were so named because of his strength: (a) its measure is ^تَعْلُنَى, the ن and ا in it being aug. (IY): (3) ^بَلْهَنَّى [248, 331] (M), meaning a pleasant life, as ^نَلَانُ نَيْ بَلْهَنَّى مِنَ الْعِيْشُ Such a one is in ease of life, i. e., ^نَيْ بَلْهَنَّى سَعَةٌ: (a) the ن and ا are aug. for co-ordination with ^تُدْعَ عَمْلُ [401], but the ا becomes ى because of the Kasra before it; and their saying ^عِيْشَ أَبْلِهُ careless, or easy, life, i. e., having few griefs, indicates that the ن and ا are aug. (IY): (4) ^حِفْقَيِقُ[400] (M), which is calamity; and also light, or active, said of a woman: (a) the ن in it is aug., because it is from ^حِفْقَ which is ^ضَرْبٌ[399] (IY).

§. 678. The ُ is aug. in [four positions (A),] (1) the fem. [263] (IM), as (a) ^ضَارَّةٌ [263, 265] and 
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[161, 607, 646] (A), like قَامَتْ [263, 264, 267, 679] (IA, Aud) and قَامَتْ [263, 646] (Ts); and قَامَتْ [265, 336] (A), so in some MSS, with the tied s, meaning the n. un. from ضَرِبَتْ ضَرِبُتْ; but ضَرِبَتْ in other MSS, with an extended ت, as being a pass. v.: (a) as for the notion that it is ضَرِبَتْ [161, 403], with a ت of the 2nd pers. pronounced with Kasr, it is a blunder, since this ت 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 رَبْتَ [505], لَتْ [540], and لَتَ [109] (Sn): (c) "in the fem." means "in a sing." as IA exemplifies it; or "a pl.,” like مُسَلَّبَاتٌ [234, 646] (MKh): (d) IHsh says "In my opinion, the [quiescent] ت 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 s of مُسَلَّبَاتٍ [402] and مُسَلَّبَاتٌ [above], which is part of a word, for which reason the inflection settles on it [402, 607]” (Sn): (e) as for the [mobile] s [679] of feminization, [which, like the quiescent ت, is not mentioned in the SH under the aug. ت, R says that] it [also] is a p. [294], not a formative letter (R): (b) آنَتْ 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], (α) that the َّ is the pron. and َّ 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 تَفْعَلُ [165] (IA), like َّ تَصَّبَّرْ 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) إِسْتَفْعَالُ [332, 667] (IM), where it is made aug. together with the َّ [680] (IA), and إِسْتَفْعَالٌ (R, Aud, A, MKh), like إِسْتَخْرَاجٌ [368] (IA, A, Tsr) and إِفْتَدَارٌ [667] (A, Tsr, MKh); تَفْعَلُ [332] (R, Jrb, Aud, MKh) and تَفَاعُلُ (R, Jrb, Tsr, MKh), as تَكْسَمُ breaking [intrans.] in pieces [486] and تَجَمَّلُ تَصَّارَبُ fighting together [487] (Tsr), like تَجَمَّلُ تَحْرَجُ [332] and تَقَانُلُ تَجاَرَبُ fighting together (MKh); and تَفْعَلُلُ تَجَّرَبُ (below) (R, Jrb); and the derivs. thereof (R, IA, Aud, A, MKh), vid. the v. and part. (Tsr, Sn),
like [493] and [387] (IA): (b) ْتَفْعِيلُ (332) and [332, 334] (R, A, Tsr, MKh), as ْتَرْدِيدُ. much rejecting (A, Tsr), like ْتَفْقِيدٌ يَسُ. hallowing, sanctifying, consecrating (MKh), and ْتَرْدِيدٌ [334]; without their derivs. (A, Tsr, MKh), because there is no ْتُ in their derivs. (Tsr), as ْتَرْدِيدُ rejected much and ْرَدَّ ْتَرْدِيدٌ rejecting much (Sn), like ْقَدْسُ hallowed, etc., and ْرَدَّ ْتَرْدِيدٌ rejected (MKh), which are without ْتُ (Sn, MKh): (4) the quasi-pass. (IM) of the ْتَعْلَمَ [or ْتَعْلُم١] (IA), from the tril. and quad. (Tsr), as (a) ْتَعْلَمَ He learnt [432] (IA, Aud, A), inf. n. ْتَعْلَم١ ْتَعْلُم٨ (332) (A), quasi-pass. of ْتَعْلَم١ I taught him (IA); (b) ْتَدَّ حَرَجَ [495. A] (IA, Aud, A), inf. n. ْتَدَّ حَرَج١ ِتَعْلَم١ and [487], inf. n. ْتَعْلَم١ ِتَعْلَم١ (A). As for the ْتُ of such as ْتَرْمَس١ [482], its augmentativeness is not regular (Sn). In any [position] other than those mentioned, the ْتُ is not judged to be aug., except by reason of some indication (A). IM's confining himself to what is mentioned intimates that the ْتُ of ْتَرْجِمَان inter- preter, translator, with Fath or Damm of the ْتُ and ْج, or Fath of the ْتُ and Damm of the ْج, is rad.; and this is the sounder [opinion], as is proved by the retention of the ْتُ in the remaining variations of the word, which is arabicized, or, as is said, Arabic (Sn). The ْتُ
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 عَوْسِجُ تَنْصُب [373], and Tanqub, a town near Makka (Sn),] [the fox, or its cub (372, 671) (Sn)], تَنْذَرُ [331, 372], and تحْلِي [274, 372] (A): (a) as for the irregular augmentativeness of the ت [when initial], it is [also in] such as [283, 334, 379], which is from تَنْفَعَلَّ (α) [334, 379], which is from تَنْفَعَلَّ the thing was dry and hard, i. q. صَلَبَ and بَيْانَ (γ) [334, 379] from مَلِل likeness; (β) صَلَبَ [332, 334, 379] from بَيْانَ plainly [332, 334, 379] from لِقَانَ (δ) [334, 379] from لِقَانَ meeting; (ε) [334, 379] from صَرَبَ covering: and, in all of that, the ت, but for the derivation, would be rad., because it corresponds to the of سِرْحَان [253] and the س of سِرْحَان [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 رَغْبَةَ humbly petitioning, supplicating, رَحْمَةَ mercy, pity, مَلَكُوتَ kingdom [681. A], and رَجُوبَهُ خَيْرُ مِنْ Jb [331, 385] (A): (α) they say رَجُوبَهُ جَبَرَوْتَ Fear is better than pity, [i. e., That thou
shouldst be feared is better than that thou shouldst be pitied (Md)]: (β) رَحْمَوْتَی [272]; but this is rare, not to be copied (IY): Mb says رَحْمَوْتَی خَبَرَ مِن رَحْمَوْتِی (Md): (b) تَرَنُّومَث 튀ănging, which is the sound of the bow upon shooting, because it is from تَرَنُّومَث trilling, quavering, its measure being عَنْكَبُوْتُ [399, 646] (A): (α) when the ت is at the end of the word, after the aug. ت. 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 سُبْرَوتُ [a desert land, and a man having nothing (MAR),] is دُعْلُوْل [below]; but he holds augmentativeness in the like to be recognizable only by derivation, as in مَلْكُوْتُ جَبَرُوْتُ and مَلْكُوْتُ [above], because they are from حَبْرِیَة haughtiness and مَلْکُوْدَی dominion [681. A]; and so in سُبْرَوتُ [above], ۰ رَحْمَوْتَی, and ۰ رَهْبُوْتَی (β) similarly S does not hold the ت which is at the end [of the word], after the [aug.] ت. when preceded by three rads., as in عَفْرِیَت [646, 674, 681. A], to be one of the prevalent [augs.], the augmentativeness of the ت in عَفْرِیَت being, according to him, recognizable by derivation from عَفْر [343], which is the wicked, crafty: (γ) in سُبْرَوتُ S makes unprecedentedness preponderate over derivation; and therefore says that it is دُعْلُوْل [above],
like ٤ُعْدُرُت ٤ُعْدُرُت [253, 396]; not ٤ُعْدُرُت [below], because this is extraordinary: but the better [course] is what some take, vid. to make derivation preponderate, and judge it to be co-ordinated with ٤ُعْدُرُت, although ٤ُعْدُرُت is extraordinary, on the evidence of the obvious derivation, because ٤ُعْدُرُت is the skilful guide, who 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) : (δ) the opinion of S is that the ٤ُعْدُرُت is rad., because they say, in the sense of it, ٤ُعْدُرُت; 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 إِسْتِفَعَال and إِسْتِفَعَال 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 ٤ُسْتَعْجُرُت [401; 674], and a subst. for the in ٤ُكُلَّتا [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) ٤ُتُرَبُّ in ٤ُتُرَبُّ [274, 372] (M), i. q. أَلْشَىٰ أَلْشَىٰ أَلْرَابُبُ the established thing, where the first ن is aug., because, according to S, there is no [paradigm] in the language like جُعْفَرُ جُعْفَرُ with Damm of the ج [392] while, according to
Akh also, it is aug., because ٌٍْٓ ٌٍْٓ 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 ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ [372, 681]. A] for a kind of tree, where the ٌٓ is aug. because there is no [paradigm] in the language like ٌٍْٓ ٌٍْٓ with ُّٓ of the ٌٓ ف [392, 671]: (b) similarly ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ [above] with ُّٓ, and ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ [372] with ُّٓ, of the ٌٓ ف are said, where the first ٌٓ is unavoidably aug., according to him that pronounces with ُّٓ, because of the unprecedentedness [of ٌٍْٓ ٌٍْٓ]; and is also aug. according to him that pronounces with ُّٓ, because it is not rad. in one dial. var., and aug. in another (IY): (2) ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ [689] (M), which, according to the Bdd, is ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ, 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) ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ [385], meaning a period of time, the first ٌٓ of which is aug., because they say, in the same sense, ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ and ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ, like ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ and ٌٍْٓ آٌٍْ [254]; so that the elision of the ٌٓ is an indication of its augmentativeness (IY).

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

*فَرَجَتْ آلَةِ الظَّلَالَمَ بِأَمْامَيْكَ* [below] (Tsr): (a) the  is added in *mothers*, as it is added in *poured out, shed* [below], where  is said (K on XVI. 80.) (b) *mother* is said [by some] to be pl. of *mother* [below], as

(1) [below] (Tsr), by Kuṣayy Ibn Kīlāb [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 [Bint Ḥulwān Ibn Īmrān (Jsh)], wife of AlYās Ibn Muḍar [Ibn Nizār (Jsh)], and AlYās is my father (Jsh, N), the  being aug. in the sing. and pl. (Tsr); but the addition of the  in the sing., as
is anomalous (K): (b) ئَرَاقَةً (Aud); inf. n. of أَراَقَ [below] (Tsr): (2) [of the ج (Tsr)] in طَيْسٍ (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 إَلُنُ (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 ج [below] with such as لَبَّةٍ and لَمْ تَرَّ [above], and of the ج [681] with [the masc. and fem. dems. in distance (Tsr)], ذُلْكُ and ذِلْكَ [173, 599], it is rejected, because the ج of silence [615] and the ج 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] ج of femininization, as in قَانُةٌ [678], an entire word, not part of another [word]; and yet he exemplifies with it" (Tsr). The ج 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 لَبَّةٍ [above]:
(2) the v. whose J is elided for apocopation or uninflectedness [644]; (3) every [word] uninfl. upon a vowel inseparable [from the word, as in كِيْفَةٌ and مَعْرَةٌ, contrary to the (word) uninfl. upon a vowel supervening for a cause that sometimes ceases, like the voc. and the sub. of ى (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 ى [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 ى in such as LXIX. 28. and يَبِدَادُ [671]; or to make [pause, which is only upon a quiescent (Sn),] possible, like the ى in such as ُعَ and ُعَ [671]: so that it is [a specific augment (Sn),] like the Tanwim [608, 677, 678], [besides being a p., like the Tanwim] and the prep. ب [503]. But the correct [opinion] is that the ى is a letter of augmentation, although its augmentativeness is rare. The proof of that is their saying أمَّاتُ [above] for أمَّاتٌ, its measure being ﻦَعْلِيَاتٌ, because it is pl. of أمَّmother; while sometimes they say أمَّاتٌ (A). The author of the saying

إِذًا الْأُمَّاتُ قَبَلَصَ الْوُجُودُ # فَرَجَتْ أَلْظَالِمَ بِأَمَّاتَكَ

[above] When the mothers are ugly in faces, thou
dispellest the darkness with thy mothers has combined the two dials. (M). They say that, in most cases, أَمْهَاتُ is used for brutes, and أَمْهَاتُ for mankind: but sometimes the converse occurs, as in إِذَا أَمْهَاتُ قَبَضَنَّ اَنْحُرَ When mothers are ugly etc. [above] and

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 أَمْهَةٌ [above] for مُّمِ (A), making the 8 aug. in the sing., as in the pl. (Sn). The measure of أَمْهَةٌ is فَعْلُهُةٌ (A, Tsr), the 3 being multiplicative; or co-ordinative, according to those who authorize فَعْلُ [392] (Tsr). But IS allows the 3 [here] to be rad., [the measure of (Tsr)] فَعْلُلَةٌ being أَمْهَةٌ, like [ and (A)] أَمْهَةٌ (A, Tsr), which is grandeur (Tsr, Sn), splendour, and pride (Sn); and this is confirmed by [their saying (A)] أَمْهَتُ أُمَا meaning I took as a mother, transmitted by Khl in the Kitāb al'Ain: [so that the o. f. of مُّمِ is أَمْهَةٌ (Sn);] but afterwards the 3 is elided; and there remains مُّمِ, the measure of which is فَعْلُ (A, Tsr). And, if this be established, [i.e., both what is transmitted by Khl, vid. that مُّمِ is a deriv. of أَمْهَةٌ, which alone is the o. f., and what is indicated by the preceding paragraph, vid. that the measure of مُّمِ is فَعْلُ (Sn),] then
are two different o. fs., like سَبَط and سِبْط [676], and دَمْث [681], [or دَمْث (KF), دَمْث (KF, Sn), i. q. سَهل smooth, level, said of ground (KF)]: so that, according to this، أُمْهَة is pl. of أُمَة [above], and أُمَات of أُمْهَة. But what IS holds is weak, because it is contrary to the apparent [weight of evidence] (A), since, in the case of أُمْهَة، what imports augmentativeness [of the s] is found, vid. أُم، contrary to قُبْر and أُمَة سِبْط and سَبَط [above] is small: so says SBd (Sn). And, as for the transmission [of تَأْمِهَت] by the author of the ‘Ain, it is not adducible as an argument, because of the errors and discrepancies in that work. IJ says "I consulted our master F one day about the Kitāb al‘Ain; but he turned away from it, and was not satisfied with it, because of the rejected doctrine and vicious etymology that are in it" (A). And it is said in the Jh that أُمَات is pl. of أُمْهَة، the o. f. of which is أُم (TsR). The s is also made aug. in أَمَّرْتَ آلَى I poured out the water, aor. أَعْرِقُ، inf. n. إِعْرَاقَة، the o. f. [of أَعْرَاقُ، aor. يَعْرِقُ (382), inf. n. إِعْرَاقَة (Sn),] being أَعْرَاق [above], aor. يَعْرِقُ، inf. n. إِعْرَاقَة (A). And [they say that (TsR)] Mb has no answer to the augmentativeness of the s in أَعْرَاق، except the allegation of blundering on the part of the
sayer thereof, who, since the Hamza is changed [into \( s (A) \) in \( T_{690} (Tsr) \)], imagines that the \( s \) is the \( f \) 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 \( H_{r} \) which is [the girl (Jh)] big in the hips, is aug., the measure being \( H_{r} \), because she \( T_{r} \), therefore prefixes the Hamza to it [in the pret. and inf. n. (Sn)], and makes it quiescent \( H_{r} \)

and Akh says that it is aug. in \( H_{r} \), and \( H_{r} \), [372, 392], which, according to him, are \( H_{r} \), because the first is from \( H_{r} \), swallowing, and the second from \( H_{r} \), which is the level place; but the argument of the majority [for the radicalness of the \( s \) in \( H_{r} \) (Sn)] is that the Arabs say of two long or tall [things or persons], \( H_{d} \) is the longer, or taller, than that, i. e., \( A_{t} \) (A); whereas, if the \( s \) were aug., they would say \( A_{t} \), with elision of the aug., and retention of the rad.; while [in \( A_{t} \)] they elide the \( e \), though it also is rad., without dispute, because elision is more suitable for finals (Sn). What Khl holds, however, [about the \( s \) in \( H_{r} \)] is right, because derivation, when it testifies to a thing, is acted upon, no attention being paid to the rarity of the thing (IY). And similarly [you say of \( (A) \)] \( H_{r} \), which is [a name of (IY)] the lion, and
is [also (A) an ep. meaning] bulky, tall (IY, A), the ُسَلْبَبٍ in it being aug., because it is from ُنَقْفٍ [331] (IY). And in ُسَلْبَبٍ [392] the ُسَلْبَبٍ may be aug., because ُسَلْبَبٍ also means long, tall, as ُقَرْنَ سَلْبَبٍ a long horn [or ُسَلْبَبٍ (A)], i.e., طَرِيدٌ (IY, A), this being a good derivation, apparent in sense and letter (IY); or ُسَلْبَبٍ may be of the cat. of ُسِبْطٍ and ُسِيِّط [above]. The truth is that the ُسَ 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 ُسَ is regularly made aug., (1) [together with the ُتَ (A),] in إِسْتِفْعَالٌ [678] (Aud, A), like إِسْتِفْعَالٌ [368] (Tsr), and its derivs. (A, Tsr): (2) as is said [by Z in the M], after the ُلَ of the fem. in pause, اَكْرَمْتُكَ I honored thee, which is [the ُسَ of] the كَسْكَسَةٌ [617]: but this sayer is bound to reckon the ُشَ of the كَسْكَسَةٌ, as اَكْرَمْتُكَ [617, 671]; and, the object of putting them being to make the Kasra of the ُلَ plain, their predicament is [like] that of the ُسَ of silence [679] in respect of independence (A). The reckoning of the ُسَ of the كَسْكَسَةٌ is a blunder, [because it is a p., not a formative letter; and also (R)] because this entails [the reckoning of (R)] the ُشَ 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 $ق$
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 ancient [681. A]:
the disj. Hamza, aor. يُسْطِيع [671], with Damm of the
initial; [contrary to إسطاع, with the conj. Hamza,
aor. يُسْطِيع (382, 759), with Fath of the initial, i. q.
was able, aor. يُسْطِيع (Sn) : ] for, according to
S [below], its o. f. is أطاعأ obedied, aor. يُسْطِيع ; while the
س is added as a compensation for [the departure of (Sn)]
the vowel of the e of the v. [from the e (Sn)], because
the o. f. of أطاعأ is أطاعأ (A), not for the departure of
the vowel absolutely (Sn). أطاعأ with Fath, and dis-
junction, 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 إفعال, its o. f. being أطاعأ, like
أطاعأ [703, 707]; but the، being treated as unsound, and
converted into ı after transfer of its vowel to what
precedes it; and the س afterwards put as a compensa-
tion for the mobility of the e, which has escaped it; as
the س is put in أطاعأ [382, 671, 679], with quiescence of
the س, as a compensation for the like of that [loss of
mobility in the e]. And there is no doubt that the
mobility of the \( \epsilon \) has escaped because of the mobilization of the vowel of the \( \text{ف} \) with the vowel of the \( \epsilon \) [below]. But, notwithstanding all of this, the putting of the \( \text{s} \) and \( \epsilon \) as compensation is anomalous. The \( \text{aor.} \) of \( \text{نستَطَع} \), therefore, according to \( \text{S} \), is \( \text{يَسَطَع} \) [671], with \( \text{Damm} \). But \( \text{Mb} \), supposing \( \text{S} \) to say that the \( \text{s} \) 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 \( \text{Fath} \) transferred to the \( \text{ف} \), "is remaining?": whereas \( \text{S} \)'s meaning is not what he supposes, but is that the \( \text{s} \) is a compensation for the mobility of the \( \epsilon \); and there is no doubt that the mobility of the \( \epsilon \) has escaped because of the mobilization of the \( \text{ف} \) with the vowel of the \( \epsilon \) [above]. \( \text{Fr} \) says that the \( \text{o. f.} \) of \( \text{نستَطَع} \), of the \( \text{conj.} \) of \( \text{هَيَتَفَعَل} \), the \( \text{ب} \) being elided for the reason assigned in the chapter on Incorporation [759]; so that there remains \( \text{نستَطَع} \) [382], with \( \text{Kasr} \) of the \( \text{Hamza} \), which is then anomalously pronounced with \( \text{Fath} \), and made \( \text{disj.} \) : and, according to him, therefore, the \( \text{aor.} \) is \( \text{يَسَطَع} \) [759], with \( \text{Fath} \) of the aoristic letter. But, when the \( \text{ب} \) of \( \text{نستَطَع} \) is elided, because of the impracticability of incorporation, the well-known \( \text{dial.} \) makes the \( \text{Hamza} \) remain pronounced with \( \text{Kasr} \), and \( \text{conj.} \), as it was [before the elision], whence فَمَا نَسْتَطَعْوَا
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 ت, since he says “such as [استُفعَال]” [678]; so that he seems to content himself with that, for which reason he says in the Kafiya, in mentioning the augmentativeness of the ت, “and together with the س, it is made aug. in [استُفعَال] and its derivs.” (A).

§. 681. The ل is aug., (1) in (M, IM) the well-known dem. [below] (IM) ns., regularly (IA), as (IA, A) دُلَّك (M, IA, A) and تَلُّك [679] (IA, A), [175] (M, IA A), and أَوْلَلِكَ (A) [pronounced] أَوْلَلِكَ [173], whence

أَوْلِتَكْ كُوْمِيْ لَمْ يُكُونُوا أَشَابَةٍ َُ ََُْٓ َََٔ أَشَابَةٍ َُْٓ أَوْلَلِكَ (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-erring?, because of their saying, in the sense thereof, اِذَا [171] and دَا [172] without a ك, لَى [175], and أَوْلَلِكَ [pronounced]
the J is added in the dems. to indicate the distance of the demonstrated [173, 599], and therefore is the opp. of the premonitory حا [174, 552]; for which reason they are not combined [173, 552], so that حا لَك is not said; because, the حا indicating the nearness, and the J the distance, of the demonstrated, there are incompatibility and contradiction between them: (b) [except in لَك (173),] this J is [mobilized to avoid a concurrence of two quiescents; and] pronounced with Kasr, lest it might be mistaken for the J of ownership [604], if [ لَك that sounding like] دَا لَك This belongs to thee were said (IY): (2) in عبد slave, servant [671], زِيدُلْ Zaidal [283], and فَحَجَلْ [675] (M), where their saying عبد slave, servant, زَيْدُ Zaid, and أَفْكَحِلْ [below] is an indication of the augmentativeness of the J (IY): (a) [male ostrich (IY)] is ambiguous (M): if you derive it from خَيْق [male ostrich, like خَيْق (Jh, KF), the م being aug. (Jh), and slender, tall (KF)], the J is aug., its measure being عبد, and the is rad.; while, if you derive it from خَيْق [with Kasr (KF), young ostrich (Jh, KF), and tall, stupid (KF)], the is aug., and the J rad., its measure being عبد; but the first [derivation] is more frequent, because they say عبد and خَيْق [i.q. خَيْق (above), the م being aug.
(Jh): 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 (IY). The J is one of the letters of augmentation (A). As for the J [679], it is rare, as in سَيْدَل and عُبْدَل [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) ُعِبَدُ for عَبْدَل [above]: (2) أَفْحَجُ نَحْجًا [675], which is having the thighs wide apart: (3) ْعَيْقَ for َعِيقَة [above]: (4) فَيْشَة for َفَيْشَة [below]: (5) طَيْسُلْ for طَيْسِ [679]. It is reported from Akh that the J of عَبْدُ الله is rad., ُعِبَدُ being compounded from ُعِبَدُ الله The servant of God, as they say عِبْشَى [309, 311]; but this is rendered improbable by their saying زَيْدَلْ for زَيْدَلْ [above]. He says, however, in the Ausat [fi-nNahw (HKh)], “The J is made aug. in ُعْبَدُ alone”, [not in the remainder, vid. زَيْدَلْ, etc., as though he said that the remainder were of the cat. of سَيطُ and سَيطُر (Sn);]
"and its pl. is عَبَدارَةٌ" : so that he has two sayings (A) on عَبِّدُ (Sn). The remainder, indeed, [i. e., all except عَبِّدُ (Sn),] admit of being [derived] from two crude-forms, like سَبْطُ and سَبِّطُ [676] (A); so that Akh's saying "[The J] is made aug. in عَبِّدُ alone" is correct (Sn). Jr denies that the J is a letter of augmentation. And the J of distance in such as ذِلِّةٌ [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], طَيْسُلْ, and فَيْعَلْ, 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 تَرُكَةٌ and تَرِكُةٌ [talkative woman (KF)], and دِمْتُ and دِمَثُ [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 عَبِّدُ and زِيْدُ [above], i. q. زَيْدُ and دِمَثُ زِيْدُ : whereas دِمْتُ and دِمَثُ are not like that, since augmentativeness of the J is not established so that we are driven to judging it to be rad. (R).
§. 681. A. Whatever is free from these restrictions [672-681] is judged to be rad., unless some proof of augmentativeness exists, for which reason (1) the Hamzas of م [672], the s of سمال [676] and ین [667, 671], the n s of حَنْطَل [677] and سَيْل ears [of corn], the t s of مَلْكَوَت [678], and the s s of قَذْمُوس and اَسْطَبَاع [680], are judged to be aug., because of their elision in [inf. n. of شَمْلَتْ الْرَّيْحَم (TsR)] and حَبْط [with two Fathas, swelling of the belly (TsR)], عَفْر glimmering and مُلْك [678] and بَنْوَة [667], عَفْرُ قَذْم [677] with Fath of its initial, i. e., dust, قَذْم antiquity and طَاعَة obedience, and in their sayings حَطْلَتْ الْأَيْلُ [677] when they have been harmed by eating colocynth and اَسْبَل مَزَّرُع The corn put forth ears: (2) the n s of نِرْجَس [677] and حَنْدَل [with Damm of the ض, the name of a herb (401) (TsR)], and the t s of تَنْضَب [678] and تْكِّيْب (Aud) with Damm of the ج and خ, [or Fath of the latter (KF),] and Kasr, [with doubling (TsR),] of the ى (KF, TsR), upon the measure of تَفْعِّل, with Damm of the ت and ف, [or تَفْعِّل with Fath of the ف,] and Kasr, [with doubling,] of the ع (Jh), diptote [because of the verbal measure combined with the quality of
They fell into the valley of Disappointment, i.e., into a vain, futile state (Tsri), [or] meaning into the vain, etc. (KFs)—so says Ks (Jh, Tsri)—are judged to be aug. (Tsri), because of the non-existence of [392], فَعَلَّلَ [with Damm of its first, Fath of its third, and Kasr of its fourth (401) (Tsri)], فَعَلَّلَ [392], and فَعَلَّلَ (Aud), with Damm of its first and second, [or Fath of the latter,] and Kasr, with doubling, of its third. But it is said that the mention of this [نَخْيَب] requires consideration, because it is transferred from the v. [4], like تَعَلَّم. It was learnt [or تَعَلَّم Thou teachest]: they distinctly declare that, and [therefore] they decline it as a diptote (Tsri).
§ 682. Substitution occurs in the three kinds [625], as stylesheet [683], [690], and stylesheet (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] انْصِبْ بَوْمَ جَدَّ طَاهِ ءَالَّالَا ۡتَأَلَّتَ ءَالَّالَا [below]; so that such as اَطْلَمَ [below], orig. اَطْلَمَ, the [second] ط being put in place of the ط of اَطْلَمَ because of the intention to incorporate [756], is not adducible as an objection; for that is not named "substitution", since the ط 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 ؤ of عَدَة and the Hamza of اَبَن [below] (Tsr, Sn). IH's saying "another" is a corroboration [or rather qualification] of his saying "letter".
in order to dispel the notion that the restoration of the \( J \) in such as \( \text{د} \text{و} \text{ه} \) [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'an (KIF), Substitution is putting one of the letters in the place of another: and IF holds فَأَنْفَذَقَ XXVI. 63. Then it was divided to be an instance of it, i. e., فَأَنْفَذَقَ, [for which reason فَكَانَ كُلُّ فَرْنَيٍّ XXVI. 63. And each division was is said, the \( ر \) and \( ل \) being interchangeable (IKn)]; and it is transmitted from Khl that, in فَكَعَسْوَا خَلَالِ الْذِيَارِ XVII. 5. And they ransack-ed the interiors of the houses, فَكَعَسْوَا is meant, the ج being put in the place of the ح, which also is read [by Talha (K)]; while F holds أَحْبَبْتِ حُبَّ الْخَيْرِ XXXVIII. 31. have preferred the love of horses [508], i. e., الْخَيْرِ and AU holds إلا مُكَاءٌ وَتَصْدِيَةٌ VIII. 35. Save whistling and clapping of hands [685], i. e., تَصْدِيَةٌ, the [second] د being changed into (KF), to be an instance of it (IKn, KIF). And this sense [of substitution] is not identical with, but is 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
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 كُتْبَة and كُتْبَة [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 ꙿ, Ꙃ, 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) قَامِ, orig. قَوْمِ, the ꙿ being ꙿ, in the o.f. [684]; (b) مُوسَرِ, [the ꙿ in] which is orig. ي [686]; (c) رُسِّ, the ꙿ being orig. Hamza, the rising [658] of which is softened, so that it is transmuted into ꙿ [684]. Thus every conversion is a substitution; but every substitution is not a conversion (IY). IM [also] means by “substitution” what includes conversion, since each of them is an alteration [put] in the position [of the altered letter]; except that substitution [in the peculiar, real sense (Sn)] is removal, while conversion is transmutation: and hence conversion is peculiar to the unsound letters and the Hamza; while substitution is not peculiar, as you will see. But compensation differs from both of them, because (1) it is [put] in a place other than that of the original, like the ꙿ of ꙿ [699], the Hamza of ꙿ [667], and the [second] ꙿ of ꙿ [283, 284]: (2) it is [given] for (a) a consonant, as mentioned; (b) a vowel,
like the س of أَسْتَالَعَ [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 ِ [739]: (2) what is extraordinarily substituted, vid. six [or rather seven] letters [below], i. e., the ح, the غ, the ق, the ض, [the ط,] and the ظ, as in رَبْعُ for young camel brought forth in autumn [696. A]; أَخْنَى for أَخْنُ for speaking through the nose [696 A]; خَطَرْ for خَطَرَ [696 A]; كُنَةً for كُنَة [699 A], which is the nest of the sand-grouse in the mountain; جَضَدُ for جَضَدُ hardy [696 A]; and تَلْعَمَّمَ تَلْعَمُّمَ for 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 لْجَدِّ صَرْفُ شُكُسٍ آمِيٍّ طَيِّ [below]; (b) what is necessary in etymology, vid. nine [letters], combined in the spelling of your [mnemonic] phrase عَدَّاتُ مُوطِيًا [below], i. e., the ِ, the ظ, the Hamza, the ت, the م, the ط, the ى, and the ِ (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 ل, 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)] I was still, finding [the camel-saddle (IA)] easy to ride upon [above] (IM), سکنت هدأت ت meaning ظل، while ملابیا is [an act. part. (IA, Tsr)] from أطلاط (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 ل for (a) the ن of امیلان — an irregular dim. of امیل [285, 286], like مغرب dim. of مغرب [286] — in وقفا فیها ألحمد [691]; (b) the ض of مضطبع in لبما رأی انن آلحمد [647, 691]: (2) the rare, like the substitution of the ی for the double ی in pause, as in خالی.
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 s [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 s, as has been mentioned; (2) repetition of the l; (3) making the pret. govern آبَدًا, which is like أَبِدَأ for ever [206]: so says IHsh in the Glosses (Tsr). Moreover, [when IM mentions the s (Tsr),] he does not discourse upon it here, notwithstanding his reckoning it, the reason being that its substitution [for the ث (A)] is regular only in pause upon such as حَمَيْمَة and نَعَّمَة [638, 690], which is mentioned in the chapter on Pause [646]; while its substitution for any [letter] other than the ث is confined to hearsay, as in their saying هَيْلَان [for إِيَّان (Tsr)], لَنَتْك [for كَرِتْكَتْ أَهْمَمْ (Tsr)], لَتْكَنْ قَاٰكِم [for لَتْكَنِي كَاٰكِمْ (Tsr)], فَرْحَتْ أَدَابَة [for فَرْحَتْ أَدَابَة (Tsr)], and أَرْحَتْ أَلْدَاء [for أَرْحَتْ أَلْدَاء (Tsr)], and أَرْحَتْ أَلْدَاء [for أَرْحَتْ أَلْدَاء (Tsr)] (Aud, A) for أَرْحَتْ [690], in all of which they substitute the s 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- incorporate]
common substitution, meaning [common] in the speech of [all, or a body, of (Sn)] the Arabs, are twenty-two, these nine before mentioned being the letters of the [non-incorporative] substitution [common in etymology, which is the substitution (Sn) described in the Tsr above, and the Tashil below, as] necessary in etymology. For he says "The letters of the non-incorporative common substitution are combined by your [mnemonic] phrase 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 طَرِبُ عَضَا" [above]. This is his language, which implies that the remaining [seven] letters [above] of the alphabet, vid. the ح، the خ، the ذ، the ط، the ض، the غ، and the ق، [all dotted, except the first, which is undotted (Sn),] are sometimes substituted by way of anomaly [696 A]: and IJ says on the reading of AlA‘mash [or, as Z says in the K, of Ibn Mas‘ūd] فَسَرَهُ بِهِمْ VIII. 59. Then terrify thou, by them [696 A], with the dotted ذ، that the ذ is a subst. for the د، as they say لَكَحْمُ خَرَادِلٍ meat cut up small for خَرَادِلٌ [in the KF خَرَادِلٍ Sn]; the idea connecting the د and ذ being that they are vocal [734], and approximate [in
outlet (732)] : while Z explains the reading as a transposition by putting the J before the ع, [in the sense of طَمِّرَةٌ Then scatter thou (K), as though it were a transposed form of شَدِّرُ (K, B),] from their saying شَدِّرُ مَدَرُ [211] (A), a comp. meaning in every direction (Sn). It implies also that the above-mentioned substitution of the J for the ن and ض, and of the ج for the ى, and similarly the substitution of the ن for the ج [688], like their saying ٣٧٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩ for رَفِلٍ رَفِّيٍّ نْم, which is the long-tailed horse, and for the م, like their saying ٣٧٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩ for أَمْغَرُتِ ٱلْشَّاةُ أَنْغَرُتِ The sheep gave its milk red, when its milk comes forth red, like مَقْرَةٌ 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 J 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 عَكَفَكْبِةٍ, [i.e., the substitution of the ج for the ى (Sn),] in the dial. of ٣٧٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩ [694]:
(2, 3) the عَعْنَعَةٍ, [i.e., the substitution of the ع for the Hamza (Sn),] as in their saying ٣٧٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩ I thought that thou wast going, i.e., ٣٧٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩٩، [527, 580]; and the كَشْكَشَةٍ [below], as in their saying, when addressing a female, ما أَلَّدْيَ جَآءٍ يُشَ What is that which has
brought thee?, meaning بَلَى, and in the reading of some قد جَعَل رَبِّي تَكْمِش سَرْيًا XIX. 24. God hath made below thee a rivulet [617]: [both of which substitutions are] in the dial. of Tamīm, [this clause referring to the َعْنَعْنَة] also, as is proved by the language of the CK to be shortly cited (Sn): (4) the كَسْكَة in the dial. of Bakr, as in their saying, when addressing a female, أَبُوْس thy father and أَمْس thy mother, meaning أَبُوْس and أَمْس [617, 680]. And, says IM in the CK, [even] this sort of substitution, [meaning the َعْنَعْنَة and what follows it (Sn),] is fit to be mentioned [only] in books of lexicology, not in books of etymology, otherwise the ُع would have to be mentioned, because its substitution for the mobile حمزة is regular in the dial. of Tamīm, that being named َعْنَعْنَة; and the ل also would have to be mentioned, because its substitution for the pron. is regular, as in يَا أَبَيْنَ الْرَّبِّيْنِ الْحَمْزَ [129, 169, 696 A], meaning عَصْيَت; while the eks. 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 مَلَل for مَلِل [278, 683, 703] (A), because the م must be converted into ج [684] (Sn); or difference from the most frequent [formation],
as in your saying [683] (A) fem. of سَقَاءة [282] (Sn). This is his language. Many of the Etymologists reckon the letters of substitution [more general than the necessary (Sn)] as twelve, which they combine in many [mnemonic] phrases, whence ۥۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚۚ
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 صرط and قرط for road and صقر hawk; and adds the س [696A], which is not a letter of substitution. For, if إسع be adduced [by way of exemplifying the occurrence of the س as a subst. (Sn)], then إدك [below] and إطلم [above] are adducible, because إسع إسع 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 إستكذا to be orig. إستكذا [696 A, 759]; so that they substitute the س for the first، as they substitute the س for the [second] س in سه، orig. سه [689, 758]; and perhaps, therefore, Z takes that into consideration (A). [R, like A, asserts that] إستكذا 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 Zutt [a race of Hindus, arabicized form of جحت with Fath (KF),] attacked (M, H). As for the restriction of the letters of substitution within the number mentioned by Z, what is meant [by it] is the letters that are often substituted, and that are strong in, and notorious for, that (IY). According to what S mentions, [which is adopted by IJ (B on II. 1.),] they are eleven letters (B, A) eight letters of augmentation [671], vid. all but the ج and س; and three others, vid. the د, the ط, and the ج (A): which are combined by أَجْدَدُ طُرُبَت مِنْهَا [above]. And some add seven others, vid. the ل in أَصِيل لإل [above], the ج and ز in ص [695] and زر اط [above], the ف in ص [below], the ع in لقو الاملو [580], the ن in أَعْن [below], and the ب in بَا أَسْمَك [696A]; so that they become eighteen (B). But the first opinion, vid. that of S, is the well-known one (IY). S does not reckon the ص and ج [above] in the chapter on Substitution, but Sf reckons them at the end of [his commentary on] the Book. And with them he reckons the ش of the جشامة [above], which is a subst. for the ل of the fem. [696A], as in تحكَّم منى الاح [617]: but, as for that which is added after the ل of the fem. as in أَمْرَتْكَ [617, 671], it does not belong to this [cat., being an addition, not a
substitution]. And S does not reckon the س [above], as Z reckons it. They say that the ت occurs as a subst. [696A]: F transmits, on the authority of Ya'kūb, the outlets for the water between the crosspieces of the leathern bucket [above] for فُرَفَعْهَا, which is from تَفْرَعَ emptying. And similarly the ب: F transmits, on the authority of As, [696A], i.e., ما أَسْبِكَ What is thy name? (R): [while] مُكَة بُكْة Bakka are two dial. vars. for the proper name of the Sacred City, like their saying أَلْبُيَط AnNubait and أَلْبُيَط AnNumait for the name of a place in AdDahna; and similar instances of interchangeability are أَلْم رَيْب constant and اَلْم (B on III. 90), and حَمَّى مُغَيْبَة continual fever and مُغَيْبَة (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),]

[They blow from it (the face) a flame blown, a gleam that is seen to be not blazing, nor struck from a flint, orig. مَنْفُوحَا (MAR)]; and Ru'ba says

غَيْرِ الْأَجَارِيِّ كَرِيمٌ الْسَّنَمِ # أَبْلَجَ لَمْ يَبْلَحَ بِنَحْيِ الْسَّمِ (R) Liberal in his ways, noble in origin, having a
wide space between the eyebrows, not born at the rising of the star of niggardliness, where he changes the of وَسْنَحُ حُجًّا for the exigency of the rhyme (MAR). The ح occurs anomalously as a subst. for the ل, as in دَرْعَةٌ and for a coat of mail [696A], because they say حُدْثُ用力ْ دَرْعَةُ He put on him his coat of mail, not حُدْثًا; 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, تَأْمَّ رَنْجُدَتْ فَمَ عَمِّرُو Zaid stood, and afterwards ‘Amr [696A], i.e., تَأْمَّ وَمَّا عَمِّرُو [540]; and they say جَدَّفُ جَدَّتُ جَدَّتٌ [540], the ف being a subst., because they say أَجْدَاتُ graves [below], but not أَجْدَافُ [above] (R); [though] Fr says that the Arabs make the ف and ت interchangeable in the language, saying جَدَّفُ جَدَّتُ جَدَّتٌ and أَجْدَاتُ, pl. أَجْدَاتٌ أَجْدَاتٌ (Jh). The ل occurs as a subst. for (1) the ق, as عَرْبَيْ بُخُعُجمُ [696A], pl. أَكْحَاجُ أَكْحَاجٌ أَكْحَاجٌ, but not أَكْحَاجٌ [above]; (2) the ت, as يا أَبْنَ أَلْرَبِير أَلْعُ [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)] Tamīm is a subst. for the Hamza in عْنُ orig. (MAR) [508], which is the عْنَعَةٌ [above] of Tamīm: the poet says أَعْنِ تَرْسَمْتُ أَلْحُ [580, 683] (R); and they say
that Zaid is standing for \[696A\], and recite

except that the bone etc. (IY). 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 جَدْف [above], because in the pl. they say أَجْدَاف [above] with the only: (2) prevalently, as in أَفْلَط [below], i.e., saved, where the ط is a subst. for the ت, because the ت is more prevalently used in it; and similarly in لِصَت [below] for لِص thief, robber [689], the ت being a subst. for the ص, because its pl. لَصْرُ is more frequent than لَصْرُ (A): (a) the exemplification of the second [case], vid. reversion prevalently, by أَفْلَط [above] is not correct, because the prevalence of reversion to the ت is in أَفْلَط itself, which is more used with the ت than with the ط; not in its variations, like مَفْلَطَ saving, مَفْلَطَ saved, and
act of saving, because the لُصَبُ, 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 لُصَبُ in exemplifying the second: (b) لُصَبُ with Kasr of the ل is chaster than لُصَبُ with] Damn or Fath; but لُصَبُ [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 أَرْخُ dated, and أَرْخُ 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 نَرْتُ inheritance, heritage [689] (SH, A), i. e., property inherited (Jrb, Sn), since “the paradigms of its derivation” are نَرْتُ he inherited, [ نَرْتُ he inherits (482, 700) (R),] نَرْتُ heir, [and (A)] نَرْتُ inherited (R, A), all of which are derived from نَرْتُ inheriting, as نَرْتُ is derived from
it (R); and [similarly (R)] in [683] (SH), pl. of face (Jrb), since betaking oneself, facing, and worthy of regard are derived from , from which is derived (R): (a) [above], , and similarly indicate that the o.f. of is ; and similarly , and similarly indicate that the Hamza in is a subst. for (Jrb): for, when, in place of one letter is an expression, all “the paradigms of its derivation” contain another letter, you recognize that the letter in it is a subst. for what is found in place thereof in “the paradigms of its derivation” (R): (2) by the paucity of its usage, [i.e., of the usage of the expression containing the subst. (R, Sn),] as in (SH, A) for the foxes, and for the hares; while S cites [685] (A) for, being more used than the latter is known to be a subst. for the (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 َنَعَلْبَيْنَ which are synonymous, while the first is less used than the second (R); (b) the substitution in َنَعَلْبَيْنَ is recognizable by "the paradigms of its derivation" [above] also, because َنَعَلْبَيْنَ is pl. of َنَعَلْبَ fox, the female of which is called َنَعَلَبَةٌ, and the male َنَعَلْبُانَ (Jrb); (c) IJ says "And َنَعَلْبَيْنَ may be pl. of َنَعَلَةٌ for statutes, ordinances, [except that the Hamza, when postponed from its place, is changed into ى for alleviation (Sn)]; but what S says is more appropriate, in order that َنَعَلْبَيْنَ may be like أَنَحِيَهَا [in the verse]; and also because َنَعَلَةٌ 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 ٌ of ضَمْرَبُ (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 ضَمْرَبُ [686] (SH, A), dim. of ضَمْرَبُ [278]; for, since the o. f., [vid. the
non-dim. \((Sn)\), is known, this is known to be substituted for the \((A)\): (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 \(\&\) and \(\&\) of \(\text{مَورَة} (R)\), in which case the letter corresponding to it in the o.f., is a subst. for it \((Jrb)\)], as in \(\text{مَورَة} [275] (SH, A)\), which is [a deriv., because it is \((Jrb)\)] the dim. of \(\text{ذَرَّ} [683]\); for, since the dim. is \(\text{مَورَة} [\text{with the} \& (Jrb)\), it is known that [the \& is original, because the formation of the dim. restores things to their o.f. (278, 282); so that \((Jrb)\) the Hamza \([\text{ذَرَّ} (Jrb)\) is a subst. for the \& (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 \(\&\) of \(\text{ضَرَّب}\) is a subst. for the \(\&\) of \(\text{ضَرَّب}\); or for which the letter in the o.f. can be a subst., as the \(\&\) and Hamza of \(\text{ذَرَّ} \) are subs. for the \(\&\) and \& of \(\text{مَورَة}\): (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 ! [in م ] is removed in مَّرَى by the preceding letter's being pronounced with ذامم, and [as] the cause of conversion [683] of the  into حمزة [in م ], vid. the occurrence of the  which is a quasi-unsound letter, after the ! which is quasi-augmentative, [is removed in مَّرَى by the disappearance of the !] 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 ! in فَساَب into  supervenes in دُوُرِبَ by reason of the 's being pronounced with ذامم, 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) [690] (SH, A), which is [judged to be (A)] orig. أَرَأَى (Jrb, A), since, if it were not so, its measure would necessarily be عَفُّلَ, which is an unknown formation (A), not recognized among the measures (Sn), because there is no عَفُّلَ [482] (Jrb); (b) [692] (SH), which is
orig. because there is no 

\( \text{ث} \) (Jrb); (c) 

\[ 667, 757 \] (SH), which is orig. 

\( \text{ث} \) being changed into \( \text{س} \) because of the intention to incorporate, and the conj. Hamza put because of the impossibility of beginning with a quiescent, that being predicated because there is no 

\( \text{ه} \) (MASH),] or 

\( \text{ه} \) (Jrb); (a) this [argument that such formations are unknown] is true of 

\( \text{ه} \) and 

\( \text{ه} \), but not of 

\( \text{ه} \) and 

\( \text{ه} \), because in every \( v. \) of the two formations, 

\( \text{ه} \) and 

\( \text{ه} \), when the \( \text{ف} \) of the first is a letter of covering 

\[ 734 \], and the \( \text{ف} \) of the second is a \( \text{د} \), \( \text{ث} \), etc. \[ 757 \], the \( \text{ف} \) of the first must be followed by a \( \text{ط} \) \[ 756 \], and the \( \text{ف} \) of the second may have the preceding letter incorporated into it; so that these two are regular, not unknown, formations: (b) you recognize the two letters in these two formations to be substs. by the fact that the \( \text{ط} \) does not occur in place of the \( \text{ث} \) except when preceded by a letter of covering \[ 692, 756 \]; while, the \( \text{ط} \) being akin to the \( \text{ت} \) in outlet \[ 732 \], and to the preceding letter of covering in covering \[ 734 \], the substitution of the \( \text{ط} \) for the \( \text{ث} \) is a probable supposition, because of the heaviness of the \( \text{ت} \) after the letter of covering, and the affinity of the \( \text{ط} \) to the letter of covering and to the \( \text{ت} \): and the incorporated letter, as in 

\[ \text{د} \] [above] and 

\[ 757 \], 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 \( \text{ف} \), and \( \text{س} \) (IY, A); (4) the \( \text{د} \); (5) the \( \text{غ} \) (M, SH, A); (6) the \( \text{خ} \); (7) the \( \text{ع} \) (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 \( \text{ج} \), as \( \text{kṣaː} \) and \( \text{rā} \) [328, 723]; (2) the \( \text{غ} \), as \( \text{bāːṭu} \) and \( \text{thāːlim} \) [708]; (3) the \( \text{م} \), as \( \text{ạraːs} \) [below]. And, since alteration is more appropriate in the final [than in the medial or initial], what has the substitution in its \( \text{ج} \) is put by IH [and others] before what has it in its \( \text{غ} \), and what has it in its \( \text{م} \) before what has it in its \( \text{م} \) (Jrb). The Hamza is necessarily (A, Tsr)] substituted for the \( \text{م} \) and \( \text{س} \) in four cases, (1) where the \( \text{م} \) or \( \text{س} \) is final, [whether a \( \text{j} \) or a co-ordinative aug. (Tsr, Sn),] after an aug. \( \text{i} \), [whether the initial of its word be pronounced with Kasr, Fath, or Damm (Tsr, Sn)—so in the Tsr (Sn),] as \( \text{kšaː} \) [above], \( \text{sːnā} \) [246], and \( \text{ṣːnā} \) prayer, [where the
Hamza is substituted for a و, the o. f. being كـساو, طـباو, دـعاو (Tsr)]; and as و ـنا (672], ـلاب ـنا (237, 260) (Aud. A), and ـفـنا evanescence (Aud) and ـنيهه decree (A)\, where the Hamza is substituted for a ي, the o. f. being فـناي, طـباي, بـناي [and ـنيهه] (Tsr); and, [says Kh in the Tsr (Su),] as و ـلاب and ـفـنا (248), where the Hamza is substituted for a ي added for co-ordination with ـن ركـاس and ـن ركـاس (273) (Tsr, Sn): contrary to such as (a) قـارل conversed with [703] and ـن تعاون helped one another and ـن تبايئن became separated (A), ـدأو and ـن هدايئن [below] (Tsr), for want of finality (A), because the ي and ي occur as an ع (Tsr, Sn) in the first two [exs., as also in the next two]; while the last two words are formed with the [inseparable] ë of femininization [266], contrary to the adventitious [ë of] femininization, which does not prevent substitution, as ـن بـن ال builder [below] (Tsr): (b) عـرو and طـبه [643, 719] (Aud, A), for want of the ! (A, Tsr): (c) ـن [below] (Aud, A), the name of the [particular (Sn)] letter (Tsr, Sn), and ـن [below] (Aud, A), pl. of ـن (684) (Tsr, Sn) a mark, and a verse of a chapter [in the Kur] (Sn), for want of augmentativeness in the ! (A), because the ! in both [exs.] is [converted from a (Sn)] 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 \( {}^6\text{ja} \) [723], its measure is 保温 with two Fathas: but as to whether its \( \varepsilon \) be a \( s \) or a \( s \), 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 \( {}^6\text{ja} \) [302], its o. f. is 保温 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 \( s \) and \( s \) in that [predicament; so that, when final after an aug. \( l \), it is changed into Hamza (Tsr)], as 保温 [273, 385]: for its o. f. is 保温 [with an abbreviated \( l \) (Tsr)], like 保温 [250, 272]; but an \( l \) is added before the final for prolongation, like the \( l \) of 保温 [671, 673] and 保温 [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 \( s \) of feminization, as 保温 \( \text{fem.} \) of 保温 [above]: but, if the \( s \) of feminization be unadventitious, substitution is disallowed, as 保温 guidance
enmity, because the word is formed with the [inseparable] سَقَآيَةُ, i.e., is not formed [without a س (Sn)] as a masc. (A), being either not constituted as a masc. at all, like سَقَآيَةُ [above]; or shaped as a masc. in another sense, like سَقَآيَةُ [above], since سَقَآيَةُ is the skin of a lamb, or kid, prepared [as a vessel] for [holding] water, or milk (Sn): (e) IM says in the Tashrl that the letter of softness is sometimes sounded true, [i.e., retained without conversion (Sn),] with the adventitious, and changed with the inseparable [س of femininization], the first as in the prov. إِسْقِي رَقَّانِ فَانْهَا سَقَآيَةٌ Give water to Rakash [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], سَقَآيَةُ resembles what is formed with the [inseparable] س of femininization; [but this, in my opinion, requires consideration, because it is good as an assignment of the cause for the س’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 سَقَآيَةُ with Hamza, as when not in a prov.: and the second as in سَكَلْيَةُ for سَكَلْيَةُ [266, 721]: (f) the predicament of the two augments [228] of
the *du.* is like that of the *s* of femininization in being accompanied by this substitution, as ِکسَّاَّزَان and ِکسَّاَّزَان (A); i.e., allowably, which is not incompatible with IM's saying "And such as ِکسَّاَّزَان, ِعَلْبَاء [are dualized] with a, or Hamza" [230] (Sn): but, if the word be [orig.] formed as a *du.*, substitution is disallowed, as in their saying ِعَقْلَتْهُ يِبْنُاَمِيِّسِ [228, 230, 721]: (g) it is objected that such a *rel. n.* [below] as ِغََّرَى, when you curtail it according to the *dial.* of those who do not understand [the elided letter] as expressed [58], contravenes the rule mentioned [in IM's saying "Then substitute the Hamza for a, and ی, when final after an *aug.*"]; because constructively "for every, and ی" (Sn): for you say ُیَا َغَارُ O *Ghâwî* with *Damm* of the , without substitution, notwithstanding that it falls within the rule mentioned; the reason that substitution is not employed being that ُغََّرَى has already been transformed by elision of its ل [301], [on account of the ی 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.* ِغََّرَى, without [the ی of] relation, is [similarly] curtailed, its predicament is like that [of the *voc.* ُغََّرَى], since here also you say ُیَا َغَارُ]; and hence Syt, when he quotes the language of IUK, omits this
expression ["rel. n."] from it: but the condition of the curtailment of غارٍ or عاري 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 عا is not 'final'; but medial, the elision being accidental (Sn): (j) [A suggests that,] if IM had put "when a ج" in place of "when final", saying "when a ج after an aug. ", it would have been right (A), because it would have excluded غارٍ, where the ع is an ع: but the expression "when a ج" is open to the objection that it does not include such as عُلْبَةٍ and نُرَبًا [above], where the Hamza is substituted for a ى added for co-ordination; and therefore IUK says that the rule should be corrected by saying "for a ى or ى that is a ج or co-ordinated with one": while A's expression "when a ج" and IUK's correction of the rule are both open to the objection that they do not include such as حَجْرَةٍ [above], where the Hamza is substituted for the ى of feminization (Sn): (k) the manner of this substitution is disputed:— (α) it is said that the ى and ى are changed into حمزة, which is apparently the language of IM: (β) critical judges of etymology say that an ى is substituted for the ى and ى, and afterwards the ى is changed into حمزة: for, when ْ كِسَارٍ and ْ رَدَائِ are said, the ى and ى are mobile
after a Fatha [684], there being no barrier between them except the aug. َت, 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 َعَصَأ and رَحِى [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 َع of an act. part. from a v. whose َع is transformed, [whether the act. part. mentioned be, or be not, denuded of the sign of the fem., du., and pl. (Sn),] as ِتَأْرَلُ and َبَيِّعُ [above] (Aud, A), which are orig. ِتَأْرَلُ and َبَيِّعُ; but are [transformed, because (Tsr)] made to accord with the v. (A, Tsr) in transformation (A), though the transformation in them is by conversion of the َع into Hamza [below], and in the v. by conversion of it into ِ (Sn): contrary to such as ُعَرَر was blind of one eye [684], act. part. ُعَرَر [708], and ُعَيِّن was large in the eye, act. part.
(Aud, A), because the ع, being sounded true in the v., from fear of confusion with عار rendered blind of one eye and عان smote with the evil eye, is sounded true in the act. part. [also] (Tsr): (a) this substitution is current in what is on the measure of فاعل or فاعلة when not an act. part., like جآئز [247], which is [spelt with a ج and J] by Kh, who expounds it as (Sn) a garden, whence

[419] (A), where it is spelt with a ج and J [247] by Al‘Aini, who expounds it as a place where water collects (Sn); and like جآئز, 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 جآئز [with the ج and J, which is a garden (Tsr)], and [its fem. (Tsr)] جآئزة [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 , or Ş is changed into
Hamza, as IM says (A); but, if A had said "which is
apparently the language of IM", as he says in the
corresponding passage [of case 1 (k, α)] above, it
would have been better (Sn): (b) the majority say
"Nay, they are converted into l, [because each of them
is mobile after a Fatha separated (from it) by a not
insuperable barrier (Sn)]; and afterwards the l is
changed into Hamza, as before mentioned [under case 1
(k, β)] in connection with ġīn and ġīn; 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 l of Ṣalā' is inserted before
the converted ֠ in ֿאֲ עַ and ּ בַּע [684, 703], and their likes; so that, two ֠s then concurring, both of which are quiescent, [the one representing] the ּ is mobilized, because it is orig. mobile; and the ֠, when mobilized, becomes a Hamza [below] (A): (d) according to the saying of Mb, then, the , and ּ are not regarded in the act. part., contrary to their case according to the two previous sayings: this is what appears to me to be the truth; and by it the saying of Mb differs [from what is apparently the language of IM, as well as] from the saying of the majority (Sn): (e) such [formations] as ּ בָּאְעַ and ּ נָלְעַ are written with the ּ, according to the predicament of alleviation [by softening the Hamza between pure Hamza and pure ּ, as is proved by what follows (Sn)], because the rule of the Hamza in those [formations] is to be softened between Hamza and ּ [658], for which reason it is written as a ּ: (f) as for changing the Hamza in those [formations] into pure ּ, they categorically declare it to be a solecism: and so [do they declare] sounding the ּ true in ּ בָּאְעַ, [i. e., pronouncing it as though it were the rad. (ּ), not changed from the Hamza, so that this (solecism) is not the same as the preceding (Sn)]; while, if the ּ might be sounded true in ּ בָּאְעַ, the might be sounded true in ּ נָלְעַ: (g) for that reason, [i. e., because the “changing” or “sounding true” mentioned by A is a solecism (Sn),] the
The dotting of the ی of تاکلد and یآیین is disallowed: MM says "The dotting of the ی of تاکلد and یآیین is vulgar: and", says he, "I have seen in one of JJ's compositions that F entered the presence of one of the so-called learned; and lo, before him was a piece of paper having تاکلد written on it with two dots below [the ی]: so F said to that Master 'Whose writing is this?', and he said 'My writing'; whereupon F turned to his companion, and said 'We have wasted our steps in visiting his like', and instantly went out" (A) : (3) where the ی occurs [in the pl.] after the ی of مفاعل [18, 256], while, in the sing., it is an aug. letter of prolongation [third], as [\[ عُجَبُرُز ، pl. (Tsr)\]], and [\[ صَحِيفَة ، pl. (Tsr)\]] صِكَتْف [246, 703, 717]: (a) the ی shares with the ی in this case, as تَلَٰدْه 'necklace, collar, pl. تَلَٰدْ'، and [\[ رَسَآئِل ، pl. رَسَآئِل [246, 717] (Aud) : (b) IM indicates the third [case] by his saying "And the [letter of (Sn)] prolongation", [whether ا ی, or an ا (Sn)], "when an aug. third in the sing., is seen as Hamza in the like of [the pl.] تَلَٰدْ [above]," i.e., The aug. letter of prolongation third [in the sing.] must be changed into Hamza in the pl. on the paradigm of مفاعل، as تَلَٰدْ، pl. تَلَٰدْ [above]; عُجَبُرُز، صَحِيفَة; and عُجَبُرُز، pl.
(A): (c) that [conversion of such a letter of prolongation into Hamza] is because, when you pluralize [and رَأْيَةُ (Tsr)] on the paradigm of مَفْعَلٌ, the \( l \) of the pl. occurs third, while the \( l \) of رَأْيَةُ (Tsr) occurs after it; so that, two \( s \) being combined, elision or mobilization of one of them is unavoidable; and, if the first [\( l \) (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 \( l \) and the letter of [its (Sn)] inflection, in order that the pl. may be like مَفْعَلٌ; so that nothing remains but mobilization of the second [\( l \) (Tsr)] with Kasr, in order that it may be like the \( e \) of مَفْعَلٌ; and the \( l \), when mobilized, is converted into Hamza [below]: while the \( t \) and the of صَحِيفَةَ [above] are assimilated to the \( l \) of رَأْيَةُ [and رَأْيَةُ (Tsr)], because they are preceded by a vowel homogeneous with them, [and are quiescent; so that they are treated (Tsr)] like the \( l \): this is the reason given by IJ: (d) Khl says that the \( l \), \( i \), and \( a \) are turned into Hamza in صَكَانُفُ, رَسَائِلُ, and عَجْبَانُثُ, 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, [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)] (α) [the preceding exs. or] (ςςορ), which is a lion (Tsr, Sn), pl. (ςςαοιρ) [253, 675] (Aud, A), because the, [in the sing.] is not a letter of prolongation (Tsr) : (b) [μαυαϊς, pl. μαυαφος (A), pl. μαυαφος] [246, 717] (Aud, A), and μαυαβος (A), because the letter of prolongation in the sing. is rad., so that it is not changed [in the pl.] (Tsr): (α) [μαυαβος (A), and μαυαβος minaret, pl. (Aud)] μαυαβος, [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 μαυαβος and μαυαβος, which also are said (A): βμαυαβος also, with Hamza in one version transmitted from Näśr, is anomalous, the well-known [version] transmitted from him being with, as [mentioned] in [the Commentary of] IUK [on the IM] (Sn) : (c) [373, 674], (αυςςυν, [373, 675], and [373, 675], and [366, 379], and [253, 396], and a certain dry measure [685]: because the unsound
letter is not third (A); while and are [also] excluded by the restriction to the letter of prolongation (Sn): (4) where the or occurs as second of two soft letters having the of [18, 256] between them, whether the two soft letters be (a) two s, as in نَيْأَتْفُ، pl. of تَيْف (Aud, A), which is the excess over the decimal number, from نَاف، aor. يَنِيفُ; whereas the saying of Sht that its o.f. is [like هِبَن (251, 716) (Tsr),] is based upon [the theory] that it is from نَاف، aor. يَنِيفُ (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (b) two s, as in أُوَارَكُلْ [715], pl. of أَوْل [357]: or (c) different, [one being a i, and the other a a (Tsr), which includes two cases, precedence of the i before the a, and the converse thereof, both exemplified by A (and Kh) (Sn),] as in سَيِّدٌ سَيِّاکْتَنُ [251], [since it is (Aud)] orig. سَيِّدٌ صَائِدٌ [685, 716] (Aud, A); and صَوَارَدُ pl. of hunter (A, Tsr), where the i is a subst. for the o of [247, 686] (Sn): orig. سَيَارِدُ and سَوَارِدُ [715] (A): (α) what follows the o 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 o of the pl. [715]; so that, if you formed from تَرُ أ a [sing. (Sn)]
like 'Uwārid, you would say 'Uwārid 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 a ә, and of dotting's being disallowed, is [the same] as was mentioned in the case of әә and әә above (A). And here is a [fifth (A)] case peculiar to the , (Aud, A):—— when two әs are combined, and the first is initial, [at the beginning of the word (Tsr),] while the second is either mobile [unrestrictedly (Tsr)], or quiescent, [but] original as a ә, then the first ә 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 әә [357, 672, 674]; and, since reduplication at the beginning of a word is rare with sound letters, it is impossible with the ә, from the heaviness of the latter: (2) that, since they allow [the initial ә of] әә [below] and the like, which is a single ә, to be changed [into Hamza], on account of [the fact] that, by reason of the Damma, it is like two әs, they are naturally disposed to make the change obligatory when two әs are [actually] present, because two әs are heavier than a ә 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 \( \text{جَاصِلة} \) joining and preserver, where you say \( \text{آَوْرُسْلُ} \) [357, 661] and \( \text{آَوْرَي} \) (Aud), like \( \text{ضَوَّرَبُ} \), pl. \( \text{ضَوَّرَبْتَا} \) [247, 383, 686] (Tsr), orig. \( \text{زَوِّرُي} \) and \( \text{زَوِّرَي} \) (Aud), with two \( \text{s} \) [below], the first of which is changed into Hamza, as 

\( \text{١} \) [48] (Tsr): and the second [case (Tsr)] as in 

\( \text{آَاٰلٰي} \) fem. of \( \text{آَاٰلٰل} \) [357], orig. \( \text{ٌٌٌوُلٌٌي} \) [below] with two \( \text{s} \), the first being a \( \text{ف} \) pronounced with Damm, and the second a quiescent \( \mathfrak{u} \) (Aud), original as a \( \mathfrak{u} \); while its pl. is \( \text{لَوُرُي} \) [357], orig. \( \text{زَوِّرُي} \) [below], which is treated as above mentioned [under the first case] (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) [the passives (Tsr)] \( \text{ٌٌٌوُفُنٌٌي} \) and \( \text{ٌٌٌوُرُي} \) [below], where [it is not necessary that the first \( \mathfrak{u} \) should be changed into Hamza, because (Tsr)] the second is quiescent, [and] converted from the \( \mathfrak{u} \) of \( \text{فَاعُل} \) [490, 671] (Aud), with Fath of the \( \mathfrak{u} \), vid. \( \text{ٌٌٌوُنَّى} \) reached and \( \text{ٌٌٌوُنَّى} \) hid; so that it is not original as a \( \mathfrak{u} \), because it is a subst. for an aug. ! (Tsr): (b) \( \text{ٌٌٌوُرَّوُي} \) with two \( \text{s} \) and \( \text{ٌٌٌوُرَّوُي} \) alleviated [658] from \( \text{ٌٌٌوُرَّوُي} \) [below] with a \( \mathfrak{u} \) pronounced with Damm, and then a Hamza, fem. of \( \text{آَاٰلٰل} \), the \( \text{ٌٌٌوُنُّعُل} \) [of superiority (Tsr)] from \( \text{ٌٌٌوُلٰ} \) [357], i. q. \( \text{ذَكَأ} \) 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:$^a$(a) allowability is to be understood from the negation of necessity (Tsr). As for [this] substitution of the Hamza for the, it is [said by Z to be] (IY) for every occurring as an initial, coupled with another [,$^{	ext{that is}}$] inseparable [from the formation], as in (1) and [above], $^a$als$^{	ext{and}}$ and $^a$als$^{	ext{, as in [above]}}$: (2) $^a$als$^{	ext{, dim. of joining [below]}}$ (M); and $^a$als$^{	ext{, dim. of [above]}}$: orig. $^a$als$^{	ext{, and in which there are two causes for conversion into Hamza, (a) the combination of two [above]; and (b) the [initial], } ^a$als $^{	ext{being [permanently] pronounced with Damm [below], on account of the dim. formation [274]: (3) [below] and [below], which you would say if you formed a n. like [253] and } ^a$als$^{	ext{, lion from promised, threatened and [weight: (a) if used as names, they would be triptote, because they are [above], like } ^a$als$^{	ext{, Kauthar [671] and Jauhar [369]; not }}$} [18], like $^a$als$^{	ext{, Adra' and Aulaj (IY). 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) َو عَدَّ [and َو َّنِصِّلُ above]; (2) جُرْبَ َو عَدَّ [above], from َو عَدَّ, upon the measure of جَرْبَ َو عَدَّ [below], upon the measure of طُومَار [377] (R).

[But A states the rule thus:—] Whenever two, s. are combined at the beginning of a word, their first must be changed into Hamza, provided that their second be not an unoriginal letter of prolongation (A), being either not a letter of prolongation, or an original letter of prolongation (Sn). Four cases, therefore, are excluded, vid. where the second [ٍ] is a letter of prolongation (1) substituted for (a) the ٌ of َنَأَّكَل [with Fath of the َن (Sn)], as in ُرُفِّي أَلَّاَشَدُ The age of maturity was reached and ٌوُرِّي عَنْهُمَا VII. 19. [686]; (b) a Hamza, as in ُرُوُلِي alleviated from ُرُوُلِي [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 َنَوَعَكَ [482] from َو عَدَّ, and then reduce it to the pass., [in which case you say ِرُوَدَ, the second (ٍ) 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 طُومَار [above] from َو عَدَّ, in which case you say ُرُوْكِانَ: (a) in these four cases the change [of َو into Hamza] is not necessary, but allowable: (b) some differ
about the fourth, where they hold the change to be necessary, [as above,] because two s are combined [at the beginning of the word]; while the second, [though an aug. letter of prolongation (Sn),] is not substituted for an aug., [contrary to the (second),] of such as ُروس (Sn),] since the Damma before it is unadventitious, [contrary to the Damma before the letter of prolongation in such as ُروس (Sn): and this opinion is adopted by IU [and R]: (c) IM prefers the saying that both modes are allowable, because the second [ ], 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 [ ] converted [from the (Sn)] | (A) in such as ُروس (Sn). And two cases are included, in which the change is necessary, vid. where the second [ ] is (1) not a letter of prolongation, as in (a) ُروس pl. of ُروس fem. of ُروس, orig. ُروس [above]; (b) ُروس and ُروس and ُروس, pl. of ُروس and ُروس, orig. ُروس and ُروس, with two s [above], the first the of the word, and the second a subst. for the | of ُروس [686], as it is substituted in the dim., like ُروس and ُروس (A), dims. of ُروس [above] and ُروس preserver; though ُروس and ُروس [above] would be more conformable to what
precedes (Sn): (c) יו"ע [above], which you would say if you formed the paradigm of גוקב [373] from יו"ע, orig. יו"ע: (2) an original letter of prolongation, as in א"ל ני, orig. ני [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 fem. of לא"ל ני, orig. ני [above]: (2) not a letter of prolongation at all, because not after Damma, whether it be (a) mobile, as in א"ל א, [and א"ל א,] mentioned [above]; and in ג"ל |pl. of לא"ל ני, orig. ני [above]: or (b) quiescent, after a vowel other than Damma, as in ג"ל |, orig. ג"ל with three s [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 נאע, as in ני and ני [above], where א or Ni [below] with Hamza are allowable; or for a Hamza, as in לא"ל ני alleviated from לא"ל ני [above]; or for any other [letter], as detailed by A (MKh). The restriction of initiality [in the first ] excludes such [forms] as מ"וי [661] and מ"וי (Aud, A), rel. ns. of וי love and וי 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)] [482] from اُنْفِرَعْلِ [i. q. ُۚعُدَلِ promising, threatening (Sn)], in which case you say اِبْأَوَّلِ اْبَأَوَّلِ, orig. اِلْوُرَأَىَ, the first , being converted into ى because of its quiescence after a Kasra [685, 699], and the last ى into I 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 , because of the cessation of the motive for its conversion; so that the word is reduced to ازُرَأَيْ [with a ى pronounced with Fath, and then a quiescent , (Sn)], where two ى 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 , the word then becoming اَرَأَيْ [with two ى s pronounced with Fath, and then an I (Sn)], both modes, [retention of the (first), 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
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conjunction of two \( s \), whether [the vowel of \( \text{Sn} \)] the second [Hamza \( \text{Sn} \)] be transferred, or not \( A \). The allowable [substitution of the Hamza for a letter of softness] is its substitution for every \( \), [permanently \( \text{IY} \)] pronounced with \( \text{Damm} \) [675], occurring \( 1 \) single, when \( a \) \( \text{ف} \), as in \( \text{أجوة} \) and \( \text{IY} \) [278, 322, 682, 699] \( \text{M} \), \( \text{وقت} \) \( \text{أخت} \) [278, 322] \( \text{IY} \); \( b \) an \( \text{ع} \), not [doubled by having another \( \) ] incorporated into [it], as \( \text{أدوور} \) [278] \( \text{M} \), pl. of \( \text{دار} \), and \( \text{أدوور} \) pl. of \( \text{دُوَّر} \) : 'Umar Ibn Abi Rab'\( a \) says

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{فَلَمَا نَقَدْتُ آصَرَتْ مِنْهُمُتْ أُطْفِيقَتْ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{مَصَابِيحُ شَبَتْ بِالْعَشَاةَ وَآنْرُ}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{لُكَلَّ دُهْرِ قَدْ لَبِسَتْ آثِرُبَا}
\end{align*}
\]

[242] \( \text{IY} \) : \( 2 \) coupled [with another \( \) ], when [the \( \) permanently pronounced with \( \text{Damm} \)] is \( \text{ع} \), as in \( \text{عود} \) [below] and \( \text{نور} \) [278] \( \text{M} \). The formula for it is “Every \( \) pronounced with a permanent [below] \( \text{Damma} \), whether such \( \) be initial, [as in \( \text{أجوة} \);] or medial, [as in \( \text{أدوور} \) and \( \text{نور} \):] and whether that which is initial be followed by an \( \text{aug.} \), converted from another letter, as in \( \text{أديري} \) [above]; or not, as in \( \text{أجوة} \) [above].” \( \text{R} \). As for
the substitution of the Hamza for the \textsuperscript{1} pronounced with Damm, mentioned [in the last two paragraphs], it is good, regular, as in (1) \textit{اجْحَة}, \textit{أَجْحَة}, \textit{وجْحَة} \textsuperscript{2, orig.} [above]; (2) \textit{آَدُور} \textsuperscript{[above]} and \textit{آَدور} pl. of \textit{نَار} \textit{fire}, orig. \textit{آَدُور} and \textit{آَدور} \textsuperscript{[242]}; (3) \textit{شَانَك}, \textit{سَاقَى} \textsuperscript{[237]} pl. of \textit{شْجَر} \textit{shank}, and \textit{غَور}, \textit{رَجَو} \textit{inf. n.} of \textit{غَآَرَ أَلْبَاء}; \textit{The water sank}, aor. \textit{يَغُرَ}, \textit{inf. ns.} \textit{رَجَو} and \textit{غَور}, where the conversion is not on account of the combination of two \textit{s}, because the second is an \textit{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 \textit{ذَلْف} \textit{This is a bucket} (IY, A); (2) the [concurrence of (IY, A)] two quiescents (IY, R, A), as in II. 15. \textsuperscript{[403, 664, 684]} and II. 238. \textsuperscript{[547, 664, 684]} (IY, A). And "not doubled [by having another \textit{r}, incorporated into it]" is to guard against such as \textit{رَكْمُ} \textit{taking refuge} and \textit{نَكْمُ} \textit{shifting}. As for the substitution of the Hamza for the \textit{ش} pronounced with Kasr between an \textit{l} and a double \textit{ش}, it [also] is [an allowable substitution for a letter of softness; and occurs] in such as \textit{تَعْرُن} \textit{and} \textit{تَعْزُن} \textsuperscript{305}, rel. ns. of \textit{نَأْذِي} \textit{and} \textit{خَأْثِي} \textsuperscript{[305]}, rel. ns. of \textit{مَأْذِي} \textit{and} \textit{غَلِيَّة}, \textit{orig.} \textit{رَأْيِي} \textit{with three \textit{s}, then lightened by conversion of the first into Hamza (A). The irregular (M), anomalous (A), [substitution of the Hamza for a letter of softness] is its substitution
for (1) the й in [a good number of positions (IY), such as (M) (a) داية and شابة [665] (M, A), for داية and شابة, where the й, being mobilized on account of the concurrence of two quiescents, is converted into Hamza, because the й 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 (IY)] إبياض (M, A), إشعال (M), and إشعال إشعال for إشعال, إبياض, and إشعال: Dukain says

\( \text{حَلَبَةُ حَتَى أَبيَاضَ مِلْبَنَةٍ} \)

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

\( \text{وَلَّا أَرَيْنَ أَمَا سُوِّهَا فَتَكَأْنُتْ طَيْبَةٌ وَأَمَا دِيَضْهَا فَأَدْهَأْمِ} \)

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 فَأَدْهَأْمَتْ؛ and they recite

\( \text{وَبَعْدَ طَيْبَةٍ أَلْسِيْبِ مِنْ كُلِّ جَانِبٍ} \)

\( \text{عَلَى لِبَتِي حَتَى أَشْعَالَ بَهْيِمَهَا} \)

And after the whiteness of hoariness from every side, which has so overgrown my head of hair that its black has become glistening, meaning إشعال: while AZ is reported to have said "I heard 'Amr Ibn 'Ubaid read
LV. 39. [665]; and I thought that he had committed a solecism, until I heard the Arabs say \( \text{داً} \text{تاً} \) and \( \text{شَابَة} \) [above]” (IY); (b) [665] and [247, 373], reported to have been pronounced with Hamza by Al‘Ajjaj (M, A), who says

\[ \text{يا دار سُلْمِي يا آسْلِيِي فَخْدِنِينَ هَذا الْعَالَمِ} \]

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

\[ \text{كَأَنَّهَا بَآْرُ نَجِيَ فَوقَ مَرْفَقَة} \]

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)] \( \text{نُرْتُبٌ} \text{آللدِحَاجة} \) The hen clucked [674]; and the poet says \( \text{صَبًّا فَقَدَ هَيِتَجْتِ} \) [665] (M), cited by Fr, where the poet, being
constrained to mobilize the l before the ق of مُشْتَقَّقٍ, because it corresponds to the ج of مُشْتَقَّلٍ, 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 ج from which the l was converted, since مُشْتَقَّلٍ مُشْتَقَّقٍ is orig. شَوْقُ (IY); and Fr transmits, in a case of no constraint, رَجُلٌ مَثِيلٌ a wealthy man (R), for لَبِيْهُ الرَجُلٌ بَالْعُقُبِ The man discharged the obligation of performing the pilgrimage (R), for لَبِيْهِ (MAR): (a) that [conversion of the l 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 l and Hamza [732] (R): (2) the ج not pronounced with Damm (M), (a) when a ف pronounced with Kasr or Fath (IY): (α) as for the substitution of the Hamza for the initial [below] ج pronounced with Kasr, it is (A) in such as لَبَاءِ [699], إسْتَحْجَاهُ, إِسْتَحْجَاهُ, and لَبَاءِ [for لَبَاءِ baldrice, وَسَاحُةَ embassy, and لَبَاءِ cushion (IY, A)]; and لَبَاءِ إِعْنَاهُ for لَبَاءِ suck, whence (IY) إِعْنَاهُّ أُخِيَّهُ XII. 76. The sack of his brother [Benjamin (K, B)] in the reading of [Ubayy (A),] Sa‘id Ibn Jubair (M, A), and IHU (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  pronounced with Kasr to the , pronounced with Damm, since they deem Kasra, as they deem Damma, to be heavy [on the ] (IY): (β) Mz holds this substitution to be regular [322] (M, R, A) in the [initial , (R)] pronounced with Kasr (M, R): but others restrict it to hearsay (IY, A); while I'm reports that IUK says "I have seen in some book that it is the dial. of Hudhail" (Sn): (γ) "initial" [above] is to guard against such as the , of طَرِيقَة long [684], which is not converted, because the [ , ] pronounced with Kasr, being lighter than the one pronounced with Damm, is not converted in every position; while the middle is more remote from alteration [than the beginning] (A): (b) [as for the (initial) , pronounced with Fath, it is not converted, because of the lightness of Fatha, except (A)] in [their anomalous sayings (A)] َلَانِعٌ languid [699] (M, A), on the measure of َقَناُة spear-shaft (Sn), said of a woman, orig. َقَناعُة (IY, A), َفَنَعَلَ from َفَنَى i. q. ُفُنِّى languor (IY), [or] from َقَناعُة [with Fath of the , and quiescence of the ] , as is understood from the KF (Sn),] i. q. بَطَأ slowness (A); َأَسْبَاء Asmá (M, A), a
woman's name (IY, A), to guard against "اسم pl. of اسم [667] (Sn), because, says IS, it is orig. "اسم [699] (A), its measure being "اسم (IY), from "اسم i. q. حسن "اسم (IY, A); and "اسم [322] (M, A), when used as a num. (IY, A) in "احد عشرة and "احدن什 [313] (IY), orig. "احدن什, from "احدن什 unity; contrary to "احدن什 (IY, A) in "ما جا نبni "احدن什 There is not any one in the house (IY), where the Hamza is [said to be (A)] original (IY, A), because "احدن什 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 "احدن什 in the tradition (M) that Muhammad said to a man, who made the sign with his two forefingers in reciting the creed, "احدن什 "احدن什 Make the sign with one, one, i. e., "احدن什 "احدن什 (IY): (b) [when a letter of prolongation: for] F recites

أحب الرمطين إلى موسى # وجعلته إذ أضاها فألقوه (R), by Jarir, praising Hishām Ibn 'Abd AlMalik, The dearest of the kindlers (of fire) to me are, also related لكتب الموزدان Assuredly very dear to me are [476] the two kindlers (of fire), Mūsā and his sister Ja'da, when the blaze has lighted them up (Jsh), with the of [or the الموزدان] and pronounced as
a Hamza; while ـَّـَ~ XXXVIII. 32.|[459] is [reported to have been (B)] read [by Ibn Kathîr with the، (B)] pronounced as Hamza (R), because of the Damma before it, like ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ the reason of that is said to be that the،, being in the vicinity of Damma, becomes, as it were, vocalized with Damm; while the، vocalized with Damm is [regularly] pronounced as Hamza, as in ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ (3) theى (M, A), (a) when [initial, and] pronounced with Fath, in which case they substitute Hamza for theى, as they substitute it for the [initial]ى [pronounced with Fath], though more rarely than for the، [above] (IY): they say (a) قطع ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ God cut off his hand! (M, R, A), with Fath of the Hamza, and quiescence of the ج (Sn), meaning ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ by restoring the ج [260, 719], and (IY, R, A) substituting a Hamza for the ف (IY), [i. e.,] changing the [first (R)]ى into Hamza (R, A): so says IJ (R): (α) ف says that ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ a dial. var., ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ being on a par with ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ Yalamlam, [a mountain of Tihâma (BK, MI),] and ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ Alamlam; but his pupil IJ disagrees with him (Sn): (b) In his teeth is ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ i. e., ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ [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 ـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~ [663, 703] said of a 131 a
man, and 

of a woman (IY, A): (b) [when a letter of prolongation: for] they (M, R), [or] some of them (A), say ʃaḥa'ah nature (M, R, A) with Hamza (A), orig. with ی (IY, R), the Hamza being a subst. for the ی (IY); and similarly ٌبَال, which is the lion (A). The substitution of the Hamza for the ی [and ی (A)] is rare (IY, A), i. e., anomalous (Sn), irregular (IY). Its substitution for the ی is in (1) [such as (Jrb)] م [304, 326, 682, 684] (M, Jrb, A), and [sometimes also in its pl. (Jrb)] م [below] (M, Jrb): (a) the o. f. of م (IY, R, Jrb, BS, A) is م [below] (Jrb, A), the o. f. of which (A) is م (IY, R, BS, A), as is proved by [the dim. (IY)] م [275, 278] (IY, Jrb, A) and [the broken pl. (IY)] م [278] (IY, A), its ب being converted into ب (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 م becomes م [above] (IY): while its ب, [being then assimilated to the unsound letters (IY, R), on account of its faintness, and being therefore like a ب or ی occurring as a final after an aug. ب (R),] is converted [into ب, and afterwards (R)] into Hamza, [as in case 1 (ب, ب) 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 م [above]
with the ٰ, which they sometimes change [into Hamza] (BS); [so that] in the pl. (IY, MAR) they also say ڇڇ ڇڇ (IY, R) for ڇڇ ڇڇ, for a similar reason, [vid. the assimilation of its ٰ to the unsound letters, as explained above under ڇڇ ] (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 ڇڇ ڇڇ [278], according to the o. f., with the ٰ, not otherwise (BS): (d) the substitution in (Jrb) ڇڇ is anomalous (SH, Sn), in two respects, [the substitution of Hamza for the ٰ, and the transformation of two consecutive letters] (Sn); but is (R) obligatory (SH), whereas in ڇڇ it is not so (Jrb): (e) hence ڇڇ [275, 278, 304, 326, 684], a [lexicological] pl. of ڇڇ, orig. ڇڇ with quiescence of the ڇ: for they elide the ٰ by assimilation to the unsound letters, because of its faintness, weak, and finality; and, when the ٰ is elided, the n. remains as ڇڇ; and then the ڇ, is pronounced with Fath, because of its vicinity to the ٰ of femininization, the letter before which, [when not an ٰ, ] is pronounced with Fath [646]; so that the ڇ, being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath
is converted into ١ [684], the n. becoming ﯾ١; and, when it is pluralized, the ﯾ of femininization is rejected, on the principle of ﯾ١ and ﯿ ﺯ١ [254]; so that the n. remains with two letters, the last of them an ١, which, when Tanwîn is affixed to it, is exposed to elision, as the ١ of ﯾ١ and ﯾ١٩ is elided [648, 684, 719], in which case the explicit n. would remain with one letter; and, that being impossible, they restore the ﯾ elided from the sing., so that the word becomes constructively ﯾ١, restoration of the elided being more appropriate than importation of a strange, extraneous letter; and then the ﯾ is changed into Hamza, so that ﯾ١ is said (IY): (f) ﯾ١ family is said to be orig. ﯾ٠; then ﯾ١٩, the ﯾ being converted into Hamza; then ﯾ١, the Hamza being converted into ١ [658]: that is because conversion of the ﯾ into ١ [684] is not established, while its conversion into Hamza [above] is established; and it is better to rely upon that conversion of which similar instances are established: but Ks says that its o. f. is ﯾ٠ [684], because they, [i. e., the members of the family,] ﯾ١٩ go back to a [common] stock, or origin (R): (2) ﯾ٠ نَِٰ۟٨١٩ [599] and ﯾ٠ نَِٰ۟٨١٩ [682] (M, A), i. q. ﯾ٠ نَِٰ۟٨١٩ and ﯾ٠ نَِٰ۟٨١٩ (A): (a) AU relates that the Arabs say ﯾ٠ نَِٰ۟٨١٩ [above], meaning ﯾ٠ نَِٰ۟٨١٩ (IY, R); while the Hamza here is
decided to be a subst. for the s, because in interrogation
is prevalently, and [\[ٓآ\] with] Hamza rarely, used,
for which reason the s is [considered to be] original: (b)
as for their saying ٓآ تَعَلَتْ آَلآ تَعَلَتْ i. q. ٓآْٓا تَعَلَتْ (IY), it is
said [that the Hamza here is a subst. for the s, and
(IY)] that the o. f. [of ٓآ in excitation (R)] is ٓآ (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

ٌمَالِ سَاعَاتٍ مَلآ اِلْوِيْدِيِّقِ ٍعَبَابُ بَعْثٍ مَساَحٍ رُمْجٍْ

(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 عَبَابُ is meant (IY), عَبَابُ being orig. عَبَابُ (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 ًعِنٍ ثَرَسَتْ أَلْحَحْ (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
عَبَابُ is only [\[ٓآ\] from 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 ى pronounced with Kasr between an ٰ and a double ى, the initial ى pronounced with Kasr, the ى, and the ى, as also the irregular substitutions for the ٰ ى and ى] are not mentioned here by IM is only that the substitution of the Hamza for them is allowable [or anomalous], not necessary; whereas here he notices only the necessary; and, if he notices any thing else, it is [merely] by way of digression. As for its substitution for the ى and ى, it is [found in] their sayings صَرَحَ for صَرَخَ screamed, and ُرَغَّنَة [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 ى is substituted for (M, SH, A) four letters (IY, A), (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), the , and ى (IY, A, MASH); (3) the Hamza (M, SH, A); (4) the [single (A)] ن (M, A). [And IH mentions a fifth, vid. the ى below.] Its substitution for its two sisters is (1) [regular (M), obligatory (SH),] in (a) such as بَاب، [719] رَمَيَ and دَعَا [703] (M, SH), and نَاب [703, 711], vid. where the , and ى are mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (M, R),
subject to the [other] conditions mentioned [by A below] (R): (b) ْجَلَّ, according to one opinion (SH), since its o. f., according to Ks, is ُّجَلَّ [683], because its dim., according to some, is ُّجِلَّ [683]; but the َّ is converted into ِ: while, according to the BB [below], the ِ is substituted for the َّ (Jrb): (2) irregular: [rare (IY)], in such as ُّيَاجِلَّ [below], ُّحَارِي (M), where they substitute an ِ, from desire of lightness [below], for the quiescent َّ and َّ, when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (IY). IM indicates the [regular] substitution of the ِ for its two sisters by his saying “Substitute an ِ for a َّ or َّ orig. mobile, after a conjoined Fath”, i. e., Change of the َّ and َّ into ِ is necessary upon eleven conditions, (1) that they be mobile; for which reason they are sounded true in بِعُ [703], because of their quiescence: (2) that their vowel be original; for which reason they are sounded true in ُّجَيْلُ [300, 658] and ُّتَوَّأَمُ ُّجِيَّلَل the she-hyæna and ُّتَوَّأَمُ ُّجِيَّلَل 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 ُّعَوْض compensation [711], ُّجَيْلُ [685], and ُّسوَرَ ُّسوَرَ 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 َعَلَبَتْ [392] were formed from raiding and ُرَمَيْتِ shooting, ُعَزَّزُ and ُرَمَيْتِ would be said, defective (A), like [16, 671], orig. ُعَزَّزُ with two s, and ُرَمَيْتِ with two ى s (Sn); and the [first] ى and ى would not be converted into ٍ, because the conjunction of the Fatha with them would be adventitious, caused by elision of an ٍ, since the o. f. would be ُعَلَبَتْ [727] and ُرَمَيْتِ, because ُعَلَبَتْ is orig. ُعَلَبَتْ [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 ى 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 ى, the transformation of which is not restrained by any quiescent other than an ٍ, or [than] a ى wherein doubling is customary": (b) for that reason
the \( \epsilon \) is sounded true in such as \( \text{قَبَان} \) *perspicuity*, \( \text{طُبِيل} \) \( [348, 683] \), \( \text{خِورَتِق} \) \( [348] \), and the \( \text{خَوْارَنَك} \); and the \( \lambda \) in such as \( \text{عَصْرَانِ} \) and \( \text{فُتْيَانِ} \), \( [663, 719] \), \( \text{غُرْزَا} \) \( [229] \), \( \text{عُمَرْيَي} \) \( [299] \), and \( \text{فُنْوُي} \) \( [300] \) \( (A) \), these [last] two exs. being combined by \( \text{A} \) because the \( \epsilon \) in the first is converted from the second \( \text{عَلِي} \) of \( \text{علِي} \), which is converted from \( \text{A} \); and in the second is converted from the \( \iota \) of \( \text{youth} \), which is converted from \( \text{a} \) \( (\text{Sn}) \); while the \( \epsilon \) is transformed in \( \text{بَاكَ} \) \( \text{نَاب} \) \( [703] \), and \( \text{يَأْعَ} \) \( \text{قَامَ} \) \( [703, 711] \), because the letter after it is mobile; and the \( \lambda \) in \( \text{ذَعَأ} \) and \( \text{رَمَي} \) \( [719] \), since there is no \( \imath \) or double \( \epsilon \) after it: (c) similarly [the \( \lambda \) is transformed in \( \text{يَخْضُنُون} \) \( \text{They dread} \) and \( \text{يَمْكَرون} \) \( \text{They obliterate} \) [with Fath of the \( \text{ح} \)], according to the dial. of those who say \( \text{مَكَاحُ} \), \( \text{اَوَر} \), \( \text{الْحُمَر} \) \( (\text{Sn}) \), \( \text{وَرُيَ} \) \( \text{يُخْضِينُون} \) \( \text{and} \) \( \text{يُمْكِرون} \) \( \text{[with two} \), \( \text{s} \) \( (\text{Sn}) \), the [second] \( \epsilon \) and [first], \( \epsilon \), respectively, being converted into \( \imath \), because mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; but being afterwards elided, because of the two quiescents: (d) and so, in the \( \text{pl.} \) of \( \text{عَصَمَا} \) \( \text{Aṣa} \), when used as a name [for a rational male \( (\text{Sn}) \)], you say \( \text{عَصْرَانِ} \) \( \text{قَامَ} \) \( [13] \) \( \text{stood, orig.} \), \( \text{عَصْرُون} \) \( \text{[the first} \), \( \epsilon \) of] which is treated as mentioned [under (c)]; (e) according to this, if you formed from \( \text{غُرَرَ} \) \( \text{رَمَى} \) and \( \text{a word} \)
like عَنْكَبُوت [399], you would say رَمِيَتَوَ and عَزْرُوت [with Fath of their first and third, and quiescence of their second (Sn)], orig. رَمِيَتَوَ and عَزْرُوت, the [second] ی and ، being converted [into ی]; and [afterwards] elided, because of meeting the quiescent [۰۰]: and that [formation] would be facilitated by the freedom from confusion [of the transformed with the o. f. (Sn)], since there is no یُفَعَّلُوتُ in the language (A); so that [in رَمِيَتَوَ and عَزْرُوت] one would understand it to be transformed, orig. یُفَعَّلُوتُ [399] (Sn): (f) some hold that this [unsound letter in the word formed on the measure of عَنْكَبُوت from رَمِيَتَوَ and عَزْرُوت (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 یَبْخَشَوْنَ [above], یَمْضَوْنَ, and یَضْمَوْنَ, 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 ی or ی] true before the ی and the double ی is that, (a) if they transformed [it] before the ی, two quiescent ی's would be combined, so that one of them would be elided [663]; and therefore ambiguity would result in such as [۰۰ ۰۰ ۰۰], because it would become ۰۰ and ۰۰, and no one would know whether it belonged to the du. or to the sing.;
while what would not involve ambiguity, [such as قنَّابَيْنِ (Sn),] is made to accord with what would involve ambiguity, because it belongs to the same cat. [in that the و and ی are followed by a quiescent La (Sn)]: (b) the ی of such as عَلْوٍی is in a position where ل is changed into ﺔ (A), because the ی of relation necessitates conversion of the ل [third] into ﺔ [300]; so that, if the ﺔ were converted into ل, because of its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, the ل would be converted into ﺔ, on account of the ی of relation; and an endless concatenation of conversions [from ﺔ] into ل, and [from ل] into ﺔ, would be entailed (Sn): (7, 8) that neither of them be an ل of the لَّنَعَلَ [with Kasr of the لَّنَعَلَ (Sn)], whose qual. is لَّنَعَلَ [348]; or of the inf. n. of this v. [331]: (a) these two conditions IM indicates by his saying “But the لَّنَعَلَ لَّنَعَلَ”, as غِيدَ tenderness and squinting, “and لَّنَعَلَ لَّنَعَلَ”, as غِيدَ was tender and squinted, “when possessed of” a qual. لَّنَعَلَ [below], like غِيدَ [tender in body (Sn)] and أَحْوَلُ squint eyed, cross-eyed, wry, is sounded true” [703]: (b) the reason why the v. in this cat. must be sounded true [in the لَّنَعَلَ] is only that it is made to accord with لَّنَعَلَ [707], as أَحْوَلُ squinted and غِيدَ 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 ٌْعَّلَ " [above] IM

guards against such as ٌْعَّلَ [403]: for it is ٌْعَّلَ with Kasr

of the ع [704], on the evidence of ٌْمَنْ felt safe (A),

being the opp. of ُحَاف، 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 ٌْنَعَّلُ, like

fearing, not ٌْنَعَّلُ: (9) which is peculiar to the ع,

that it be not an ع of the ٌْنَعَّل م 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 ٌْنَعَّل م, the ع, when a ع [below], is

preserved, and is not transformed", i.e., When the ٌْنَعَّل م

whose ع is a ع is i.q. تَفَاعَلَك [487], it is sounded true [in

the ع], because made to accord with تَفَاعَلَك ٌْمَنْ 703], on

account of its being in the sense thereof, as اٌْجَتْنُوا [492, 707] and اٌْدُوْجُوا They intermarried [693, 707], i.q.

and اٌْدُوْجُوا تَتَأَجُّنُوا: (b) by his saying "And, if reciprocity

be plain" [above], he guards against ٌْنَعَّل م's not being

i.q. تَفَاعَلَك, in which case its transformation is necessary,

unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether its ع be a ع, as in

ٌْزَاكِبَ doubted; or a ع (Sn)], as in اٌْخَتَانُ was unfaithful, i.q.
and passed through, i. q. 

(c) by his saying “when a ء,” [above], he guards against its ء being a ی, in which case its transformation is necessary, even though it be indicative of reciprocity, as

They were distinct, one from another, They trafficked, one with another, and meaning They smote one another with swords, i. q. 

because the ی is more like, [i. e., nearer in lightness to (Sn),] the ی than the ء [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 s, or two ی s, or a ء 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 ء s is [in] such as blackness, inf. n. of ی حوٰى i. q. was black, [the fact] that the ! of ء is converted from a ء being proved
by their saying حَوْرَانٍ for its du. [229], and حُرُوُّ [672] for the pl. [249] and fem. [273] of black; (β) of two ى s is [in] such as أَلْحَبَاءٌ for rain, its o. f. being حَيِّيٌ, because its du. [229] is حَيْيَانٍ; but its second ى being transformed [into ٰ] because of what has been mentioned above [under (a)]; (γ) of the ٰ and ى is [in] such as أَلْحَوْرَيٌ love [326], its o. f. being حَوْرٌ, but its ى being transformed: (b) for that reason one sounds [both the ى and ٰ] true in such as حَيَوْانٌ animal [698], because the [letter] entitled to transformation is the ٰ, transformation of which is impossible [under the sixth condition], because it is a ل followed immediately by an ٰ (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 عَامٌ utmost extent [723], orig. غَامِعٌ [with Fath of the two ى s (Sn)], the first ى being transformed [into ٰ], and the second sounded true, which is facilitated by the second’s not occurring as a final: (α) like عَامٌ in that [respect] are تَأْيِةٌ [305]: ٰتَأْيِهٌ [302, 305, 683, 723], according to Khl, its o. f. being تَأِيَةٌ; but the ى 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 $\ell\dot{a}$) (b) the saying that its o. f. is

(α) $\ell\dot{a}$ [commonly written $\ell\dot{a}$, as in B on II. 37.],

with quiescence of the first $\ddot{i}$ [298], entails transformation of the quiescent $\ddot{i}$, [contrary to the first condition]:

(β) $\ell\dot{a}$, on the measure of $\ddot{i}\dot{\nu}^\prime$, entails elision of the $\ddot{e}$ without any necessitating cause (A) for its elision, because the customary [procedure] in the like [formation] is conversion of the first $\ddot{i}$ into Hamza, as [the $\ddot{i}$ and $\ddot{e}$ are converted] in $\ddot{b}\dot{\nu}^\prime$ and $\ddot{\nu}^\prime \ddot{i}$ [683], [respectively]

(Sn): (γ) $\ell\dot{a}$, like $\ddot{n}\dot{\nu}^\prime$ [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 $\ell\dot{a}$ into $\ddot{i}$, not into $\ddot{e}$ [661] (A), in order to give precedence to incorporation [in $\ell\dot{a}$] over transformation [in $\ell\dot{a}$]: but Jrb holds that precedence should be given to transformation; while some hold that precedence should be given to incorporation in the $\ddot{e}$, and to transformation in the $\ddot{j}$, 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 $\ell\dot{a}$] are
six, the four mentioned by A [above in a (γ) and b]: the
fifth that its o. f. is آيّةُ، with دامم of the first ی،
like سمرَةٌ [254], the ا being converted into ٠، which,
says Kh, is refuted by [the fact] that conversion of the
Dammm into Kasra 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، آيّةُ،
with دامم of the first ی، the transformation of which
[into ٠] is according to rule": [and] the sixth that its
o. f. is آيّةُ with فاث of the first [ی]، as in the first
saying, except that the second [ی] is transformed,
according to rule; so that آيّةُ becomes حياةً، like حياةً
life; and then the ج is moved up to the position of the
ع، in which case its measure is حَلَّةٌ with three Fathas:
(d) the commentary of B [on II. 37.] contains two other
modes، آريّةٌ [like تمرةٍ a date (B)], with quiescence, and
آريّةٌ [like رَمْكَةٍ a mare (B)], with Fath, of the ج؛ 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 عَصَّمُ [685, 722], عُصِّمُ pl. of عَصَمَى [243, 685, 722], and عَصِّمَ inf. n. of عَصَّمَ [685, 722]: so
says YH: (d) the combination of two transformations is
allowable with a separative, as inُ نُ فُ رْنُ They fulfil, since its o. f. isُ فُ رْنُ: 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 inُ مَلاَءِ andُ شَآ اُث [683] andُ تَرْرِي [658], ori.ُ مُ شَآ andُ تَرْرِيُ مُ شَآ: but it is sometimes replied that these expressions are anomalous: so says YS (Sn): (11) that neither of them be anُ عَ of what ends in an augment peculiar to ns. (A), like theُ ن andُ نُ, and theُ فَلْلَمَةُ of feminization (Sn): (a) this [condition] IM indicates by his saying “And theُ عَ of that [word (IA)], at whose end that [augment (IA)] which is peculiar to theُ ن. has been added, must be preserved”, i. e., The conversion of theُ وَ andُ ضَ intoُ ن, on account of their being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is prevented by their being anُ عَ 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 asُ ﺞِؤُلْلَٰنِ [331, 698, 703] andُ سَيْلَانُ ﺞِؤُلْلَٰنُ flowing: (b) whatever instances of this sort, [whose عَ isُ أُ, orُ وَ], and at whose end are anُ نُ andُ نُ (Sn),] occur transformed are reckoned anomalous, asُ دَارُ ﺟٰنُ دُرَٰن andُ مَأَشَانُ Māhān (A), [each of which is] a 133
[proper] name (KF), by rule ُدَوْرَانُ (A, MKh), because orig. the du. of ُدَارُ (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 ُنُ (Tsr, Sn)] is transformation (A, Tsr); and that there is no anomaly in ُدَارُانُ and ُمُهْاَنٌ, but the sounding true in ُجُولُانٌ and ُمُهْاَنٌ. being distracted by love is anomalous (Tsr); because the ُن and ُن do not exclude the n. from resemblance to the v., since they are constructively separate, which, says F, is confirmed by their saying ُزَعْفِاَنٌ from ُزَعْفِاَنٌ [274, 282, 283], the ُن and ُن remaining in the dim., and not being elided (Tsr, Sn): but the correct opinion is the first, which is that of S: (d) there is a dispute about the abbreviated ُل of feminization [263, 272] in such as ُصَرُّرى Sawarà, [on the measure of ُنْعَلَى, mentioned by S (Bk),] which is a name of a water, Mz holding that this ُل 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 ُصَرُّرى, in pronunciation, is equivalent to ُنْعَلَا They two [masc.] did: so that the sounding of [the in] ُصَرُّرى true is, according to Mz, regular; but, according to Akh, anomalous, not to be
copied; and therefore, if the like thereof were formed from ُقُولُ saying, then, according to the opinion of Mz, ُقُولِ would be said; but, according to the opinion of Akh, ُقَالَ and, in this question, IM's choice wavers; for in the Tashil he adopts the opinion of Akh, and in some of his books the opinion of Mz: while [his son] BD decides in favor of the latter; and what Mz holds is the opinion of S: (e) the addition of the [mobile (Sn)] ُ of femininization [263] is disregarded [as a factor] in sounding true, because it does not exclude the n. from the semblance of a v., since the [quiescent (Sn)] ُُُُبَ is affixed to the pret. [607]; so that no incongruity [with the v., such as ُُُُبَأَمَتْ She said and ُُُُبَآَمَتْ She sold] is established by affixion of the ُ in such as ُُُُبَقَالَةَ and ُُُُبَبَعَةُ [247] (A), pls. of ُُُُبَقَالَ كُفَلَ saying and ُُُُبَبَعَ كُفَلَ selling, orig. ُُُُبَبَعَةُ and ُُُُبَبَعَةُ, like ُُُُبَكَمَلَةُ [247], pl. of ُُُُبَكَمَلُ perfect (Sn); and, as for the sounding true in such as ُُُُبَحْوَکْهَةَ and ُُُُبَحْوَکْهَةَ [247, 711], [pls. of ُُُُبَحْوَکَنَّ weaving and ُُُُبَحْوَکَنَّ 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 ُُُُبَ be not a subst. for a letter not transformable, by which he guards against ُُُُبَشَيْرَةَ [with Fath of the ُُُُبَ, though Kasr is more excellent, as SBd transcribes from the CK (Sn).] for ُُُُبَسْكَرَةَ tree [685]; for they do not
transform [this ی (MN)], because the ی is a subst. for the ج، the poet says

إذا لم يكن فيك من هدى ولا جنى فأبعدا كن الله من شيراب [685] (A) If there be not in you any shade, nor any fruit, then God curse you for trees!, where شيراب، with Fath of the ش، is orig. شکراب (MN). And the other is that the ی be not in the place of a letter not transformable, even if it be not a subst. [for such a letter], by which he guards against such as یبس despaired, since its ی، though mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is not transformed [into ی], because it is in the position of the Hamza; while the Hamza, if in its position, would not be [so] changed [658]; so that the ی is treated in the same way, because of its occurrence in the place of the Hamza. So he says in the CK: "and", says he, "it may be that the ی in یبس is sounded true because, [even if it were transformable (Sn),] its transformation would be negatived: for it was [orig.] before, but has since been put after, the Hamza; so that, if it were changed [into ی], two alterations, the alteration of transfer, [i. e., transposition (Sn),] and the alteration of change, [i. e., transformation,] would be combined in it". This is his language: but some mention that the reason why [the ی in یبس] is not transformed is that the conjunction of the [preceding]
Fatha with it is adventitious, because 'a is the f 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 'a 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], a certain disease in a camel's head [703], and جَيْدُ, i. e., length, and beauty, of neck; جَمَارُ حَيْدَى, as حَيْدَى [272]; and حَوْكَة and حُوَّة [above]. But this is not needed because these [ns.] are anomalous [in that their or ل is not converted into ] notwithstanding their fulfilment of the conditions (A); though حَيْدَى's being anomalous proceeds only upon the opinion of Akh [above] that the ' of feminization does not prevent, not upon the opinion of Mz that it does prevent, transformation (Sn): and like those [ns.] in anomalousness are رَأَح pl. of رَأْحُ going at evening and غَيْب pl. of غِيْب absent [257]; عَفْر pl. of عِفر a young ass; Huyawa, [a stronghold belonging to the Banu Zubaid in AlYaman (MI)]; حَمْض pl. of حِمْضُ, which is the very cunning man; and pl. of which is the dog's
platter (A). طَائِقٌ [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 آَلِحِيرَة AlHira, [a city near AlKūfa, جَبِرِيّ]; and (Jh, KF) also (Jh) حَارِيّ, [irregularly (Jh)], as though, deeming the combination of the two Kasras with the [three] ى s to be heavy, they substituted a Fatha for the Kasra of the , and an ٌ for the [first] ى: (2) of دُر [302], دَارِى, converting the quiescent first ى into ٌ [311]. And [the Prophet's saying (KF)] اَرْجِعُنَّ مَارُزَاتٍ عَيْنَ مَاجُورَاتٍ Repent ye when laden [with sin], unrewarded occurs in tradition, orig. مَوْزُرَاتٍ, the [quiescent], being converted into ٌ for lightness [above], as we have mentioned (IY): [or] for conformity (KF), because of the influence of مَاجُورَاتٍ (Jh); whereas, if it stood alone, مَوْزُرَاتٍ would be said (Jh, KF): so says IAl (Jh). And hence their saying يَبِّيَجِلُ for يَبِّيْجِلُ [333, 674, 701, 703], and يَبِّيَجِلُ for يَبِّيْجِلُ [701], converting the [quiescent] و and ى into ٌ, because they consider the combination of ى with ٌ to be easier for them than the combination of two ى s, and than ى together with ٌ (IY). But such as يَاَكِرٌ [or ِيَاَكِرٌ], [though regular in some dials. (R),] is weak (SH), because of the conversion of the quiescent ى, ى, preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath,
into I (R). And the most likely [opinion] is that the saying تَزَوَّدَ مِنَا آنَّ أَلْحَح [16] and its counterparts are instances of that [conversion of the quiescent ی into ی] (IY). Substitution of the I for the Hamza is (M, SH) (1) obligatory [below] in such as أم [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 رَآِبِت [642, 658, 682] (M, SH), where the use of the original, or of the deriv., [letter] is allowable, for which reason the substitution is not obligatory (IY), except according to the people of AlHijaz [658] (R). Its substitution for the [single (A)] ں [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 رَآِبِت زِيدَا I saw (M) Zaid [640] (M, R): (2) that [v.] to which the single [corrob. (IY)] ں preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath is affixed (M), as in لَنُسْفَعَا XCVI. 15. [153, 497, 608, 610, 649] (M, R, A); and similarly ١٠٤١: A1A’sha says لا تَعْبَدُ الْشَّيْطَانَ ﺍلْحَح [497, 649], meaning فَتَأْجَبَنَ ﺍلْحَح; and the other says تَأْجَبَنَ ﺍلْحَح [154, 424], meaning that shall assuredly blaze up brightly, [orig. تَأْجَبَنَ, as explained below]; while Imra alKais, in his saying ﺍلْحَح,
[115, 640], is said to mean ُتَفْقُنُ [649]; and the counterparts of that are numerous (IY): (a) ُتَأْجَجَّكَا 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 [640]; while its ag. is the pron. of (α) نَارَا a fire: AHD says in the Kitāb an Nabāt "ناَرَ [264, 282] is made masc., which is rare"; and then cites this verse: while some say that نار is only fem.; but that the poet makes the pron. masc., because by نارَا he means شَهَاَبَا a flame, which is masc., or because the feminization of نَارَ is improper [263], نَارَا ُتَأْجَجَّمَ being analogous to حَطْبَا [21, 263]: (β) حَطْبَا (β) ُلا أَرْضُ أَبْقَلَ 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, حَطْبَا and نَارَا; while the pron. is made masc. because of the predominance of [the masc.] حَطْبَا over [the fem.] نَارَا [320]: F says "Akh says that he means the fire and the firewood": (b) some say that ُتَأْجَجَا is an aor. v., from whose beginning the [aoristic] ت is elided; but that the l is substituted for the single corrob. ن، the o. f. being تَتَأَجَّجِكُنْ [above]: and in that case the latent pron. [165] belongs to the fem. نَارَا, for which reason the v. is made fem. (AKB): (3) إِذَنْ [594, 640], as ُفَعْلُتُهَا إِذَا XXVI. 19. [201] (M). The l is
substituted for the ن in these positions because of the ن'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 s is [authorized by IH] in ن [above], according to one opinion (SH), i.e., that its o. f. is نِمْلُ, which is the saying of the BB [above]. This is valid, as respects [both] sense, because نِمْلُ is i. q. نِمْلُ; and [letter,] because its dim. is نِمْلُ; although the saying of Ks [above] is nearer to analogy in changing ، into ।. And for this reason the author of the KF adopts the opinion of the BB, saying “Its o. f. is نِمْلُ”: [though he does not follow IH and Jrb in holding its s to be converted directly into ।; but prefers the indirect conversion described by R in §. 683, adding] “the s is changed into Hamza, [so that نِمْلُ becomes نِمْلُ (KF);] and then [two Hamzas occur consecutively, so that (KF)] the [second (KF)] Hamza [is changed (KF)] into ।” (MASH).

§. 685. The s is the letter most extensively substituted (A). It is substituted for (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), the । and ُ (MASH); (3) the Hamza; (4) one of the duplicate [or triplicate] letters; (5) the و; (6) the ع; (7) the ب; (8) the س; (9) the ث (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 \( \overline{\text{t}} \), the \( \overline{\text{\(A\)}} \), and the Hamza (\( \overline{\text{IY}} \)). Its substitution for the \( \overline{\text{t}} \) is [regular] in two cases, vid. where the letter before the \( \overline{\text{t}} \). is (1) pronounced with Kasr, as in مَصَبَّحُ [18, 253, 256], and مَفْتَتْحُ pl. of مَفْتَتْحَ [253, 386]; and similarly in their \( \text{dims.} \) (Aud), مُصَبِّيْحُ [274, 283] and مُفْتَتْحُ [274] (Tsr): (a) hence ضِيَرَابُ inf. n. of قَالُوا and ضَرْبَتْهُ [332]: (b) the reason why the \( \overline{\text{t}} \), when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, must be converted into \( \overline{\text{s}} \) 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 (\( \overline{\text{IY}} \)): (2) a \( \overline{\text{s}} \) of the \( \text{dim.} \) [279], as in غَلَامُ dim. of غَلَامَ [369, 374] (Aud), because the letter after the \( \overline{\text{s}} \) of the \( \text{dim.} \) is only mobile [274], whereas the \( \overline{\text{t}} \) does not receive a vowel; while the letter before the \( \overline{\text{t}} \) is only mobile, whereas the \( \overline{\text{s}} \) of the \( \text{dim.} \) is only quiescent: so that, after the \( \overline{\text{s}} \) of the \( \text{dim.} \), the \( \overline{\text{t}} \) 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 \( \overline{\text{s}} \), because of
its affinity to the preceding letter; and because, if the ٣ were converted into ٤, it would afterwards have to be converted into ی, as in ِسِّيَكَ [below] (Tsr). Its substitution for the ٤ is [regular] in ten cases, (1) where the ٤ occurs after a Kasra, when the ٤ is (a) final, [whether it be in an act. or pass. v., or in a n. (Tsr),] as in ِرَضِيَ was pleased [686, 719] and ِقُرِيَ was strong, ِعَفِيَ was effaced, the raider [301] and the caller (Aud): (a) the ٤ in these five exs. is converted into ی because of its occurrence as a final after a Kasra, their o. f. being ِرَضِوُ and ِخَرَ from ِضَوْانَ pleasure and ِقُرَةَ قُرَيَةَ strength [729], ِعَفَرَ عَفِيَ وَاَلَّذِيْرُ and ِعَفَرَ عَفِيَ and ِغَازِرَ دَعِيَةَ & raiding and ِدَعِيَةَ a call (Tsr): (b) before the ٥ of femininization, as in ِشَاكِيَةَ sad (Aud), said of a woman (Jh), an act. part. [on the measure of ِفَعَّلَة (Jh)] from ِفِسَأَلَ (Tsr); ِعَكِيَةَ [246] (Aud), pl. of ِفِسَأَلَ (Tsr); ِسَجَوُ (Tsr); ِعَسَارَةَ raider [724] (Aud), a [fem.] act. part. from ِعِزَوُ (Tsr); and ِفَرِيقَتَةَ (Aud) and ِفَرِيقَتَةَ [283] (Tsr), dim. of ِفَرِيقَةَ [248, 301, 675] (Aud) and ِفَرِيقَةَ [385, 675]: (a) the ٤ in the whole [of these exs.] is converted into ی because of its occurrence as a final after a Kasra, since the ٥ of feminization is virtually separate [266]: (b) the ٤ in [or ِفَرِيقَةَ] ought not to be converted into
because the word is [orig.] formed with the َسْاَس، as is proved by [the fact] that we have no infl. n. ending in a َسْاَس، preceded by Damma, which shows that [or ُعَرْتُبْة] is on a par with ُعَنْفَرْرَان [721]; but they make no distinction here between the word's being [orig.] formed with the َسْاَس and its not being so (Tsr): (c) pl. of ُسَوْسَوْسَةٌ [with Fath of the ُس، i. q. مُسْتَثْرِي equal, as مُسْتَثْرِيُّ مَا لِهُهَا الْأَمَرُ The people are equal in this matter (Tsr),] and meaning servants [below] are anomalous (Aud): (α) is, as it were, pl. of مُسْتَثْرِيُّ [above] by elision of the augs., except that another ُس is added in it (Tsr): (β) its measure is َنَعَالِدَةٌ: and it is anomalous in several [other (Sn)] respects, firstly the repetition of the ُب in the pl., notwithstanding its not being repeated in the sing., which is the counterpart of the repetition of the ُع [in the dim. (Tsr)] in ُعُشْيَشْيَةٌ [286] (Tsr, Sn), dim. of ُعُشْيَةٍ, notwithstanding its not being repeated in the non-dim. (Sn): secondly the pluralization of ُنَعَالَةٍ upon this measure, the pl. required by analogy being َعَشَيْبَةٌ, like َعَشَيْبَةٌ pl. of ُْفَبَةَ
that, when it is repeated alone, it should be *rad.*<sup>1</sup>, as in تَرْبَعَ (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (γ) مَقْتِيَةٌ " [above] is [said by Dm to be (Sn)] pl. of مَقْتِيَةٌ act. part. (Tsr, Sn) of i. q. خَدُمَ i. q. خَدُمَة served (Sn), from مَقْتِيَةٌ i. q. خَدُمَة service (Tsr), being orig., [as in the Tsr (Sn),]<sup>2</sup> مَقْتِيَةٌ; but having the [second (Sn)] \(_2\) converted into \(_3\), because final after a kasra; and being then subjected to the same transformation as تَأَمَّ (16) (Tsr, Sn); [so that its sound pl. is مَقْتِيَاتٍ, like تَأَمُّصُونَ (234),] as

مَتَى كُنْنَا لِأَعْلَك مَقْتِيَتَيْنَا

*When were we servants to thy family?* [below] (Tsr): [but the author of the KF says that] اقتُنوا is i. q. اسْتَخْدَمَة took him as a servant, anomalous, because is intrans. [494A, 496]; and [that] the sing. of اسْتَخْدَمَة and مَقْتِيَةٌ [below] is مَقْتِيَةٌ, [like مَقْتِيَةٌ sing. of مَقْتِيَةٌ (253, 265)] (KF): (δ) the servant is called مَقْتِيَةٌ with Fath of the \(_1\), and doubling of the \(_2\), as though it were a rel. n. [300] from مَقْتِيَة service, which is an inf. n.; but the \(_2\) of relation may be made single, [as in يِمَانٍ (311), in which case مَقْتِيَة becomes مَقْتِيَة, the sound pl. of which is مَقْتِيَاتٍ, like تَأَمُّصُونَ (234),] as in the saying of 'Amr Ibn Kulthum
Thou browbeatest us, and threatenest us.

Gently! When were we servants to thy mother, (that thou shouldst browbeat us, and threaten us)? [while some say that] the [sound] pl. is formed by rejecting the of relation; so that you say مُقَتِّرُونَ in the nom., and مُقَتِّرُونَ in the acc. and gen. (EM): S says "They asked Khl about مُقَتِّرُونَ pl. مُقَتِّرُونَ; and he said that it was on a par with أَشْعَرُونَ pl. أَشْعَرُونَ [253]" (Jh): (e) these two [anomalous formations] have no third: ISd says in the Muḥkam that F said "IAmb told me, on the authority of Th, that the latter had not heard any [formation] like مَقَتَارَةٌ, except one word that ĀUd had told him, vid. مُصْمُّعَ لَسْوَٰسَةٍ meaning سَوَّاً i. q. مُصْمُّعَ is predicable of one or more, as سَوَّاً لَسْوَٰسَةٍ III. 109. They are not equal, because it is orig. an inf. n. [143], i. q. إِسْتَوَآ equality (ML); (η) they say سُوَاٰسِيةٌ also, according to the general rule in transformation (Tsr, Sn); and the pl. of مُقَتَرَةٍ ought to be مَقَتَارَةٌ [above]: (θ) IBr says in the Glosses on the Jh that سُوَاٰسِيةٌ is a heteromorphous pl. of سَوَّأَل, like بَاطِلُ pl. of بَاطِلٌ [255]; as though it were pl. of سُوَاٰسِيةٌ: and that the measure of سُوَاٰسِيةٌ is دَعُلَةٌ, like [that of] شَرْوَشَةٌ agile; not دَعُلَةٌ, because
the cat. of سَلْسَس [674] is extraordinary; nor فَعَلَةُ كُرِكْب [373, 671, 672] is extraordinary; nor فَعَلَةُ، because the cat. is not repeated alone: so that [the notion of] فَعَلَةُ سُوَاسِيَةٍ or فَعَلَةُ سُوَاسِيَةٍ or فَعَلَةُ سُوَاسِيَةٍ is vain; and it must be فَعَلَةُ: and this is a fine discourse, which the author of the Aud transcribes in the Glosses [on the IM]: (c) before the ن of feminization, (α) abbreviated, as when you form from غِزْرُ a word [on the measure of غِرْلِي], like غَرْلِي [397, 399], in which case you say غُزُويَّا; (b) prolonged, as when you form from غِزْرُ a word [on the measure of غِرْلِي], like غِرْلِي [273, 390], in which case you say غُزُويَّا (Tsr): (d) before the aug. and ن، [which resembles the two نs of feminization (Tsr),] as in your saying غَزِيَّان [686] on the pattern of غَرْلِي [385] from غِزْرُ (Aud), because the two نs of feminization [263] and what resembles them are virtually separate [from the n. ending therein] (Tsr): (2) where the ن occurs as ن of an inf. n. of a v. transformed in the ن, and is preceded by a Kasra, and followed by an ن, as in غِزْرُ fasting and غِزْرُ standing [713] (Aud), inf. ns. of the [unaugmented] tril. (Tsr); and غِزْرُ submissiveness [713] and غِزْرُ accustoming oneself (Aud), inf. ns. of the augmented [tril.]: orig.
and زَجَرَ and إِنْقُرَ اَيْ وَاللَّهُ أَيْسَرُ, the which is converted into اَيْ, because it is transformed in their vs. by conversion into اَيْ [684, 703]; while its remaining sound in the inf. n. after a Kasra, and before a letter resembling the اَيْ in prolongation, would be deemed heavy; so that it is transformed in the inf. n. by conversion into اَيْ , 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 اَيْ ] (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) رَسَأَ bracelet [below] and سِوَأَ tooth-pick (Aud), generic ns. [3], where the اَيْ is not converted into اَيْ (Tsr), because the quality of inf. n. is non-existent; (b) لَرَأَ inf. n. of لَرَأَ sought refuge, one with another, and جَوْرُ inf. n. of جَوْرُ was neighbour to, [where, though they are inf. ns., the اَيْ is not converted into اَيْ (Tsr),] because the اَيْ of the v. [ and جَوْرُ (Tsr)] is sounded true; (c) رَأَ inf. n. of رَأَ went in the evening, for lack of the Kasra (Aud) before it (Tsr); (d) تَمَلَى [below] inf. n. of تَمَلَى shifted and عَمَّ inf. n. of عَمَّ visited the sick, [where, though they are inf. ns. whose vs. تَمَلَى and عَمَّ are transformed by conversion of their اَيْ into اَيْ, the اَيْ is not converted into اَيْ (Tsr)] for lack of the اَيْ (Aud) after them (Tsr): (a) in this case, [i. e., where the اَيْ is lacking (Tsr),] transformation
is rare, as جَعَلَ اللَّهُ كَنْمٍ تَبَيَّنًا وَأَرْزُقُوهُم 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 Nāfī and Ibn ‘Āmir, [i.e. q. قَيَامًا, like i. q. إِعَادَةً عَرُوْدُ] جَعَلَ اللَّهُ الْكَعْبَةَ الْبَيْتَ 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 whereto the pilgrims and settlers shall repair (B),] in the reading of Ibn ‘Āmir (Aud), their o. f. becoming قَوْمًا, but the ُbeing converted into َbecause the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr (Tsr): (α) قَبِيمُ is an inf. n. on [the measure of] فَعَلُّ, like صَبَعْ [348], its ُbeing transformed [into َ], as it is transformed [into ] in its v. (B on V. 98.): (b) sounding [the ] true, notwithstanding the fulfilment of the conditions, in نَارُ الْطَّمِيْحُ inf. n. of نُوارُ The doe-gazelle shied away, i. q. تَفْرَتُ, is anomalous (Aud): (α) by rule it should be نَيَارُ; but it occurs with the ُsounded true, as in the saying of Al‘Ajjāj

يَمُتَّلِطُ بِالْتَّانِسِ آنِئْوَارًا

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 قَدَرَمًا
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with the ل [in IV. 4. above]; but [this is not an inf. n., since] گنام is what a thing is supported by, like مِلَّان for what a matter is governed by (K): (3) where the ل occurs as 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 in pl. of دَار house, چیل pl. of حیله artifice [684], دیم pl. of دیده [below], قیم pl. of قیمة value, price [238, 278], and قیم pl. of قیمة stature [238] (Aud): (a) the o. f. is گیم, دوم, چول, دوار; but, since the ل is preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr in the whole [of these exs.], and in the sing. is transformed by conversion into ل in the first and last, and into د in the intermediate [exs.], it becomes weak, so that the Kasra overpowers it: (b) we deduce from the multiplication of the exs. that, when the ل is transformed in the sing., the occurrence of the ل after it [in the pl.], as in دیار [above], is not prescribed as a condition, contrary to the opinion of IUK (Tsr): (c) گرف pl. of حاجہ need is anomalous (Aud), the regular form being جیج, because the ل is preceded by Kasra, and is transformed in the sing. [by conversion into ل] (Tsr): (b) quasi-transformed, i. e., quiescent, in which the condition of conversion is that it be followed in the pl. by an ل, as in یاقس pl. of یاقس whip [242, 713], یاض pl. of یوض cistern, and یاض
pl. of ٍجُرُضٍ [238, 254, 713] (Aud) : (α) their o. f. is جُرُضٍ, and ٍجُرُضٍ : 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 ی [in prolongation] (Sn) : (β) it results that conversion of the ٍ into ی in this case has five conditions, (α) that the expression be a pl. ; (β) that the ٍ in its sing. be dead by reason of quiescence ; (γ, δ) that the ٍ in the pl. be preceded by a Kasra, and followed by an ٌ ; (ε) that it be sound in the ل (A) : (c) if the ٌ be missing, the ٍ is sounded true, as in كِرْزٌ pl. of كَرْزٌ mug, and غَرْنٌ pl. of غَرْنٌ 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 ٍ is sounded true; and may not be transformed, because to the lack of transformation [in the sing.] is joined the protection of the ٍ by its distance from the end [of the word], in consequence of the ی of femininization, [which is regarded as an outwork protecting the ٍ on its weak side, i. e., towards the end, where alteration is prevalent] (Tsr) : (α) نِمْسٍ [pl. of نُمْرَة 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 contracted from  [237], being orig.  for which reason it is transformed, [because of the presence of the ] ; and that it is afterwards contracted [into  ] : so IM 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 indication 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 alternative] form, wherewith it might be made to accord in conversion: so says Jrb (Tsr): (d) the , is also sounded true, (α) if it be mobile in the sing., as in  pl. of
while the saying \(\text{لا ين أعرف ألمع} (246, 279, 713)\) is anomalous (Aud), by rule and usage, the regular form being \(\text{طوراة} (246, 713)\), as Kl gives in his version of it (Tsr); and hence, as is said XXX-VIII. 30. The horses standing upon three legs and the point of the toe of the fourth leg, the coursers (Aud), pl. of \(\text{حور} (Tsr)\): though \(\text{الهيبان} (251)\), not of \(\text{حور} (Aud)\); and, says IM in the CK, as for \(\text{طويل} pl.\) of \(\text{عبران} (Tsr)\), possibly it may be regarded as [a heteromorphous pl.,] of the cat. of \(\text{هيبان} pl.\) of \(\text{حور}\), as though it were \(\text{فلاط} (251)\), meaning surpassed him in tallness (Tsr): (β) if the \(\text{ج} (343, 348)\) be unsound, [a \(\text{ي} or \text{ر}\), the first (Tsr)] as in \(\text{ريبيان} (Tsr)\), orig. \(\text{رببيان} (348)\), the \(\text{ى} (348)\) being converted into \(\text{ى} (Tsr)\); and [the second as in (Tsr)] \(\text{روبيان} (Tsr)\) with [Fath of the \(\text{ج}\) and (Tsr)] doubling of the \(\text{ج}\) (Aud), the air (KF), i. e., what is between the sky and the earth, and [Jaww\text{ا} (Tsr)] the name of a district in AlYamam\text{ا} (Tsr): in which case one says [in their pl. (Tsr)] \(\text{روبان} (278, 713)\) and \(\text{ربوان} (235, 237)\) (Tsr), with the \(\text{ى} (Tsr)\), [vid. the \(\text{ى} (Tsr)\),] sounded true (Aud);
orig. \( \text{زَرَأي} \) and \( \text{ْجَرَأ} \), the \( \text{ي} \) and \( \text{ٰ} \), being changed into Hamza, because final after an \( \text{اَعْجَرَى} \)[683]: while transformation of their \( \text{غ} \) is not allowable with that [transformation of their \( \text{ج} \)] (Tsr), lest two transformations occur consecutively (Aud); so that one is restricted to transformation of the \( \text{ج} \), because it is the seat of alteration (Tsr): and similarly in what resembles them (Aud), i.e., where the \( \text{ج} \) is transformed by being changed into Hamza, and the \( \text{غ} \) is [therefore] sounded true (Tsr): (4) where the \( \text{غ} \) 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 \( \text{غ} \) be in a n. or v. (Tsr):—you say \( \text{عتَرْبُت} \) \( \text{زَكَرْتُ} \) [I took (Tsr)] and \( \text{عتَرْبُت} \) \( \text{زَكَرْتُ} \) [I threw, by retaining the \( \text{غ} \) in its own form, because it is third (Tsr)]; but, when you put the Hamza or reduplication [433], you say \( \text{عَطْيَت} \) \( \text{زَكَيْتُ} \) I gave and \( \text{عَطْيَت} \) \( \text{زَكَيْتُ} \) I purified, [by changing the \( \text{غ} \) into \( \text{ي} \), because it becomes fourth (Tsr)]: and you say, in the pass. part. [of \( \text{عَطْيَت} \) and \( \text{زَكَيْتُ} \) and \( \text{مُعَطَّيَانِ} \) and \( \text{مُزَكَّيَانِ} \)] (Aud), by changing the \( \text{غ} \) into \( \text{ي} \)[229]: (a) the reason why it is changed into \( \text{ي} \) in the pret. and pass. part. of the augmented v., although it is not after a Kasra, is that (Tsr) they make the pret. [\( \text{زَكَيْتُ} \) and \( \text{عَطْيَت} \) (Tsr)]
accord with the aor. [لَغَّتْ وَلَغَّتْ (Tsr)], and the
pass. part. [لَغُبَاتْ وَلَغُبَاتْ (Tsr)] with the act. part.
[لَغَبَاتْ وَلَغَبَاتْ (Tsr)] with Kasr of the ط and ل (Tsr)],
since each of them, [i. e., of the aor. and act. part.
(Tsr),] has a Kasra before its final [case 1] (Aud): (a)
they make the deriv., [i. e., the pass. part.,] accord with
its original, [the act. part.,] as they make the original,
[i. e., the pret.,] accord with its deriv., [the aor.] (Tsr):
(b) S asked [his master (Tsr)] Khl about the reason for
the transformation of [the ] in such [prets.] as

We raided one another [727] and We called one
another, [orig. and ] , the being changed
into ى (Tsr),] notwithstanding that the aor. [لَغَزَّ و
and ] (Tsr)] has no Kasra before its final: and he
answered that the transformation existed [in the pret.]
before the coming of the initial ُ، vid. in ُغَازَرْتُ ُغَازَرْتُ,
for conformity with [the aor.] ُغَازَرْتُ and ُدَاعِيَتْ
[with Kasr of their penultimate (Tsr)]; and that it was
afterwards retained in company with the ُ، of [femininization in such as ُمُعَطَّة
given (Tsr), the ِ of which is converted from ى،
because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with
Fath [684]; while this ى is converted from َ، 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.] 

\[\text{شَأَر} \]

(with Fath of the Hamza, as likewise is the aor., (Sn)), meaning preceded, outwent, is anomalous, the regular form being \[\text{يُشَأَرَ} \], because it is from \[\text{شَأَر} \]; while [in the aor.] there is no Kasra before the , on account of which it might be converted into \[\text{i} \]; nor is the , converted in the pret., with which the aor. might be made to accord: if, indeed, the Hamza of transport be prefixed to it, you say \[\text{يُشَأَرَ} \] [in the pass. (Sn)], for conformity with the act. (A) \[\text{يُشَتَّيِبَي} \], the of which is converted into \[\text{ى} \] on account of the Kasra before it (Sn): (5) where the , when quiescent, [and] single, follows immediately after a Kasra, as in \[\text{مِيرَان} \] a balance, [orig. \[\text{مُرَان} \], because from \[\text{وزَن} \] weighing (Tsr),] and \[\text{مِيَقَات} \] time appointed for performance of an action [278] (Aud), orig. \[\text{مُوقَاتَ} \], because from \[\text{وقَت} \] time, where the , is converted into \[\text{ى} \], because quiescent [and single] and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) \[\text{صُوان} \] receptacle of a thing (Tsr)] and \[\text{سِوار} \] [above] (Aud), because the , in them is mobile, not quiescent (Tsr); (b) \[\text{إِجْلِوَا} \] (Aud) continuance, together with swiftness, of journeying [332, 482, 494] (Tsr), and \[\text{إِعْلَوْطَ} \] (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 ل of with Damm, when an ep. [272], as in XXXVII. 6. Verily We have adorned the heaven nearest [to you (K, B)] and your saying for the pious is the highest rank [725] (Aud), orig. and the ulwi, because from근 nearness and elevation, the in them being converted into ي, because the, with the Damma [of the initial] and the sign of feminization, is deemed heavy in the ep., [which is considered heavier than the substantive;] so that its ل is lightened by conversion into ي: (a) the proof that here] is an ep. is its being preceded by its qualified, as exemplified: (b) this is the original use [of اليني]; while their use of it [as a substantive, which is] not preceded by a qualified [359], is a divergence from the original, but is subject to the same treatment [of the ل] (Tsr): (c) as for the saying of the Hijazis [(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 قاد.
with transformation, which is omitted for notification of the o.f. [725]: (d) the Banū Tamīm say َنَفْعَلُو… with transformation, according to rule (Tsr): (e) if ِّنَفْعَلُو be a substantive, [not an ep., the ل in (Tsr)] it is not altered [by being changed into ی]; but the ِّ is retained in its o.f., to distinguish the substantive from the ep. (Tsr),
as in the saying [of Dhu-r-Rumā (MN, Tsr)]

[725] (Aud) O abode in Ḥuzwā [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 ِّ 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 ل of ِّنَفْعَلُو, when a ِّ, is changed in 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 Etymology of the substantive, who reverse [it], changing the ِّ in the substantive, not in the ep., so that they make ِّنَفْعَلُو 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 ٌۆ،", where the substantivity is adventitious; and they assert that the sounding (of the ِّ) true in
is anomalous, like that in 'حَيْبَة' (below): but this is a doctrine of whose correctness there is no evidence; whereas” (A)] “what I say is confirmed by evidence, and is agreeable with [the doctrine of (Tsr)] the Masters of lexicology: [for] Az quotes Fr and JSk as saying that whatever ep. is like الدُنياَيَّةٌ and is with the ی, since they deem the heavy with the Damma 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 "الْقَصْرَة" [above], while the Banū Tamīm say "الْقُصْرَة" (A, Tsr): and, as for the saying of IH "contrary to the ep., as اَلْغَرْزَى" [725], meaning the fem. of الْغَرْزَى 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 اَلْغَرْزَى should be said, as اَلْغَرْزَى is said” (A): (7) where the ی and ی meet, [and are combined (Tsr),] in a [single (Tsr)] word (Aud), or what is virtually a [single] word, like مُسْلِمِي 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 ی must be converted into ی, whether the ی precede or
follow, because it is heavier than the ى, in order that lightness may, so far as possible, be attained (Tsr); and then the [first] ى must be incorporated into the [second] ى [747] (Aud), because of the combination of two likes [731] (Tsr): (a) exs. of that, (a) where the ى precedes [the ى (Tsr)], are سَيْدَةٌ سَيْدٌ and مَيْتٌ مَيْتٌ [251, 703], orig. ِسَيْدٌ and مَيْتٌ [683, 716] (Aud), because from سَادَ was lord, aor. ُيُسْوَدُ by common consent, and مَاتَ died, aor. ُيُسْوَدُ according to one of the two dials. [482]: (a) their measure, according to critical judges, vid. the BB, is ُقيّعَلٌ with Kasr of the ى: (b) the Bdd hold it to be ُقيّعَلٌ with Fath of the ى, like ُصَرْفَ ُصَيْغُم و ُصَرْفَ [373], transferred to ُقيّعَلٌ with Kasr of the ى, because, say they, we do not see, in the sound, any ِ on [the measure of] ُقيّعَلٌ 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 ُفَعَّلَةٌ pl. of ُفَعَّل, as ُرُمَةٌ and ُقِتَةٌ [247]; and, if ُقيّعَلٌ were ُقيّعَلٌ with Fath, they would say ُسَيْدَةٌ with Fath (Tsr): (b) where the ى precedes [the ى (Tsr)], are ُلَى and ُلَى [278, 302], inf. ns. of ُكَرْيَتٌ I folded and ُكَرْيَتٌ I twisted, orig. ُكَرْيَتٌ and ُكَرْيَتٌ (Aud), with Fath of their first, and quiescence of their second [letter], their ى, being converted into ى, and incorporated into
the ی (Tsr): (b) sounding [the ى (Tsr)] true is necessary, 
(a) if the ى and ی be in two words, as یَدْعُو یاَسِر Yūsīr 
calls [with the ی preceding the ى (Tsr)], and یَرَمَیۡاَم یاَحَدّ A threatener will shoot (Aud) with the ى preceding the 
، (Tsr): (b) if the first of them be (٠) mobile, as ۠طَیَبٔل [with the ى mobilized with Kasr (Tsr)], and ۠عِبِرِز [348,714] (Aud) with the ى mobilized with Damm (Tsr): (٠) 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 ٰل [686], as ۠سُوّرِز [716]; substituted for a ى [686], as when you form from ۠بِیعَا بیطَر [482], saying ۠بِیعَا، and then put it into the pass., saying ۠بِیعَا; and substituted for a Hamza [658] (Tsr), as ۠رُوۡیةٞ alleviated form of ۠رُوۡیةٞ sight (Aud): for in the whole of that there is no change [of ى into ى], nor any incorporation, because the first [unsound] letter is [allowably] adventitious; contrary to ۠بِیعَا alleviated form of ۠بِیعَا، which is on the model of ۠بِیعَا، being without husband, or without wife: since the second Hamza is changed into ى [as in ۠بِیعَا،] because the one before it is pronounced with Damm [661], so that ۠بِیعَا، becomes ۠بِیعَا،; and this change is necessary [661]: and then the ى is converted into ى، which is incorporated
into the [second] ى, so that became أٴيم; and this [process also of] change and incorporation is necessary, because the ى 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 ترَى [with quiescence of the ى (Tsr)], orig. [نَّرَى ] with Kasr [above] (Aud), because it is a pret. v. (Tsr); but made quiescent [in the medial] for lightness, as علمُ as [with quiescence of the ى (Tsr)] is said for علم * [482] (Aud) with Kasr of it: though some allow تَى with incorporation after conversion (Tsr): (c) three sorts deviate anomalously from what we have mentioned, (a) a sort [in] which [the ى] is transformed, though it does not fulfil the conditions, like the reading [لِدِرِيَّا ] in XII. 43. [498] with change [of the Hamza into ى, and of the ى into ى, ] and incorporation [of the first ى into the second] (Aud), although the ى 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 ى] is sounded true, notwithstanding [its] fulfilment of them, [i. e., of the
conditions (Tsr),] as ضُرْبُنِّ [male cat (Tsr)], [below], رَجَاءٌ بْنُ عَوَّى الْكَلْبُ The dog howled, and Rajá Ibn Haiwa (Aud) : (α) you do not incorporate in ضُرْبُنِّ [below], because it is a [prim. (Jh)] substantive, which is not conformable to the v. (Jh, Tsr); and similarly in حِيْوَة [below], a man's name; both being different [in this respect] from َعَيْدٍ، مَيْتٍ، َعَيْسٍ (251) (Jh): so says Jh: (β) ٍيِّمُهُ أَيْوَمْ is on the measure of أَفْعَلْ: they say, on a day wherein hardship has befallen them, ٍيِّمُهُ أَيْوَمْ a most hard day, i. e., كَثِيرٌ عَلَّمْذَة containing much hardship (Tsr): (γ) Haiwa, [says Jh in the Sahah (Tsr),] is not subjected to incorporation, [as َعَيْدٍ and َعَيْسٍ 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 femininization [18] (Tsr): (c) a soːt in which the ی is changed into ُ، into which the [preceding] ُ is incorporated, [according to the converse of the rule (Tsr),] as عَرِّة [inf. n. of نَهْوَٰ عَنِ َالْمَكْرُ (above), by rule عَرِّة (Tsr),] and نَهْوَٰ عَنِ َالْمَكْرُ [686] (Aud), by rule نَهْوَٰ [722], because orig. نَهْوَٰ , being from forbidding (Tsr): (d) [both] transformation and sounding true are regular in the dim. of that n. [mobile in the ٍ (Tsr)] whose broken pl. is on
[the measure of] مَفَاعِلُ [18, 253, 256], as جَدِّوَلُ [369] (Aud), pl. جَدِّواَلْ [253]; and أَسَوُّ, when [a substantive (Tsr)] denoting serpent (Aud), pl. أَسَوُّ (Jh, Tsr), because it is a substantive; whereas, if it were an ep. [below], its pl. would be [سَوْنُ] on [the measure of] فَعَلُ [249] (Jh): so that, in the dim. of جَدِّوَلْ and أَسَوُّ, you say أَسَوُّ جُدِّيْلٌ and أَسَوُّ جُدِّيْلٌ [279], by sounding [the] true; and أَسَوُّ جُدِّيْلٌ and أَسَوُّ جُدِّيْلٌ [279], by transforming [it into ى, and incorporating the ى of the dim. into it]: (a) as for the transformation, which is the preferable [method], it is the same process as in مَيْتَ سَيِّدٍ and مَيْتَ سَيِّدٍ [above], according to the rule; and, as for the sounding true, it is because you treat this ى [of the dim.] like the ى of أَسَوُّ جُدِّيْلٌ and أَسَوُّ جُدِّيْلٌ [279], since the ى of the dim. and the ى of the broken pl. are each put to denote a meaning; (b) if were an ep. [348], transformation would be necessary in [the dim. of] it, because it does not take the pl. أَسَوُّ: so says BD (Tsr); [but Jh says that] the dim of أَسَوُّ black is أَسَوُّ, and, if you will, أَسَوُّ, [meaning blackish,] i.e., approximating to blackness [287] (Jh): (c) by our saying "mobile in the" [above] we guard against such as أَسَوُّ, because, though their broken pl. [246] is on [the measure of] مَفَاعِلُ [above], transformation [of the ى] is necessary in their dim., as
[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  in] the dim. [and ] is not taken into account, because it is adventitious: so says IAz (Tsr): (d) the pl. of [above] is [715], the  being sounded true in its pl., because sounded true in the sing.: but, for its dim., S says , transforming it, and making it like , [which is allowable as dim. of serpent,] although its pl. is ; while there is nothing to prevent those who say for the dim. [of ] from saying (Jh): (8) where the  is the  of the [of the v. (Tsr)] whose pret. is on [the measure of ] with Kasr of the , [the trans. and intrans. being alike in that respect, the first (Tsr) as approved it, pass. part. approved [722]; and [the second as (Tsr)] where the  is the  of Zaid, pass. part.  overpowered Aud; orig.  overpowered [722] and , with two s after the , the first being the of [347], and the second their : (a) their  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 ِمَرَضَّعَى and ِمَرَضَّعَى, in which the ِ and ى are combined, while the first of them is quiescent [case 7], for which reason the ِ is converted into ى, and the [first] ى incorporated into the [second] ى; while the Damma is changed into Kasra, in order that the ى may be preserved from conversion into ِ (Tsr): (a) the reading ُبَرَضَّعَى ِمَرَضَّعَى لXXXIX. 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 ِ of the v. be pronounced with Fath, sounding true is necessary, as مَدْعَر َراَدَى [722] and called (Aud), orig. مَدْعَر َراَدَى and مَدْعَرْ مَدْعُور, with two ِ, the ِ of مَفْعُول [347], and the ِ 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 عَلَى عِرْسِي مُلَكَةُ أَنْ نِي ُ أَنَا أَلْلَهُ مُعْدِيًا عَلَيَّ وَعَادِيًا

[722] (Aud), by 'Abd Yaghūth [Ibn Wakṣāṣ (MN)] alḤārithī, And my wife Mulaika has known that I am the lion, when assailed, and when assailing, where he transforms [the ِ of] مَعْدَرُي [684], orig. مَعْدَرُو (MN,
Tsr), upon the measure of مَفْعُولَتُ (MN): (α) Mz recites this verse with مَعْدُوّا, by sounding [the J] true: but others recite it with transformation (A, Tsr); and IM indicates the allowability of this by his saying "And sound the [J of] مَفْعُولَتُ from such as عَدَا 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 (Tsr): مَعْدُوّا عَلِيّه وَعَدَا (γ) occurs thus, with the undotted ع and د, in the MSS of [the commentary by] IUK: but مَغْرَبٌ عَلِيّة وَعَارِيّا when raided, and when raiding, with the dotted ع and د, occurs in Z's book, [the M], where he says "They say مَغْرَبٌ عَتْرَة and مَغْرَبٌ عُتْرَة; but they do say مَغْرَبٌ عَتْرَة, as 4وقَدْ عَلِمْتُ عَرْسَيْ مُلْيِكَة أَئِنِي • أَنَا أَلْلَهُ مَغْرِيّا عَلِيّه وَعَارِيّا [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'Ainī, who perhaps saw this version in some MS of the M; but Broch and Jahn print مَغْرَبٌ أَلْحٌ in the text of the M; and this is the version given by IY, as also by R, IHsh, and A;
(1282)

while either version suits the argument in the Aud:

(9) where the \( \textit{ج} \) is the \( \textit{k} \) of \( \textit{فعول} \) [with Damm of the \( \textit{Tsr} \)], when a \( \textit{pl.} \), as \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{عَصَا} \) \( \textit{حُصُو} \), \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{دَلَو} \) \( \textit{حُصُو} \) [328], and \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{دُلَو} \) \( \textit{حُصُو} \) [237, 243] (Aud):

(a) the \( \textit{o. f.} \) is \( ^{3} \) \( \textit{قَفُوُرُ} \), \( ^{5} \) \( \textit{عُصُوُرُ} \), and \( ^{5} \) \( \textit{حُصُوُرُ} \): but, deeming the combination of two \( \textit{s} \) heavy in the \( \textit{pl.} \), they convert the last \( \textit{s} \) into \( \textit{i} \); and then the first is transformed by conversion into \( \textit{i} \), and incorporation [case 7]; while the letter before the [first] \( \textit{ي} \) is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the \( \textit{ي} \) may sound true (\( \textit{Tsr} \)): (a) sounding [the \( \textit{j} \)] true [in the \( \textit{pl.} \)] is anomalous, as \( ^{3} \) \( \textit{عَنْوَانُ} \textit{أَبُو} \) \( \textit{حُنْجُرُ} \), [\( \textit{pl.s.} \) of \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{أَبَ} \) \( \textit{فَرَّأُ} \) father and \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{أَخَ} \) brother, both transmitted by \( \textit{IAr} \) (\( \textit{Tsr} \)]]; \( ^{5} \) \( \textit{نُكَرُ} \) [with an undotted \( \textit{Tsr} \)], \( \textit{pl. of} \) \( ^{5} \) \( \textit{نُكَرُ} \) \( \textit{i. q.} \) \( ^{6} \) \( \textit{جِهَة} \) \( \textit{دَرَاسَة} \) \( \textit{جُهَة} \) direction; \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{نَكَرُ} \) \( \textit{جُهَة} \) \( \textit{دَرَاسَة} \) \( \textit{جُهَة} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) with a \( \textit{pl. of} \) \( ^{5} \) \( \textit{نَكَرُ} \), which is the \textit{cloud that pours down its water}; and \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \), \( \textit{pl. of} \) \( ^{5} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \), which is [the \textit{cavity of} (\( \textit{KF} \))] the \textit{chest} (Aud), transmitted by \( \textit{AHm} \) on the authority of \( \textit{AZ} \): (\( \infty \)) the \( \textit{pl.s.} \) mentioned are pronounced with Damm of the first and second [letters], \( \textit{orig.} \) \( ^{5} \) \( \textit{نَكَرُ} \) \( \textit{نَكَرُ} \) \( \textit{نَكَرُ} \) \( \textit{نَكَرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \), and \( ^{5} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \) \( \textit{بَهْرُ} \), with two \( \textit{s} \), the first of which is incorporated into the second (\( \textit{Tsr} \)): (b) if \( \textit{فعول} \) be a \textit{sing.}, sounding [the \( \textit{j} \)] true is necessary, as \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{عَنْوَانُ} \textit{عُمَّرُ} \) \( \textit{كَبْرَى} \) XXV. 23. \textit{And have exceeded} [the limit in wrong-doing (\( \textit{K}, \textit{B} \))] with \textit{great excess}, \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{لَا} \) \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{يُرَبَّدُونَ} \textit{عَلَّمُوا} \) \( \textit{فَيَآ} \) \( ^{2} \) \( \textit{رَضُّ} \) XXVIII. 83. \textit{Seek not}
elevation in the earth, نُمَّ в inf. n. of زِيَادٌ The wealth increased, and سَمَّى in. n. of زِيَادٌ Zaid was exalted (Aud), all of these exs. being sing. in. ns., pronounced with ِJean of the first and second [letters], orig. عُثْبِر , عُثْبِر , عُثْبِر , عُثْبِر , and سَمَّى , with two s, the first of which is incorporated into the second (Tsr): (a) sometimes, however, the sing. is tranformed (Aud), by conversion of the last , into ى , and transformation of the first, like the transformation of [the , in] طَلِيَّ [case 7] (Tsr), as عُتٌّ [684, 722], inf. n. of عَنْوَا أَلْشَيْحُ The old man became decrepit ; and ُقَسَمٍ , inf. n. of قَسَمَةُ قُلُبُهُ His heart was hard (Aud): (c) what is [said by IM] in the Alfiya necessarily implies that the pl. [ُقَعُول] and the sing. [ُقَعُول] are equal [in this respect, that sounding true is preferable to transformation]; for [immediately after Ḥādā! a true; or transform, etc.,” cited above under case 8,] he says Ḥādā! a true; or transform, etc.,” cited above under case 8,] he says "Similarly the ُقَعُول from the [crude-form] containing the , when this letter appears as a ل of a pl. or sing., occurs biform": whereas transformation is more suitable in the pl., because of its heaviness; and sounding true in the sing., because of its lightness (Tsr): (10) where the , is an ع of ُقَعُول [with ِJean of the ف , and doubling of the ع (Tsr)], when a pl. sound in the ل , like صْبُم [pl. of صَبَّم (Tsr)] and نَيْم (Aud) pl. of نَيْم , the ع [in
both] of which is a, [247, 715, 716, 722]: (a) their o. f. is نَوْمٌ and صَوَامٌ [below]; but, two وُ and a دَamma being combined in the pl., it is as though three وُ s were combined, in addition to the heaviness of the pl., which therefore deviates to alleviation by conversion of the two وُ s into شَاٰ s, because two شَاٰ s are lighter than two وُ s (Tsr): (a) the more frequent [method] is to sound [the نَوْمٌ ] true, [according to the o. f. (Tsr),] as نَوْمٌ and صَوَامٌ [above] (Aud); but a frequent, common, [method] is transformation, which is indicated by IM’s saying “And such as نَوْمٌ for نَوْمٌ is common” (Tsr): (b) sounding true is necessary if the ج be (a) unsound, lest two transformations [of the ع and ج (Tsr)] occur consecutively, as شَرَوى and غُوَى, pls. of شَرَوْى roasting and غَارَب erring (Aud), orig. شَرَوٰى and غُوَى, the ج 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 شَاٰ, 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 ثَوَامٌ and ثَوَامٌ [384, 715], because the ع is then far from the end, [which is the seat of alteration (M.Kh)]; while the saying
by Dhu-r-Rumna (IY on § 715),

[or] by Abu-l-Ghamr al-Kilâbi, 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, her greeting (Jsh), recited with

its ni'am by IAr (IY),

is anomalous (Aud), by rule, with the sounded true, which IM indicates by his saying “But the anomaly of such as ni'am is attributed” (Tsr) to the learned (Sn, MKh) in Arabic (Sn), i.e., is transmitted [by them] (A, Tsr) in

[above] [A]. And the is [regularly] substituted in place of the in [the gen. and acc. of] such as mulsâman [16, 228] and

[16, 234] (R). Its substitution, (1) for the , is (M, SH) (a) regular in such as (M, R) (a)

[above] (M), [274, 283] and

[253] (IY, R); (b) anomalous in such as [643, 686] (SH): (a) "weak" [643], not "anomalous" (R): (2) for the , is (a) [regular (M), obligatory (SH),]

in such as (M, SH) and "mâyân" [above], whence
wind and rain continually (IY); (b) I equipped for raiding (M, R) and I urged to raid (M), for conformity with the aor. I was a boy, or boyish, aor. is converted into because of the Kasra of the before it, the between them not being [regarded as] a separative, because of its weakness by reason of quiescence (IY); (b) [above]; (c) (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)
with conversion of the  into  without Kasr of the aoristic letter [404], by treating the mobile  here like the quiescent, for which reason they convert the  into  on the principle of  and  [above], as they treat the quiescent  and  like the mobile in  and  [684] (IY on § 684): (α) [according to R, however,] such as  is regular, though weak: (β) so is such as  : F says “It is regular, according to some folk, although it is weak”; but Z decides that  and  are anomalous (R). Its substitution for the Hamza is (1) [regular, but not obligatory (R),] in such as  [278, 642] (M, SH), for  (IY on § 658), orig. with Hamza (Jh, Jrb); and  [by alleviation of  pl. of  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  when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr [658] (IY): (2) necessary in [such as]  [659, 661] (R). The [necessary] substitution of the  [686] and  for the Hamza occurs in two cats., (1) the  upon [the measure of (Tsr)]  [726]: (2) the two Hamzas concurring in a [single (Tsr)] word [661] 133 a
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 قَصْصٍ أَمْلَئْتُ [below] (SH): (a) by "such as" IH means an augmented tril., wherein two similar letters are combined, but incorporation is not possible, because the second is quiescent [731], as in أَمْلَئْتُ [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 قَصْصٍ and تَقَصَّصَ أَلبُزَى [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 مَدْدَتْ مَدَّيْتُ for I extended is not said: and, as for their saying فَلَا رَبِّي نَعَالٌ Then no, by thy Lord!, i. e., رَبِّ نَعَالٌ [below], it is anomalous: (c) they also substitute the ی for the first of the duplicate letters in [the n. on] the measure of فَعَالٌ; when a simple substantive, not an inf. n., as in دِبَاسٍ, شِرارَزُ, دِبَارٍ, دِبَابَجُ [below], according to him
that says [in the pl.] دَانَنِيرُ (MAZ), كَبَابِيِّم، دَمَامِيسٍ [278], and شَوارَبَرُ. but this substitution is regular, since فَعَالُ, when non-inf., does not occur except with the first of its duplicate letters changed into ى, to distinguish the simple substantive from the inf. n., in which it is not changed, as كَذَابُ inf. n. of كَذَّبُ [332]:

(a) when the simple substantive is with the ا, as in دَمَامِيسٍ صَنَّاْرة [head of the spindle (MAR)] and دَانَانِيرُ [short (MAR)], it is not changed, because of the freedom from ambiguity: (b) as for him that says كَبَابِيِّم and دَمَامِيسٍ, it may be (α) that, since the ا 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 فَعَالُ [377] (R), the ا not being a subst. (IY, R) for [the first of] the duplicate letters (R), but an aug. for co-ordination with سَرَدَاح [396] (IY): (c) as for their saying شَوارَبَرُ غَاَذَّارَة, with the و, in the pl. of غَاَذَّارَة [below], it is based upon [the supposition] that غَاَذَّارَة is orig. غَاَذَّارَة, although there is no فَعَالُ in their language [377]; or غَاَذَّارَة may be orig. غَاَذَّارَة, the ا being changed into ى, by assimilation to the ا in غَاَذَّارَة [247, 686], in which case its o. f. [in the sing.] is غَاَذَّارَة [713, 716] and غَاَذَّارَة occur in
the inf. n. of \([332, 482, 494]\) and \([482, 494, 667, 675] (R): (e) the substitution of the \(ي\) for one of the duplicate [or triplicate] letters is [exemplified] in (a)

\[\text{I dictated the writing (M, Jrb), aor. }\]

\[\text{I
}\]

\[\text{inf. n. }\]

\[\text{for }\]

\[\text{[above] (IY);}

\[\text{the Kur has }\]

\[\text{نَهُدَة تُبَلَّى عَلَيْه بُدْرَة وُقَصَّدًا XXV. 6. And they are dictated to him morning and evening (IY, Jrb)

\[\text{and }\]

\[\text{وَلُبْسَلِ الَّذِى عَلَيْه الْحَقُّ II. 282. And let him on whom lies the debt dictate [below] (IY); and the poet says}

\[\text{فَلِيَتْ لَا أَمَلُكَ حَتَّى يُفَارِقَ ثُاُمُّا}

\[\text{Then I swore I would not weary of him until he should}

\[\text{دَهْدَوَنَ} (\text{وُجُدَّه})

\[\text{ثُأَمَُلُكَ}

\[\text{كُتَابَة}

\[\text{is}

\[\text{As in II. 282. [above] (Jrb): but [some hold that (Jrb) properly (IY)] they are two [excellent (Jh)]

\[\text{dial. vars., [both occurring in the Kur (Jh).] because their employment is uniform (IY, Jrb), as}

\[\text{أَمَلُكَةَ كُتَابَةَ},

\[\text{aor.}

\[\text{يُبَلُّي},

\[\text{inf. n. }

\[\text{إِمَلَّا},

\[\text{and}

\[\text{إِمَلَّا أَكَتَابَ},

\[\text{aor.}

\[\text{يُبَلُّي},

\[\text{inf. n. }

\[\text{إِمَلَّا}

\[\text{(IY); so that to make one of them original, and the other deriv., is not more appropriate than the converse (IY, Jrb): (b)}

\[\text{I clipped my nails [below] (M, Jrb), transmitted by ISk (IY), for}

\[\text{تُصَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}

\[\text{IY, Jrb), where they substitute a}

\[\text{ي for the third ص, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): (c) No, by thy Lord, I will}
not do! (M), meaning لَزِدْ [above], where they substitute a ى for the second ب, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): (d) تَسْرُّتُ (M), orig. I took a concubine, تَفَعَّلْتُ from السَّرِّ [331], which is named السَّرِّ secrecy, because he that intends it hides, and seeks to conceal himself (IY): (α) سَرِّية concubine is نُعْلِيَةُ, [a rel. n. (Jh)] from السَّرِّ (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 أَرْض سَهْلَة دُعْرُ and سُهْلِي دُعْرُ [311], rel. ns. of دَعْرُ and سُهْلِي smooth ground (Jh): but Akh says that it is نُعْلِيَةُ (IY), derived (Jh)] from سَرَرُ gladness, because her master is gladdened by her (Jh, IY): (e) كَتَبَتُ (M), orig. تَكَتَّبْتُ I exercised thought, الَّتِي being the exercise of thought, orig. الَّتِي, one of whose ن س they change into ى, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): and لَمْ يَتَسَسَ [read by Ḥamza and Ks in (B)] II. 261. [644, 647] (M), orig. لَمْ يَتَسَسَّنَ It hath not been altered from مِن حَبِي بِمَسْتَوْنِ XV. 26, 28, 33. (IY), meaning of [black (K)] clay wrought into shape (K, B), i. e., altered, a ى being substituted for the third ن, and then converted into
because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684], so that ْيَتَسَنْ becomes ِيَتَسَنْ َيَتَسَنْ; and the ٌ being afterwards elided for apocopation [404, 720], so that ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ becomes ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ; this is the saying of IA... [below] (IY): (f) The falcon stooped, or swooped (M), i.e. ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ meaning The bird dropped in its flight (IY): (α) they do not use its ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ except changed (Jh, IY), as where, deeming three ض s heavy, they substitute a ى for one of them (Jh): Al'Ajjaj says ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ [below] (Jh, IY): (g) the saying ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ ْتَفْعَلُ 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 ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ ْيَتَسَنْ, but substitutes a ى for the second ْم (IY): (h) ْتَصَدِّيَة (M), [as] in ْمَا ْكَانَ ْصَلُوتُهُمْ ٍعَنَّدَ ْالْبَيْتِ إِلَّا ْمَكَأ ْتَصَدِّيَة VIII. 35. [21, 682], where the ى is a subst. for the [second] ُ (IY), according to those who pronounce it to be from ْتَصَدِّيَة, aor. ْيَصِدُ (M); i.e., clapping of hands and making a noise, whence ْيَصِدُ ْيَصِدُ ْيَصِدُ ْيَصِدُ ْيَصِدُ ْيَصِدُ ْيَصِدُ ْيَصِدُ ْيَصِدُ XLIII. 57. [below].
i. e., Lo, thy people [Kuraish (K, B)] clamour, and cry out, at it; one of the two یs being transmuted into ک: this is the saying of AU: (α) تَفْعِیْلَةٍ تَصْدِیلیةٍ, [being orig. تَفْعِیْلَةٍ تَصْدِیلیةٍ, then by incorporation تَفْعِیْلَةٍ تَصْدِیلیةٍ, ] like تَفْعِیْلَةٍ تَصْدِیلیةٍ expiation and تَفْعِیْلَةٍ diversion; but, when the second ی is converted into ک, incorporation is impossible, from the difference of the two letters (IY): (i) تَلْعَیِیتُ [I ate endive (IY)], from لَعَاءَة endive (M), which is a delicate herb, according to what ISk transmits, on the authority of IAr; whence, says As, the world is called لَعَاءَة : (α) its o. f. is تَلْعَیِیتُ; but they substitute a ک for one of the یs, from dislike to the combination of [three] یs (IY): (j) تَدْعَیِیتُ دَعْدَیْتُ [below] (M): they say (α) دَعْدَیْتُ صَهْصَیتُ دَعْدَیْتُ) الْحَجَرَ I rolled the stone down, aor. دَعْدَی دَعْدَی and دَعْدَد, quasi-pass. It rolled down, i.e., دَعْدَدَة, quasi-pass. تَدْعَیَة (IY), a ک being substituted for the [second] ی (Jh): Dhu-r-Rumma says


dْدْعَدْی مِنَ الْعَرْضَ الْجَلَامِیدَ

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

کَانَ صَوْتَ جَرِیْهَا الْمَسْتَعْجِلِ ۡجَنْدَةَ دَعْدَیْتِهَا مِنَ جَنْدِلَ

As though the sound of her hurried swallowing were a stone that thou hadst rolled down from stones: while their
saying ُدَعْنَـۑ ٱلسَّجِعَلِ for what the black-beetle rolls together indicates that the o. f. is صَفْحَصْـۖتُ (ب) ُدَعْنَـۑ ٱلسَّجِعَلِ [below], for meaning I said "Hush! hush!" [187], i.e., "Be silent", the ی being a subst. for the ٍ, from dislike to the reduplication (IY): (ط) مَكَٰکِیُّ (IY) pl. of مَکْرُونُ (below) (M), according to what AZ transmits, the [second] ی being followed by two ی s, the first a subst. for the ی of مَکْرُونُ [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 (IY): (ل) دِیْجُوْجِ مَثَلُ دِیْجُوْجِ meaning intensely dark night, orig. دِیْجُوْجِ , where, disliking the reduplication, they substitute a ی for the last ی; 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 دِیْجِ, of the class of the defective [16] (IY): (م) دِبْرَوْنَ register [332, 716], دِبْرَجِ brocade [above], and ثَمْرَاطُ carat [278, 332] (M), orig. دِبْرَوْنَ (ن), the paradigm of which is نُعَالِ, the in it being a ل, because they say ثُدْنَتُ I registered, and, in the dim., دِبْرِيْوْنِ: if, then, it be said "Then wherefore do you not convert the ی of دِبْرَوْنَ into ی, because of the
's occurring quiescent before it, on the principle of its conversion in سَلَد and مَبْت [above]?", the reply is "Because that would lead to destruction of the object: for, disliking the reduplication in دَوَان, they change [the first د into ی], in order that the two letters may be different; so that, if they were afterwards to change the [second ی into ی], saying دِیَان, they would revert to [a reduplication] such as what they have fled from: and besides the ی is not inseparable, being only substituted for lightness, since they say دُؤَارِیس, restoring the ی when the Kasra is removed from before it; so that it is plain to you that this ی is not inseparable; because, in some circumstances, it return to its o. f.; though some say دِیْارِیس, making the subst. inseparable": (ب) دِبَّاج that being indicated by their saying دِبَّاج [above], with the ب, in the pl., as though they disliked reduplication [in the sing.], and therefore changed [the first ب into ی]: (γ) تَرَاط [278], where, because of the heaviness of the reduplication, they substitute a ی for the first ی, that being indicated by the pl. تَرَاط [278], where the appearance of the ی is an indication of what we have said (IY): (n) چِبَر، curd (M), coagulated milk, the water of which is extracted (KF), orig. چِبَر, like تَرَاط (IY); and چِبَر [377] (M) a dungeon [belonging to AlHajjāj
(Jh, KF) Ibn Yusuf (Jh), and a burrow, den, [orig. دماس] the ى being substituted for the [first] م (IY): according to him that says كمابيس سرارس [above] (M) in the pl. (IY); (o) the saying of the poet, [describing a wild cow in search of her calf (Jsh),]

قامت بِهَا تَنْبُذُ كِلَّ الْبَنْشِدٍ ُنَأَتَتْ تَيْمَلَتْ يِمْثِلُ ضَوْءُ الْفَرْقَدِ

[below] (M) She stood in it (the patch of ground), seeking with all inquiry, البُنْشِدٍ in the shape of the pass. part. being a ممَ inf. n. [333], and joined a calf like the light of the asterism called AlFarkad (Jsh), by which one guides oneself (KF), where he means اَتَصَتْ ٌنَابِسٌ (٢) [689], but dislikes the reduplication (IY): (٢) أَنَابِسْ (٢) [248, 253] (SH), orig. أَنَابَسٌ [248, 274], because it is pl. of ٨ إِنْسَان (Jrb); (a) أَنَابِسْ (٢) إِنْسَانٍ (٢) in which case the ى is not a subst. for the ن: so says Mb: (b) إِنْسَانٍ, [by conversion of the ن into ى (K, B on XXV. 51.)] its o.f. being أَنَابِسٍ [above], which also is used; so that it is like ٦ طَرْبَانٌ [248, 274], pl. of ٦ طَرْبَانٌ [237, 385] (R), the o.f. being طَرْبَانٍ [250] (K). As for the ع, the ب, the س, and the ث, they are [sometimes replaced by the ى ], as in (1) the saying

ٍمَنْهَا لَيْسَ لَهُ حَواُئِنٍ ُلَفْضِافِى جَبَِ السُّنَافِيَّٰ
[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 ضفادع, but substitutes the ی for the ع by poetic license (IY): (2) the saying

لَهَا أُشَابِرُ مِنْ لَحمٍ تَتبَرَّةٌ ۡمِنْ الْتَعَالِي وَحَزٍ مِّنْ أَرَابِيَّا

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

إِذَا مَا عَدَّ أَرْبَعَةٌ نَسَالٍ ۡبِ فَرْوَجِكَ حَامِسٍ وَأَبُوكَ سَادِّي

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

يَفْدِيكَ ِيَ زُرعُ أَبيِ وَحَالِيِ ۡقُدّ مَرَ ِبَيْمَانِ وَعُدُّا ِآثَالِي

وَأَنَبُّ بِاْللهٍ ِرَكَانٍ لَا 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 ك for the second ك of the third (Jsh), as though he disliked the cat. of the third [and the fourth (H), and the fifth (Sn)], and the sixth (Sn) are weak (SH), because unheard from trustworthy Arabs (MASH). And sometimes the ي is substituted for the ج, as شميرة شيرة [684] and شجيرة (R). It is [therefore said by A to be] substituted for eighteen letters, (1) the ل, as in علَّمٍ [above]; (2) the و, as in غزَّت [above] and the variations [of the inf. n. (Sn)] thereof, [as يغزى and غزى (Sn)]: (3) the Hamza, as in بَيْرٍ [642, 658]: (4) the ض in صَحْصَيْت and دَهْدَيْت [above]: (5) the س in أَذَا مَا عَدَّ الْحَمْل [above]: (6) the ب in أَلْبَرَنَيْنِ [above]: (7) the ر in شِيْبَرَ [above]: (8) the ن in (a) طَرْبِيْنِ [above]; (b) نَظَّمَيْت [above]; (c) as IAl holds, لِمْ يَتَسَنَ II. 261. [above]; (d) دُيْنَارٍ [above], orig. دِيْنَارٍ, because of their saying دَنَبْيَرٍ [18] and دَنِيْبِرٍ [278]; (e) إِمَّسَانُ, with the ي, for إِنْسَانُ man: (9) the ص in تَصَيْتُ أَظْفَارِي [above]: (10) the ض in
(1299)

إذا الكرم أبتدروا الْبَاعُ بَذَرٍ تَقْصَضُ الْبَارَى إذا الْبَارَى كَسْرُ

(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., تَقْصَضُ الْبَارَى, [taken (Sn)] from إنْقَضَضَأَن, [this being pronounced a taking, not a derivation; so that the objection that an augmented inf. n. is not derived from a more augmented is averted (Sn)]: (11) the ل in [above]: (12) the م in نَزْوَرَ أَمَرَأَ الْحَرُصُ, where, says IAr, the poet means تَّمَلَّعَتْ (13) the ع in (a) وَمُمِهِلٌ الْحَرُصُ [above]; (b) تَّسْدِيْدَة (A) [above]: (14) the د in تَتَسْدَدَتْ, [above], orig. تَتَسْدَدَتْ (A); (15) the ت in طَوِيَّتَتْ بِتَنِل الْحَرُصُ [above]; (16) the ت in كَنَّ مَرَّ الْحَرُصُ [above], i.e., التَّلَاثُ (684), i.e., مِنْ شَجَرَةٍ مَنْ شَجَرَتْ اللهُ الْحَرُصُ pl. of دِيْجَٰرِجُ [above], orig. دِيْجَٰرِجُ (A): YH says "so that the ي of the pl. is elided, and the [last] ج then converted into ج", and analogy requires that the like of this should be said on A's saying "orig. مَكَاكِبُكُ" [below]: but this is correct only when the ي of دِيْجَٰرِجُ
and مَكاَكْيُ (with Tanwin دَيْاَج) is single; not when it is double, as the ی of مَكاَكْيُ is marked in such correct Mss of the KF as I have seen: nay, [in مَكاَكْيُ and دَيْاَج] the quiescent ی is the ی of the pl., [being a subst. for the ی of مَكاَكْيُ دَيْاَج, which becomes a ی in the pl., because the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr:] while that which follows it is a subst. for the ل [or ل] (Sn): (18) the ل in مَكاَكْيُ pl. of مَكْتُول [above], orig. مَكاَكْیَكَب [above] (A).

§. 686. The ی is substituted for (M, SH, A) three letters (A), (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), by which are meant (یY) the ی and ی (یY, جرْب, A), because all [three] are letters of prolongation and softness (یY); (3) the Hamza (M, SH, A). As for its substitution for the ی, it is in one case, vid. where the letter before it is pronounced with ؤْدَم [below] (آود), whether it be in (1) a v. (ترس), as in ظْرُب and بُرِّع [below] (آود): (a) their o. f., before they are put into the pass., is بَابَع trafficked with [683], swore allegiance to, and ضَارِب fought with [490]; but, when you put them into the pass., you pronounce their initial with ؤْدَم [436]; while it is impossible for the ی to remain after a ؤْدَم, because the letter before the ی is pronounced only with فُتح; so that the ی is converted into ی, for homogeneity
with the vowel of the letter before it (Tsr); (b) the Revelation has \( \text{ما وَرَّى عَنْهُمَا} \) VII. 19. What was hidden from them [683] (Aud): or (2) a n., as in \( \text{ضُوْيَرِب} \) dim. of \( \text{صارِب} \) [below]; if the \( \text{i} \) be not second, converted from a \( \text{i} \), as in \( \text{نَاب} \) meaning [canine] tooth, [\( \text{ضُوْيَرِب} \)] in which case it returns to its o. f., vid. the \( \text{i} \), as \( \text{نُيبَب} \) [278] (Tsr). And, as for its substitution for the \( \text{i} \), it is in four cases, (1) where the \( \text{i} \) is quiescent, single, and [in a sing. (IA),] not in a pl. (Aud), [and is] after a Damma (IA), whether it be in (a) a n. (Tsr), as in \( \text{مُرَتَّس} \) [278] and \( \text{مُرَتَّس} \) [278, 682, 699] (Aud), orig. \( \text{مَيْسَر} \) and \( \text{مَيْسَر} \), act. parts. [of \( \text{أَيْقَنَ} \) was certain and \( \text{أَيْقَنَ} \) was well off (A)] from \( \text{أَيْقَنِي} \) certain and \( \text{يُسَيَر} \) easy, the \( \text{i} \) in both being changed into \( \text{ر} \) because occurring after a Damma ; or (b) a v., as in \( \text{يُوَتَّس} \) is certain and \( \text{يُوَتَّس} \) is well off (Tsr): (a) the \( \text{i} \) must be preserved [from change (Tsr)] if it be (\( \alpha \)) mobile, [because by means of the vowel it resists change (Tsr),] as in \( \text{هَيْاَم} \) (Aud), i. e., says Jh, most violent thirst, and delirium from love, and a distemper that seizes camels, so that they wander about the land, and do not graze (Tsr): (b) incorporated [into its like (Tsr)], as in \( \text{حَيْيَض} \) (Aud), pl. of \( \text{حَيْيَض} \) [247], where the \( \text{i} \) 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 دَابَّةٍ [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 ٍ: but this ex. [قَحْضٌ] 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 حَمَّاضٌ [384] from بَعٍ, بَدَعٍ, [the ی in] which, for the [first] reason that we mentioned [in the case of قَحْضٌ], is not transformed (Tsr): (γ) in a pl.: but in this [case (Tsr)] the دَامَّة [occurring before the single ی in the pl. (Tsr)] must be converted into Kasra, [because of the heaviness of دَامَّة, ی, and the pl. (Tsr),] as in the [نَعَل] pl. of آَنْعَلَ [243, 249, 710], like هَيْيمٌ wandering about, [pl. of هُيْيَمٍ and هَيْيَمٍ (Tsr),] and بَيْضٍ white (Aud), pl. of بَيْضٍ and بَيْضٍ (Tsr); or of another [measure], like pl. of عَيْطٍ, on the principle of بَرَّلٍ pl. of بَرَّلٍ [247], عَيْطٍ being the she-camel that does not conceive [718], pls. عَيْطٍ and عَيْطٍ [247] (Tsr): (2) where the ی occurs after a دَامَّة, and is the ل of (a) [468, 476],
like How intelligent the man is! and What a good judge he is!, [with Fath of their first, and Damm of their second (Tsr),] i. q. ُحَافِلَةٌ، i. e., ُحَافِلَةٌ، and مَا أَنْهَيْتَ (Aud), i. e. أَحْكَامُ نُهِيَتْ and from ُنُهِيَتْ I forbade and ُنُهِيَتْ I judged, the ی in them being changed into й because occurring after a داممة (Tsr): (b) a n. ending in a [fundamental, inseparable] ﯱ [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 ُرَمِي a [n. ending in ﯱ (Tsr),] like ﯱ مُقَدِّرةٌ [333], [with داممة of the ﯱ (Tsr),] in which case you say ﯱ مَرْمُوَةٌ [with the ، ء ، orig. مَرْمُيَةُ ، the ی being changed into й because occurring after a داممة (Tsr)], contrary to [what happens when the ﯱ is affixed after the formation of the word, in which case the داممة must be converted into كسرة, in order that the ی may be preserved, as in (Tsr)] such [formations] as ﯱ تَرَافِيةٍ inf. n. un. of تَرَافِيٍّ flagged [336]: for its o. f., before affixion of the ﯱ ، is ﯱ تَرَافِيٍّ with داممة [of the ﯱ ، because it is of the cat. of تَفَاعُل ، since تَوَأَيٍّ ﯱ تَرَافِيٍّ is (Tsr)] like ﯱ تَكَاسَلُ [with داممة of the س (Tsr),] inf. n. of تَكَاسَلُ ﯱ تَكَاسَلُ was sluggish; but its داممة is changed into كسرة, in order that the ی may be preserved from conversion [into ، (Tsr)] ; and afterwards
the  does supervene, to import *unity* [336]; while the transformation [of the Damma into Kasra (Tsr). remains in its state (Aud), the predicament [of the J not being altered by restoration of the Damma to its original place, and change of the  into , because that would lead to the occurrence of an *inf. n. ending in a*, preceded by an inseparable Damma [721], since the adventitious  being virtually separate [266], is not taken into account (Tsr): (c) a *n. ending in the* [aug. (Tsr)] and , as when you form from [a name (Tsr)] on the measure of *Sabu‘ūn* [with Damm of the (Tsr)], the name of the *place* about which Ibn Aḥmar [or rather Tamīm Abn Abi Muḥbil, according to the correct opinion (Tsr),] says [236]; in which case you say Ramūwān (Aud) with Damm of the , *orig.*, the  being changed into , because occurring after a Damma: (a) you may, however, say that, when a [n.] like [237, 250] is formed from , then [685, 723] is said, the letter before the and being given the predicament of what occurs as a genuine final, like [the J of] [685]: while this necessarily requires that, in the like of *Ramūwān* [368] from , it is not allowable to say , since we have no *decl. n. ending in an inseparable*.
after a Damma [721]; but the Damma must be converted into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved, so that you say رِمْ ی[724]; and similarly رمیان 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 فَعَلْيُ with Fath of the ف, when a substantive, not an ep., as قَقَرَى piety, reverence [689, 725], كَلْك سَرَّوَى [272], [i. q. مَثْلُ, as كَلْك سَرَّوَى Thou hast its like, or match, i. e., مَثْلُ, transmitted by IJ (Tsr),] and قَقَرَى [248] (Aud), orig. قَقَرَى, قَقَرَى, because from قَقَرَى I feared, reverenced, قَقَرَى I sold, and قَقَرَى I was youthful, the ی in them being changed into س 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 سَعْبَى Saʿyā, [a name (Tsr)] for a [certain (Tsr)] place, [a district in AlYaman or its immediate neighbourhood, by rule, says IJ, سَعْبَى (Bk),] and زَبَا for the [nice (EM)] odour, and طَغْيَا [with Fath, says Th (Jh),] for the young of الْبَقْرَةُ الْوَحِلْشِيةُ the wild cow, or bovine antelope, are anomalous: but [this requires consideration, since (Tsr)] the first, [vid. سَعْبَى from سَعَى striving (Tsr),] may be
transferred from an *ep.* [4], like صَدِيْا حَرْيَبَى and صَدْيَا صَدِيْا [725], *fems.* of حَرْيَبَى [250] and صَدِيْا ثَرْيْسَي (Aud), the sounding [of its ي] true being retained as an accompaniment after its being made a name, as F explains (Tsrr); while the second, [vid. رَبْيَا (348) (Tsrr),] is said by the GG, [S and others (Tsrr),] to be an *ep.* wherein the quality of substantive predominates [149], the o. f. being رَآئْحٌة رَبْيَا a fragrant odour, i. e., filled with perfume; and the third, [vid. طَغِيَانٌ from طَغِيَانٌ inordinate wickedness (Tsrr),] is more often pronounced with Damm of the ط [below], so that perhaps they retain the sounding [of the ي] true as an accompaniment when they pronounce [the ط] with Fath for lightness (Aud): (b) thus they criticize IM; and the author of the Aud follows them: but afterwards he says in the Glosses “It has since appeared to me that IM’s meaning [by ‘anomalous’] is anomalousness in usage; for I have read, in his [own] handwriting, a marginal annotation here ‘The substitution of the ط for the ي, when a ل of مَلْعَى, is not to be taken as a precedent, because there is no cause [for it], while it necessarily involves increase of heaviness’”: (c) various spellings of طَغِيَانٌ [272] are transmitted: As says “with Damm of the ط [above], like حَبْلَى”; while Th says “with Fath of the ط [above], on the paradigm of سَكْرَى”; and AU says “with Fath
of the ط, and Tanwin": so says ISd (Tsr): (4) where the ى is the ى of فَعُلْتَ [718], with Damm [of the (Tsr), when (a) a substantive, like طَرْبُيَّة happiness, [i. q. طِيبُ (Tsr),] an inf. n. of was happy (Aud), aor. طِيبُ (Tsr), like لِبْشَرْيَ [272, 331] and رَفْقِي [272] (K, B on XIII. 28.); or Tūbā, a name for Paradise (Aud), whence شَكْرُة طُرْبُيَّة the tree of Paradise (Tsr): (a) the meaning of طُرْبُيَّة لَدَيَّ Mayst thou be happy! or Happiness be thine! is آَمِبَتُ خَيْرًا وطِيبًا Mayst thou find good fortune and happiness!; while the [syntactical] place of طُرْبُيَّة is the acc. or nom., as in طِيبُ طِيبًا لَدَيَّ, and سَلَامُ سَلَامًا لَدَيَّ [41] or سَلَامُ [25, 28], its two places being indicated to you by the reading of طُرْبُيَّة لِهِم وَحَسَنَ مَآِي 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 سَقَيَّة لَدَيَّ [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 ى of فَعُلْتَ [272, 355], like آَكْسَى the happy state, or life, آَكْسَى the shrewd woman, and آَكْسَى the good woman, fems. of طِيبُ [718], and آَكْسَى [351] (Aud), ns. of superiority acting as prim. substantives (Tsr): (a) what indicates that
they are acting as [prim. (Tsr)] substantives is that the 
آَلْفَاحُ [249], as فَاحِلٌ the learned and the great, [pls. of 
آَلْفَاحُ] like آَنْفَاحِلِ pl. of آَنْفَاحِلٌ [249] (Aud), which is a 
prim. substantive: (b) the o. f. is آَلْكِيْسَيٌ, آَلْطَيْبِيٌ, and
آَلْخِيْرَيٌ with ذَامَمٍ of their initial; but the يٌ is
changed into ذٌ because quiescent and preceded by a
letter pronounced with ذَامَمٍ (Tsr), as in ذٌمْوَتٌ and
ذٌمْوَرٍ [above] (K on XIII. 28): (c) if فَعْلٍ be a pure
ep., [i. e., preceded by a qualified (Tsr),] its ذَامَمٍ
must be converted into كَارَة, [in order that the يٌ may
be preserved from conversion into ذٌ, 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., ذٌمَأْرَة حَقَّةٌ wrong'ul, [from
ذَمَأْرَة حَقَّةٌ deprived, or defrauded, him of his right, aor. ذٌمَأْرَة
ذِيَضْرِي, i. q. ذَمَأْرَة حَقَّةٌ diminished to him his right and
ذَمَأْرَة حَقَّةٌ wronged him (Tsr),] and ذٌمُشّة جَيْكُي an elegant, or
affected, gait, i. e., wherein the shoulders move [272, 718]
(Aud), from ذٌمُشّة جَيْكُي meaning moved his shoulders
in his walk, orig. ذٌمُشّة جَيْكُي and ذٌمُشّة جَيْكُي with ذَامَمٍ of their
initial, the ذَامَمٍ being changed into كَارَة in order
that the يٌ may be sounded true, as in ذٌمٌ pl. of ذٌمٌ
(1309)

[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 $\text{س} \text{نـ} \text{ل} \text{ي}$, when an ep., the Damma may [either] be preserved, the $\text{ي}$ being converted into $\text{و}$; or be changed into Kasra, the $\text{ي}$ being preserved: so that you say the happiest or $\text{الـثـرـبـي} \text{ي}$ [below], the shrewdest or $\text{الـثـرـبـي} \text{ي}$, and the narrowest or $\text{الـثـرـبـي} \text{ي}$ (Aud), from vacillating between conformity with its masc. [by retention of the $\text{ي}$] 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, (a) that IM and his son allow two forms in $\text{س} \text{نـ} \text{ل} \text{ي}$ when an ep.: whereas the GG decide upon one of them, saying that the $\text{ي}$ [occurring as the $\text{ع}$] of $\text{س} \text{نـ} \text{ل} \text{ي}$, when a substantive, is converted into $\text{و}$, as $\text{كـوـس} \text{ي}$ $\text{طـرـبـي} \text{ي}$; while, in the ep., it is not converted, but the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, so that the $\text{ي}$ is preserved, as $\text{قـسـبـة}$ $\text{س} \text{ي}$ $\text{ضـيـر} \text{ي}$ $\text{جـيـكـي}$; (b) that the GG mention the $\text{آـنـل} \text{ي}$ 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 $\text{ي}$ into $\text{و}$: whereas IM mentions it in the cat. of the eps.; but allows the two forms in it, unequivocally declaring that both are heard from the Arabs: (f) Shl says "No instance
of this [formation] occurs [with its ع] converted, except the 
افعال لفظي, [apparently regarding لفظي as an ep.
throughout case 4] (Tsr): (g) Makwaza alAframî reads
ط مثبى لهم in XIII. 28. [above], pronouncing the ط with
Kasr [in the substantive], in order that the ي may be pre-
served, as ي Pittc [above] and معيشة [333, 710] are said (K).
Its substitution, (1) for the ي, is (a) [obligatory (SH)]
in such as (a) ضیارة [18] (M, SH), pl. of ضیارة [247, 278, 383] (Jrb); and ضیارب (M, SH), dim. of ضیارب
[278, 682] (Jrb): i.e., in [the ultimate pl., and the dim.,
of (R) such as (IY)] فعال ضیارب [above] (IY, R),
like ضیارب and حاتم [373]; and فاعل and ضیارب, like
سابط and عامول [377]: for, whenever you mean to form
the dim., or [ultimate] broken pl., from any of those
[ns.], you convert its و into ى, as ضیارب and ضیارب
[above], ضیارب and حواتم [247], عوانيل and عوينيال, and
سوييبد: (a) the cause of its conversion in the
dim. [278] is obvious, vid. the fact that the letter before
it is pronounced with دامم [above]: (ب) as for its
conversion in the broken pl. [247], it is by conformity
with the dim.: for, when you say حواتم and ضیارب
[above], there is no دامم on the ض and خ necessitat-
ing conversion of the و into ى; but, since you say حواتم
in the \textit{dim.}, you say حَوَائِمُ in the broken \textit{pl.}, which is made to accord with the \textit{dim.} in this [conversion], because they follow one course [247, 274, 279], this broken \textit{pl.} being treated like the \textit{dim.} in many of its predicaments, in that the sign of the \textit{dim.} is a quiescent \( \varepsilon \) third preceded by a Fatha [274], and the sign of the [ultimate] broken \textit{pl.} is a quiescent \( \iota \) third [256], preceded by a Fatha, while the \( \iota \) is the sister of the \( \iota \), as above shown; and that the letter after the \( \iota \) of the \textit{dim.} is pronounced with Kasr [274], as is the letter after the \( \iota \) of the [ultimate] broken \textit{pl.} [256] (IY) : (b) ضُرْبُ [below], \textit{dim.} of ضَرَّبَ [278], \textit{inf. n.} of ضَرَّبَ [332, 685] : (c) جَوْيَتُ and حَوائِمُ [above], since the substitution is obligatory, because of the combination of two Hamzas (IY) : (d) ضُرْبُ [above] (IY, R) and تُضْرَبُ (R), where you convert the \( \iota \) of the [act.] \( v. \) ضَرَّبَ [and تَضْرَبُ] into , according to the rule mentioned [above], because the letter before it is pronounced with ةَمَم (IY) : (e) ءَمْوُى [294, 300] (M, SH), and the like [rel. ns.] from the abbreviated (IY), where the \( \iota \) third or fourth [300] has the \( \iota \) of relation affixed to it, in which case you convert the \( \iota \) into , (R), whether the \( \iota \) be [converted] from a ء or \( \iota \) (IY, R), because of the occurrence of the
double ی after it: (α) the reason of its being converted into ، and the reason of this ی's not being converted into ل، notwithstanding its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, have been explained 

\[300, 684\] (R): یناری [229, 639], du. of ینی [500],

when [used as (IY)] a name (M); and similarly یلداز [229], إذا [205], امزائى، یلداز، dus. of ینکى [204], whether [an adv. of] time or place، اِل [559], and اِس [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 ل and و، you would say یناری [234], and the like: (α) the cause of the conversion of such ل as those into ل، 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 ل is assigned to them, and therefore they are converted into ل، when they need a vowel: (β) if it be said "Since they are original, not substituted, why is their conversion into ل، not disallowed, because they have no o. f. as ل or ی؟", the answer is that the matter is so, except that, when these words are used as names, they are translated to the predicament of ns.: so that what is predicated of the ل in those ns. which it is not good to pronounce with Imāla,
such as sand-grouse, is predicated of their 1; and, as you say, so you say and and somewhat similarly, if you named a man, you would inflect it, saying This is Darab, I saw Darab, and I passed by Darab, although, before use as a name, it is not invaded by inflection; so that, as, when used as a name, is transferred to the predicament of ns., and is therefore infl. [194, 206], so and, and, when used as names, are transferred to the predicament of ns., and their 1s are decided to be converted from the , since they are original, and Imāla has not been heard in them (IY): (b) weak in [such as] for viper [in pause] (R), [where] some of Tayyi say with the ] (M on §. 643); (a) Fazāra and some of Kais convert every final 1, whether for feminization, as in [248, 272], or not, as in 401, 671, 673, into [in pause]; so say the GG; but IH makes that peculiar to the 1 of "such as 643, 685", which is not proper: (b) the reason why they convert it into is that the 1 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 1 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 ١٠٤٨ and ١١٥٤ are said, with the ١ of silence ١١٥٥ after it; so that in pause they substitute [for it] a letter homogeneous with, but plainer than, it, vid. the ١; (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 heavity of the ١, which is heavier than the ١; and also because the letter before it is pronounced with Fath, which somewhat lightens the heavity of the ١: (d) this is also an excuse for the conversion of the ١ into Hamza ١٠٤٣, although it is heavier than the ١: (e) Tayyi leave it, in continuity, in the same state as in pause, saying ١٠٤٦ with the ١ in both states: (f) some of Tayyi convert the ١ into ١ in pause], because ١ is plainer than ١, and plainness is intended: for the ١ is [sounded] farther in the mouth than the ١, because it is [emitted] from the throat ١٠٢; and after it the ١, because it is from the middle of the tongue; and after it the ١, because it is from the lips: (g) the ١ is more frequent than the ١, 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 ١ into ١ in pause] leave the ١, 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 ا is converted into ى or ٠ is that the three resemble one another in prolongation and width of outlet (R on Pause): (2) for the ى, is (a) [obligatory (SH)] in such as (α) مِتْسَنُ (M, SH) and مُوسَرٌ [above] (IY), طَوْبَى [above], and بُطُرَ (M, SH), orig. بُطُرَ (Jrb), pass. of بُطُرَ [482] (IY), from بُطُرَة [332], whence بُطُرَة [377] (Jrb); vid. where the ا is quiescent and unincorporated, and is preceded by a letter pronounced with ِمَمْمُم (M, R), and followed by two or more letters [below], except in such as بِيِبَسُان [249], and حَيْكَي [above] (R): (α) if the ا in مِتْسَنُ and مِوتْنُ become mobile, or the ِمَمْمُم before it be removed, the word reverts to its original ا, as in the dim. مُبوَسَنَتُ and مُبيِقَنَتُ [278], and the broken pl. مُباَسَنَتُ and مُباَتِينَ [252] (IY): (β) our saying "[and followed by] two or more letters" [above] is to guard against such as بِيِبَسُ [above] (R): (γ) as for ضَوْرِبُ [above], the ا in it is a subst. for the ا substituted for the ا of ُقَاعَدٍ; while the last ا is a subst. for the ا of ُقُوَى [332] (IY): (b) بَقُوَى sparing, taking compassion on [725] (M, SH), orig. بَقِيَ [a quasi-inf. n. (KF)] from اَلَبِقَى عَلَيْهِ ُسَرَأَهُ spared him, i. q. اَلَبِقَى عَلَيْهِ ُسَرَأَهُ took compassion on him, from اَلَبِقَى ُسَرَأَهُ remained,
as though he desired him to remain (Jrb); and had he desired him to remain (Jrb) [above], from ُرَتْبَتْ [689] (IY): (c) ُعَمْرُوُي (294, 301) (R): (b) [anomalous, weak (SH),] in such as (a) ُهُذَا أَمْرُ مَضْوُوٓ عَلِيٓعَى This is a matter accomplished (M, SH), orig. مَضْوُوٓ (R, Jrb), from مَضْيُ [below] (Jrb), the last in it being a subst. for the ى, which is a ل in مَضْيَتْ (IY), because it is from مَضْيُ, aor. يُبْصِيَ (R): ُهُوَ أَمْرُ يَبْلَدَعُ َفَيْنَ [He is (M, R) a strong enjoiner of good conduct (IY, R),] a strong forbider of bad conduct [685] (M, SH), which is from ُنَهَيْتُ I forbade (IY), [being] orig. ُنَهْوَى (R, Jrb), from ُنَهْيُ (Jrb), as though the ى were converted into و, in order that ُنَهْوُ might correspond to ُأَمْرُ; whereas, if they converted the ج [of ُفَعْلُ] into ى, the Damma would be turned into Kasra, and ُنَهْوُ would become ُنِهْيُ [722], which would not correspond to ُأَمْرُ (R); and therefore ُشَرْبَتْ مَشْوَا َّا I drank a purgative (IY, R), which is the medicine that moves the stomach (R), from مَشْيَتْ I moved, because the laxative necessitates motion: (α) they change the ى into و, because they mean the formation ُفَعْلُ; and therefore dislike it to be confounded with the formation ُفَعْلُ, [as would happen] if ُنَهْيُ and ُمَشْيُ [722] were said (IY): ُجَبَيْةٍ (M, SH), for ُجِبَائِةٍ ُجَبَائِةٍ inf. n. of ُجَبَيْةٍ.
I collected the tax (IY, R, Jrb): (α) [the assertion] that the [last] of مَضْرُبُ ٌ is a subst. for the ى is said to require consideration, because one says مُضْرَبَةٌ ُا أَلْمَرُ. I accomplished the matter, inf. n. مُضْرَبَةٌ ُا أَلْمَرُ [above], and مُضْرَبَةٌ ُا أَلْمَرُ, inf. n. مُضْرَبَةٌ ُا أَلْمَرُ; and similarly [the assertion] that the ى in جَبَارُة ُا أَلْمَرُ is a subst. for the ى, because جَبَارُة ُا أَلْمَرُ and جَبَارِيَة ُا أَلْمَرُ are two dial. vars., since Jh says in the Sahâh "[Ks says (Jh)] جَبَبَتُ أَلْمَارِيٌّ نَيٌّ [الْكُرْوُضُ] I collected the water in the trough or cistern and جَبَّرُة، the inf. n. of the first being, it is said, جَبَبَيْتُ جَبَّرَةٍ, جَبَبَيْتُ جَبَّرَةٍ, and of the second جَبَّرُة; and Jh also says "جَبَبَيْتُ أَلْمَارِيٌّ جَبَّرَا جَبَّرَا، inf. n. جَبَبِيَةٌ جَبَّرَا، جَبَبِيَةٌ جَبَّرَا": 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 ى] (R). They say مُعَوْنَةٌ ُا شَوَى َّا شَوَيْنَه ُا شَوَيْنَه and ُا شَوَيْنَه as dims. of thing and ُا عَيْنَه ُا عَيْنَه eye, respectively, converting the ى in them into ى but the chastest [practice] is to say مُعَوْنَةٌ ُا شَوَيْنَه ُا شَوَيْنَه ُا شَوَيْنَه ُا شَوَيْنَه with retention of the ى, and دَامَم of their initial; though Kasr of their initial is allowed in the dim. [274, 721], on account of the ى, in order that the consonant and vowel may be conformable, one to
another. And of this class is their saying ضریعة and بیت as dims. of ضریعه real property, or estate, and بیت tent, house, respectively: whereas the form adopted in them is ضریعه and بیت, as in a verse by AlKhalil Ibn Aḥmad that I have had recited to me

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 [ضریعه and] بیت [274, 721] (Jh, KF), with Kasr of the initial, as also in the dims. of ضریعه عیب ass, شیع [above], and their likes (Jh). This [retention of the ئ, however,] is not obligatory, which is proclaimed by H's saying "the chastest"; and therefore his reckoning that [conversion of the ئ into ] among the "mistakes" [which the D, by its title "The Pearl of the Diver on the Mistakes of the Distinguished", professes to expose,] is an excess of language. And IM distinctly declares in the Tashil that the ئ before the letter [ ئ characteristic] of the dim. is made into ئ, necessarily, if it be an ٰ converted from ئ; so that you say بیت as dim. of باب [278]: (2) allowably, though less approvably, if it be a ئ or an ٰ converted from a ئ: so that نوبت and شریع
are allowable as dims. of شَجْعٍ and تَأْبُ [278]. And similarly ضِمْعَةٍ and َدَوُبَتْ [above]. And what َسْرِيُّ dis-allows is allowed by some, who transmit it from the KK, saying "They say شُرَى as dim. of شِئٍ": so that what َسْرِيُّ mentions is of no account (CD). Or شُرَى is a weak dial. var., on the authority of Idris Ibn Mūsā, the Grammarian (KF). The substitution of the َسْرِيُّ for the Hamza [685] is (1) [allowable (R)] in such as جُوْنَةٍ [642], pl. جُوْنَ (M, SH), orig. جُوْنَةٍ and جُوْنَ with Hamza: (a) the ex. is said to be a blunder, because the composition جَانٌ is neglected in the language, and thus the جُوْنَةٍ is not known to be orig. Hamza: the author of the ِنَاحَةٍ says "And جُوْنَةٍ with ِدَامِم is the inf. n. [331] of the جُوْنُ intensely black, [pl. جُوْنَ (Jh).] of horses, [like غُبْسَةٍ dingy whiteness and وَرَةٍ bright bay color (Jh)]; and جُوْنَةٍ is also the جُوْنَةٍ 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 جُوْنَ], and the Hamza in it a subst. for the جُوْنَةٍ: (b) "the جُوْنَةٍ of the perfumer" [above] is his حَقَّةٍ small round box (Jrb): (2) necessary in (a) [such as (MASH)]. I believe [661]: (b) such as حَمْرَأوُبٍ.
[230, 726], according to the most recognised [usage]; and
[248]; and [304] (R). [On the substitution of the , for the  see §. 687.]

§. 687. The  is substituted for [four letters (IY, A),] (1) the , [necessarily (SH, Aud),] in [16, 667] (M, SH, Aud, A), according to most (A), alone (M, SH), the  not being substituted for the , except in , 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 [16, 306] (IY, R, Aud, A), like crowd (A), its  being a , and its  a (IY), as is proved by [its broken pl. (IY, Tsr)] (IY, R, Aud, A) and its dim. ; [275] (IY), because the broken pl. [or the dim.] restores things to their o. f. [260, 278] (Tsr), and by wide-mouthed and
I opened my mouth (R); and its measure being with Fath of the first [letter], and quiescence of the second (IY): but the  [that occurs in it, being assimilated to the unsound letters (IY),] is elided (IY, R, Aud, A), as the unsound letters are elided from such as and [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 would be said, which would be deemed heavy (A);
and, when the ﺃ is elided, the ﻥ. remains of two letters, the second a ﺓ, and the first pronounced with فاء [below]: while its retention in this state would lead to conversion of the ﺓ into ﻋ [684], on the principle of [the conversion in] ﺕ and ﻋ [719], because of its being mobile with the vowels of inflection, and preceded by a letter pronounced with فاء; and, this ﻋ being elided, as in ﻋ [643, 683], because of the concurrence of two quiescents, upon affixion of ﺪ in to it, the decl. ﻥ. would remain ﺶه [below], which is not found (IY): and [since, according to what has just been mentioned, the ﻥ. requires the ﻋ to be retained (IY),] they substitute the ﻡ for the ﺓ (IY, ﺮ, ﺞ, ﺔ), because the ﻡ [is a sound letter, on which the vowels are not heavy; and (IY)] is from the same outlet as the ﺓ [732] (IY, ﺕ), both being from the mouth; and has in it a nasality akin to the softness of the ﺓ: (a) if it be said "What is the proof that the ﻧ is pronounced with فاء [above] to the exclusion of ﺪ or ﺔ?", the answer is "The [common] pronunciation testifies to that": and then, if it be said "AZ transmits ﻭ and ﺔ, with ﺪ and ﺔ, for ﻭ", the answer is "That is not common in it; and the decision is [based] only upon the most frequent [pronunciation], which is فاء, ﺪ and ﺔ being rare, of the cat. of blunder, the explanation of which is that, seeing [the vowel of] the ﻧ in this ﻥ. vary, when
the n. is pre. [otherwise than to the ι of the 1st pers.], as 

This is thy mouth, I saw thy mouth, and 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'Ajjaj (AKB)]

O would that it, by which he may have meant a word that was to be spoken, had issued from his mouth, so that the kingdom might return to its owner, and its rightful claimant!, i.e., says Jh, َحَقُّ قَبْلَ أَبْعَدَةٍ and (AKB), it is related with Damm and Fath of the َفَ، together with doubling of the َمٌ:—as for the Damm of the َفَ، 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. َأَنْوَاءٌ, and for its dim. َفُوْىٌ [above], not َفُوْىٌ أَفْمَامٌ [below] nor َقُوْيٌ; but the explanation of it is that they double the َمٍ in pause, as they double [the final] in َخَالِدٌ َبَيْجَعُ and َخَالِدٌ [640]; and that continuity is then treated like pause [647], as in the القَصْبَا [640, 647, 648] (IY): (c) if َثُمَ be pre. [to an explicit n. or a pron. (Tsr)], it is returned to the o.f., [vid. the َوَ ] Zaid's mouth and (Tsr) َفُوْىٌ thy mouth [below] (Aud, A), because prefixion
restores things to their o. fs. (Tsr): and the substitution seldom remains, as in [the saying of the Prophet (Tsr)]

\[\text{Assuredly the perfume of the mouth of the faster is pleasanter to God than the odour of musk (Aud, A) and the saying of Ru'ba [Ibn Al'Ajjaj (MN)]}\]

\[\text{يُصِبِّحُ عَطَمَانَ وَبِئْيَ الْبُكْرَ فَمَهُ} \]

[16] (Tsr), where عطُسَانَ is i. q. عطِسانَ, which thus occurs in some places (MN); but F asserts [in the Baghdādiyāt cited below] that the م is not retained except in poetry, which is refuted by the preceding tradition (Tsr): (b) Akh says that the م is a subst. for the ٰ below, its o. f. being ٰ, which, being transposed, becomes ٰ, whereupon the م is elided, and the ٰ made into a م; and, in proof of that, he cites ٰ [below], which, according to him, is like ٰ in restoration of the elided [ٰ] by poetic license (R): (c) as for [the explicit n. in] فُونَ [above], it has three states, (α) severance from prefixion, where the م must be changed into م from the impossibility of eliding or retaining it, because by elision the decl. n. would remain uni. [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 س of the 1st pers., where it has two dial. vars.:—(x) the more notorious of them is َء [130] in the three cases [of inflection]: by analogy, it is orig. ١ُوُى, خِلَّم my morrow; then ٌنآى [684], because of the س's being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath: but since, in what is infl. with vowels, [like خِلَّم, ] the custom runs that, when it is pre. to the س, [as in خِلَّمْي, ] one is confined, out of all the [inflectional] vowels, to Kasra [129], [which is then put not for inflection, but] for affinity [to the س]; while here the س is like an inflectional vowel, the س being like Damma, the س like Kasra, and the س like Fatha [16]; therefore the س is made obligatory in the three cases [of inflection] before the س 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 َيِّئاَنِّ is assimilated to the inflectional, so that the س and
are put in its place in 'I and as] the uninflectional Fatha in 'I is assimilated to the inflectional, so that the 'I is put in its place in 'I and [99]; all of this being because of adventitiousness: and therefore, since the 'I, which is an 'I in 'I, becomes assimilated to the inflectional [ 'I'], and what is before the inflectional 'I in the six ns. [16] is pronounced with Kasr, therefore the 'I in 'I is pronounced with Kasr: (8) sometimes "I [130], and 'I [above] are said in all the states of prefixion, as "I [16]: (γ) the first [dia. var.] is more correct and chaste, because the cause of the need for change of the 'I into 'I, upon severance from prefixion, is fear of elision of the 'I on account of the [concurrence of] two quiescents; whereas, in the state of prefixion, there are no two quiescents, since there is no Tanwin in the pre. [110, 609]; so that the change of the 'I into 'I is more properly omitted: (c) prefixion to [an explicit n. or a pron.] other than the 'I of the 1st pers., where the more recognised [practice] is to inflect it with consonants, as mentioned [16]; but 'I [or ] occurs, as above shown: (α) the poet has combined the 'I and 'I, saying "I [231, 233, 306], which is a combination of the subst. and original, [vid. the 'I and (A KB)]; but
some endeavour to excuse it by saying that the ٌ is a subst. for the ٧ [above], which is the ٨ put before the ى (٨ on IH upon the Genitives): (٧) the constructive meaning of the first saying, as [shown] in [the Kitāb (IKhn) alMasā'il (IKhn, BW, HKh)] alBaghdādiyyāt [above] by F, is that the poet, by poetic license, prefixes ٨ ٨ with the ٠ substituted for its ٨, as in وَفِي الْبَكْرِ ٨٨٢ [above]; and then puts the ٨, which is an ٨, though the ٩ 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 أُتْرِل يَا أَلْلَهُ الْحَمَّٰل ٥٦, where the poet combines the premonitory ٧٠ [٥٥١] and the two ٧٠s which are a compensation for it [٥٢]: and, according to this account, two poetic licenses are combined in ١٠٩ فَسَبَى هُمَا ٨٩٩ with the ٨ ٨, its predicament being that it should not be pre. therewith; and combination of the subst. and original: but I say that prefixion of ٠ ٨٩٩ with the ٨ is chaste; and is not a poetic license, this being refuted by the tradition لَخَدُّوا ٦٠ أَلْصَلَّى الَّذِي ٦٠ ٦٠ ٦٠ [above]: (γ) as for the second saying, it [evidently coincides with the saying of Akh recorded in (b) above; but, according to A.K.B.,] looks like the opinion of S, who, in the chapter on Relation, the name of which, according to him, is the chapter on الإضائة, says the following words:—"As for ٦٠٦٠, two
letters have gone from its o. f., because it is orig. but they substitute the م in place of the ُ، [in order that it may resemble the aprothetic ns. of their language (S)]; so that this م is equivalent to the ع, like the م of ُد, 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 ُد in its [curtailed] state, when he forms its rel. n. [306], leaves م in its [curtailed] state; while he that restores the ل to م restores the ع to م, putting it into the place of the ل. as they put the م into the place of the ع in م: the poet says ضـما ّنقتـنا آلهـ, and they say َنـمَوْانِ [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 ضـما ّنقتـنا آلهـ has the option of saying, at his will, ُنـمَوْانِ or ُنـمَوْانِ فـيَنِي ُنـمَوْانِ in every case [306]" : this is the language of S: (S) F in the Baghdādiyāt, although he does not report the opinion of S there, reports another mode of accounting for نـمُوْاتِمَا, saying “It is said that AlFarazdāk substitutes م for the ع, which is a ُ، as it is substituted when the n. is aprothetic; and then substitutes م, for
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the $s$, which is a ل: and that substitution of ل for ل [686] is not strange, its permissibility being indicated by [the fact] that they are [sometimes] interchangeable in a single word, like عصَة [306], the ل of which is judged sometimes to be $s$, because of their saying عصَة [275, 311]; and sometimes to be ل, because of their saying عصَة [234, 244, 275, 311] ": (e) IJ holds قُومُ بِهِمَا to be دل. of دل [below] with abbreviation, saying on يَا حَبَّدَا آلِهَم [233] that may be an abbreviated n., like عصَة [16]; and that عصَة occurs accordingly (A.K.B): (d) فم has [ten] dial. vars.: —(a) the most notorious and chaste of them is (ذ) inflection with consonants in prefixion to [an explicit n. or a pron.] other than the ل of the 1st pers. [16]; (ب) Fath of the ف, together with a single م, in the state of severance [from prefixion]; and (γ) change of the ل into ل upon prefixion to the ل [130]: (b) the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th are فم, with the ف triply vocalized, and the ل elided as forgotten, unrestrictedly, [i. e., in the three states (ذ—γ) just detailed,] together with change of the ل into م: (ذ) the triple vocalization of the ف is founded upon [the fact] that, in the state of prefixion, the ل, for which the م is substituted, is converted into ل and ل [in the acc. and gen. respectively], for which reason the ف 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 are نُمْأُ, with the ب triply vocalized, [and the 1] abbreviated, unrestrictedly, [i.e., in the three states (α — γ) detailed under the 1st var.,] as though it were a combination of the subst. and original, or the م were a subst. for the چ put before the ع, as above mentioned [in (c, c, α)]; so that نُمْأُ is du. of نُمْأُ [above]: (d) the 8th and 9th are مُعْمَمُ, with the م doubled, unrestrictedly, [i.e., in the three states (α — γ) detailed under the 1st var.,] and the ف pronounced with دايم or فاث, as in مُعْمِمُ [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 چ; and the pl. is مُعْمُمُ [above]: (c) the 10th is making the ف imitate the م in the vowels of inflection, as مُعْمِمُ مُعْمِمُ This is a mouth, I saw a mouth, and نَظَرَتُ هَلَى فَيْمُ I looked at a mouth: (α) it is as though the state of prefixion without a م — I mean مُعْمَمُ [above], مُعْمَمُ, فَلَنُ — were considered here: (β) sometimes the ف of مُرْأَةٌ also is made to imitate its inflectional letter [in its vowels], as مُرْأَةٌ, مُرْأَةٌ, and مُرْأَةٌ; while the ع of مُتَعُوْنُ and مُتَعُوْنُ 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 لِيَسْ مِنْ أَمْدَارِ آله [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 ذَلِ الْحَيَّيْلِهِ آله [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 a ب (M, R, Aud, A), as in عُنـَبـ [677] (M, SH, A) and شَنَبـ (M, SH) having sharp, serrated, canine teeth (MASH), fem. of شِنْبـ (Jrb, MASH), and عَنـَبـ بَكْر from Bahr (IY), whether the ن and ب be (Aud) in one word or two words (R, Aud), as عَنـَبـ [above] and سَيْبِعْ بَيـِسَر [above] and إِذَا أَنْبَعَت أَشْقَاـَـَـََا XCI. 12. When the most wretched of them arose, [i. e., of Thamūd, vid. Kudār Ibn Sālif, or he and those who abetted him in the slaughter of the she-camel, because the أَنْعَل of superiority, when you prefix it, is applicable to the sing. and pl. (B),] and مَنْ يَعْتَنَّا XXXVI. 52. [182] (Aud): (a) IM indicates that by his saying "And before a ب convert [below the ] when it is
made quiescent, into م (Tsř), like 所 " [below]" (IM), i. e., Whoso cuts (thee), do thou surely cast out (from thy mind, and reject), where the GED is a subst. for the single corrob. و [614, 649, 684] (IA, A): (b) that [conversion] is [only (Tsř)] because articulation of the quiescent و before the ب is difficult, from the difference of their outlets [732], together with the incongruity between the softness and nasality of the و and the rigidity of the ب [734] (A, Tsř); so that, when the و occurs quiescent before the ب , it is converted into م (Tsř), the م being exclusively distinguished by that [substitution] (A), because it is from the same outlet as the ب , and is like the و in nasality (A, Tsř): (c) there is no difference in that [respect] between the [ و (Sn)] detached [from the ب , by its being in one word, while the ب is in another, notwithstanding their concurrence (Sn),] and the attached; and IM has combined the two in his saying " like مَنْ بُنَّ أَنْيِدًا " [above] (A): (d) it is written as a و , but pronounced as م (Jrb): (e) they often term change of the و into م “ conversion”, as IM does [above]; but it should rather be termed “ substitution”, because of what I made known at the beginning of the chapter [682] (A), vid. that technically “ conversion” is only in the unsound letter, or the Hamza (Sn): (b) weakly (SH), anomalously
(Aud, A), without a ب, when the ن is (a) quiescent, as in حَمْطَلَۡلَّ for [254, 677]: (b) mobile (A), as in بنَامٍ (SH, A) for بنَامٍ (Jrb, A), which are the [fingers or (KF)] finger-tips (Jrb), in [such as (Aud)] the saying [of Ru’ba (M, R, MN, Ts, Jsh) Ibn AlAjjaj (MN Jsh)]

يا عَالَةً ذاتُ المَنْطِيقِ التَّمْيَمَ مَرَكِّبُ المُكَصَّبِ أَلْبَنَامٍ (M, R, Aud, A), meaning ُيا عَالَةً [58] (Tsr), O Hāla, 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, Ts, Jsh) with henna (Jsh), orig. التَّمْيَمَ (Aud), the م being substituted for the ن (MN, Ts, Jsh), as in عَبْرُ حَمْطَلَّ, etc. (MN), for observance of the rhyme (Jsh), anomalously, since it does not precede a ب (Ts); and in طَمَّةُ الْمَلْكِ عَلَى الْخُيْرِ God disposed him to good (M, SH), transmitted by ISk (IY), i. e., طَانْمَةٌ (IY, R, Jrb), from طَانْمَةٌ 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 قَاتِينَ black, dusky, orig. [688] (Aud, A): (α) the ب in (a) بنَاتُ مَكْحَرٍ (M, SH, A), transmitted by As (IY), for بنَاتُ مَكْحَرٍ, [with Fath of the ب and quiescence of the dotted خ, as in the KF (Sn),] which are [thin (Jrb) white (IY, R;
clouds (IY, R, Jrb, A), that come before the summer (IY, R, Jrb), rising high in the sky (R), the \( \text{بُخَّار} \) being the original (Jrb), because \( \text{بُخَّار} \) is from \( \text{بُخَّار} \) (Jrb, A): (a) IS says that it is [taken (IY)] from vapour, exhalation (IY, R), because the clouds are from the \( \text{بُخَّار} \) vapour, or exhalation, of the ground; and, according to this, the \( \text{ب} \) is original, and the \( \text{م} \) a subst. for it (IY): but IJ says that, if \( \text{بُخَّار} \) were said to be from \( \text{شَقُّ} \) i. q. \( \text{مَكْبَر} \) cleaving, from the text \( \text{تَرَى} \) \( \text{آللّٰكَ} \) \( \text{نَيِّي} \) \( \text{مَوَهَّر} \) XXXV. 13. And thou seest the ships in it cleaving [the water by their running (K, B)], it would not be improbable (R): (b) sometimes they say it with the undotted \( \text{ح} \), as though it were from \( \text{بُخَّار} \) sea, because the clouds are from the vapour, or exhalation, of the sea (IY): (b) \( \text{عَلَى} \) \( \text{هُدَأ} \) (IY) \( \text{الآمَر} \) \( \text{مَا} \) \( \text{رَتَّب} \) \( \text{رَاتِبَة} \) (IY, A)] I have not ceased to be constant (M, SH, A) to this (IY, A) matter, transmitted by IAl (IY), i. e., \( \text{فُلُكَ} \) \( \text{رَتَّبّ} \) [below] (IY, Jrb), from \( \text{رَتَّبّ} \), i. q. \( \text{رَتَّبّ} \), \( \text{رَتَّبّ} \), inf. n. \( \text{رَتُّب} \), \( \text{رَتُّب} \), i. q. \( \text{رَتُّب} \) was constant (Jrb), the \( \text{م} \) being a subst. for the \( \text{ب} \), [as is deducible] from the frequency, and versatility, of the \( \text{ب} \), since you say \( \text{رَتَّبّ} \) [above], aor. \( \text{يَرَتَّبّ} \), act. part. \( \text{رَتِّبّ} \) [682], i. e., \( \text{قُلْتُ} \) \( \text{نَزِيم} \) \( \text{ثَمِّنَ} \) constant; but do not say \( \text{رَتَّم} \), aor. \( \text{يَرَتَّمّ} \), in this sense: so that the \( \text{ب} \) is the original (IY): (a) AASh says that \( \text{مَا} \) \( \text{رَتَّم} \) \( \text{رَاتِبَة} \) \( \text{عَلَى} \) \( \text{هُدَأ} \) is for \( \text{رَاتِبَة} \) \( \text{مَا} \) \( \text{رَتَّم} \) \( \text{رَاتِبَة} \) \( \text{عَلَى} \) \( \text{هُدَأ} \).
[above], i. e., مَفِيًا keeping, the مَ being a subst. for the ب, because رَتْبُ رَتْمَ like رَتْمَ is not said: but IJ says that the م admits of being original, from رَتْمَ, which is a thread bound on the finger to remind one of a want, and is also a kind of tree: the poet says

هَلْ يَنْفَعْكُمُ الْيَوْمُ إِنْ هَمَتُ بِهِمْ؟ كَثِّرْهُ مَا تَوْصِيُ وَتَعْقَدُ الْرَّتْمَ

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 ب كَتِبَ i. q. قُرْبَ (IY, R, Jrb, A), where the ب ought to be original, and the م a subst. for it, because كَتِب is [the crude-form] generally employed, as تَذَّ أَكَتَبَ لَّهُ الآمُرُ Rَمَآءَهُ مِنْ كَتِبٍ 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),] نُغْبَا (M, A), pl. of نَغْبَة gulp (IY). The [reason why the م is used as a subst. for these four letters is that the] م and و [and ب] are labial; while the م is akin to the ل and ن in being vocal, and [intermediate] between rigidity and laxity [734] (R).

§. 688. The ن is substituted for [four letters (A),]
(1) the ج, [anomalously (SH),] in بِهْرَانِي صَعَانِي and بِهْرَانَه صَعَانَه (M, SH, A), rel. ns. of بَهْرَنَى صَعَانَى and بَهْرَنَا (R, A),
orig. بِهْرَانِي صَعَانِى and بِهْرَانَه صَعَانَه [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 صَعَانَى and بَهْرَنَى صَعَانَى and بَهْرَنَا should be صَعَانَى and بَهْرَنَا, as you say صَعَانَى and بَهْرَنَا from صَعَانَه [304], and صَعَانَى and بَهْرَنَا from صَعَانَه [247, 273, 390], substituting a ج 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 صَعَانِى and بِهْرَانِي [311], irregularly: (b) authorities differ about that (IY):—
(a) according to S, the ١٠ is a subst. for the , (IY, R', as though they said ١٠ and ١٠ [311], like ١٠ [above], and then substituted a ١٠ for the , (IY), because the regular form is ١٠ ١٠, like ١٠ from ١٠ [304]: while the ١٠ and ١٠ 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 ١٠ is orig. ١٠”; and addsuces, as evidence thereof, its return to the o. f. in ١٠ and ١٠ (R): (c) some say that the ١٠ is a subst. for the Hamza [below] in ١٠ and ١٠ (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 ١٠ (IY, R, Jrb), since the ١٠ is from the mouth, and the Hamza from the farthest [part] of the throat [732]; whereas the ١٠ is akin to the , (IY, Jrb), and is therefore substituted for it (IY): (d) they make the ١٠ 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 ج, [weakly (SH),] in ١٠ (M, SH, A), for ١٠ [537] (M, A); and ١٠ لَبَنِينَ نُعَلُتَ كَذَا No, but thou hast done such a thing, for ١٠ [545] (A): (a) it is said [by some] that (R) the ١٠ is a subst. for the ج, [the o. f.
being لَعَلَّ (Jrb),] because لَعَلَّ is [more (R)] frequently [and generally (IY)] used (IY, R, Jrb): while the ن approximates to the ل in outlet [732], for which reason (a) the ن is incorporated into the ل [749, 751], as وَبَيْنُ مِنْ لَدُنْهُ أَحَرَّ عَظِيمًا IV. 44. And will bestow from Himself a great reward (IY, Jrb); and (b) the ن of protection is elided with the ل in لَعَلَّيْنِ, as with the ن in إنَّكَ and َكَانَى [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 ْتَقَا يَا صَاحِبِيِّ الْعَلَّ [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 َأَيْمُ َأَيْمَ for َأَيْمُ َأَيْمَ [with Fath of their Hamza, and quiescence of their ى (Sn),] denoting serpent; and ُقَاتِمُ َقَاتِمَ for ُقَاتِمُ َقَاتِمَ [687] (A), ُقَاتِمُ [in this phrase] being a corrob. of ُقَاتِمُ (Sn); (4) the Hamza [above], ُجَنَّانَ being transmitted by Fr for ُجَنَّانَ [384], what is what is used as a dye (A). The ن in the ْفَعَلَانَ
of ْتَعَلَّلَى is [said by S to be] a subst. for the Hamza [of ْتَعَلَّلَى], as the Hamza [in ⪞حُمْرَأ⪟] is a subst. for the l of ⪞حُمْرَأ⪟ [263, 683] (S). As for the saying of Khl and S that the ْن of the ْتَعَلَّلَان whose fem. is ْتَعَلَّلَى, like the ْن of ْسَكْرَانُ غَضِبَانُ [250], is a subst. for the Hamza of ْتَعَلَّلَان, 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 ْتَعَلَّلَان], as the ْل 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 ْتَعَلَّلَان, and Hamza in ْتَعَلَّلَان, ] is tropical, because alternating letters are in one word; whereas what is here is not so, since the fem. of ْسَكْرَانُ is with abbreviation, not ْسَكْرَانُ with prolongation (Sn).

§. 689. The ْن is substituted for [seven letters (A),] (1, 2) the ْل and ْي (M, SH, A), when [the ْل or ْي is] (a) a ف [699] (M), in which case its substitution is (IY, SH) of two kinds, (a) regular (IY), obligatory (SH), in [ ْتَعَلَّلَان] and its variations (IY),] such as اِتْعَلَّلَان threatened [below] (M, SH) and ْتَعَلَّلَان, ْتَعَلَّلَان, ْتَعَلَّلَان [492] اِتْعَلَّلَان , and ْتَعَلَّلَان [278]
and متَّرَنَ، where they convert the ت into ت، and incorporate it into the ت of إنفعَل. entered [below] (IY): and [such as (M)] divided into portions [below] (M, SH), from يِسَر [368], where they substitute a ت for the ت، as for the ت in إنفعَل and [above] (IY): (α) IH means every ت، or تَيُّن that is a ت of إنفعَل [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 ت، or تَيُّن (Aud, A), not substituted for a Haniza (Tsr)], when تَيُّن، is [necessarily (IA; A)] changed into ت، [according to the chastest dial. (A, Tsr),] in إنفعَل” (IM) and its derivs. (IA, A); and incorporated into the ت of إنفعَل 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 ت، on account of the proximity of their outlets [732], and incompatibility of their qualities (A, Tsr), since the soft letter is vocal, and the ت surd [734] (A); as, [in the case of the ت، (A)], أَصَلُ (IA, A), [492] (IA, Aud, A), مَتَّصِلْ (A)، مَتَّصِلْ (A، Iاتَصِلْ، يِتَصِلْ (IA, A), and اِرْتَصَلْ (IA, A)، ظَلْ (Aud), orig. [إِرْتَصَلْ (IA, A)، اِرْتَصَلْ (IA، A، Tsr)، مُرَتَّصِلْ (IA، A)، and
and [similarly] \( \text{إِتَّعَدَد} \) [above], from \( \text{إِتَّعَدَد} \) (A), orig. \( \text{إِتَّعَدَد} \); the \( \text{ت} \), being converted into \( \text{ت} \), and incorporated into the \( \text{ت} \) of \( \text{إِتَّعَال} \), because incorporation removes the heaviness (Tsr): and as, [in the case of the \( \text{إِتَّسَار} \) (A), interpreted by Frd as \text{playing at hazard with gaming-arrows}, which our Master confirms, accounting for its derivation from \( \text{يُسَر} \) by the statement that the heathen used to think that such playing would occasion \( \text{يُسَر} \) \( \text{ease, opulence} \) (Sn), [above] (Aud, A), \( \text{مُتَسَر} \), \( \text{إِتَّسَار} \), \( \text{يُسَر} \) [above] (Aud), orig. [above] (A, Tsr), \( \text{مُتَسَر} \), \( \text{إِتَّسَار} \), \( \text{يُسَر} \) (A, Tsr), \( \text{مُتَسَر} \), \( \text{إِتَّسَار} \), \( \text{يُسَر} \) (A), the \( \text{ى} \) being converted into \( \text{ت} \), and incorporated into the \( \text{ت} \) of \( \text{إِتَّعَال} \), from their anxiety for incorporation, because it makes two letters become like one (Tsr): the poet [\text{Tarafa Ibn Al'Abd alBakri} (MN)] says

\[
\text{فَأَنَّ الإِلَهَاءِ يَتَلَفِّجُونَ مَوَلَعَةً # تَضَابِيقَ عَنْهَا أَنَّ تُوْلِجُهَا أَلْبَرَ}.
\]

(IY, Aud), constructively: \( \text{تَضَابِيقَ عَنْهَا تُوْلِجُ آلْبَر} \), \text{And verily the rhymes, by which he means odes, enter places of entrance, from which the entrance of needles has been excluded} (MN), orig. \( \text{تَوْلِجَ} \), from \( \text{لَوْج} \) entrance.
(1341)

(MN, Tsr): and the [other (IY)] poet [Ala‘shā Maī-mūn Ibn Kais (MN, Tsr), satirizing (MN), intimidating (Tsr), ‘Alkama Ibn ‘Ulātha (MN, Tsr),] says

(1Y, Aud) And, if thou threaten me, I shall threaten thee with the like thereof: and I will add the lasting, biting (words) (MN), orig. أَرْتُقَدْنِي and تَوَتَّقَدْنِي (MN, Tsr): (γ) the reason why they change the ﬂ in that [formation] into ﭽ 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 ﺪ [rad. or converted from ﺖ, (Sn)] after Kasra [685], an ﻷ [converted from ﺖ, or ﺪ (Su)] after Fatha [684, 701], and a ﺪ [rad. or converted from ﺖ (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 ﭽ, 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 ﺖ [732]; [while they do not make the subst. a ﮟ (Sn),] in order that it may agree with, and therefore be incorporated into, the following letter, [vid. the ﭽ of ﺪ] [IY]: (δ) some GG
say that the substitution, [even] in the cat. of إِنْتَصَلَلٌ, [where the ﺔ is a ﻫ,] is only for ی, because the ی is not retained with the Kasra in إِنْتَصَلَلٌ and إِنْتَصَلَلٌ; while the aor. and act. and pass. parts. are made to accord with the inf. n. and pret. (A): but [the advocates of] the first [theory] may say that the doctrine that ی 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 ی is retained, but then changed into ﺔ (Sn): (ء) "soft [letter]" comprises the ی and ی, as above shown: but, as for the ﺔ [697], it is not included in that, because it is not a ﺔ [673]; nor [is it, when original (Sn)], an ﻫ or a ﺔ (A), which is not incompatible with its being an ﻫ or a ﺔ, when it is a subst., as in یاَلٓ and ﺐۚیَمٔ [684, 703, 719] (Sn): (اء) some people of AlHijaz leave this substitution, and pronounce the ﺔ of the word according to the vowels before it, saying ﺔ [685], aor. یاَنَثَرُ [701], act. part. مُوْنَثَرٓ; and یاَنَثَرُ, aor. مُوْنَثَرٓ [701], act. part. مُوْنَثَرٓ: and Jr transmits that some of the Arabs say إِنْتَصَلَلٓ and إِنْتَصَلَلٓ, 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): (ن) we have restricted the ی and ی by saying, as in the Tashil, "not substituted for a Hamza", to guard
against such as أَفْتَرَسْ , إِيمَانُ [661, 702], *inf. n.* أَرْتِمِسْ [699, 702] (Tsr) : (b) irregular (IY), anomalous (SH), in such as أَتْلَجَجٌ (M, SH), *orig.* أَوْلَجٌ because from لَجَجُ [above] (Jrb), as says the poet [Imra al-Kais (IY)]

ربَّ رَأَيْ مَنْ دَبَى ثَعَالٍ *مَنْتَلِمٍ كُفَايَةٍ فِي قَنَةٍ*

(M, R) *Many a marksman of the Banu Thu'ul, putting his two hands inside his lurking-places!* (MAR), lest the wild animals [see them, and] flee away (IY); and ضَرْبُهُ كَتَنِى أَنْتَكَهُ He smote him, so that he made him fall in a reclining posture (R), *orig.* أُوْلَا (MAR) : (α) numerous expressions [illustrative] of that [irregular substitution of ت for the when a ف] occur (IY) : and hence (R) they say (IY, A) تَنْجَا [408, 646, 671] (M, R, A) for تَنْجَاهُ (MAR), نُفَعَألُ from نَجَاهُ i.e., the location in front of everything, as فَلَانَ تَنْجَا زِيد Such an one is in front of Zaid, i.e., ُقُدَامَةً before him (IY); and تَرَاتُ [278, 307, 408, 671, 682] (M, A), as وَتَأْكُلُونَ تَنْجَا أَكَلًا لِمَا LXXXIX. 20. *And ye devour the inheritance with wholesale voracity,* orig. فَرَائِنَ تُفَعَآلُ تَرَاتُ (IY); and the like (A); and وَبَيْعُونَ (IY) from بَيْعُرُ gravity, staidness (IY, R), as says the poet [Al'Ajjaj (S, Jh)]

فَأَيْنَ يُكُنُّ أَمْسِى الْبَلَيْلِ تَنْيِفُرٌ

145a
Then, if I have become the cause of my gravity (IY), meaning ذَرَارٍ (S, Jh): and فُكَّان (M, R) incapacity and reliance upon another (Jh, KF), فُعَلَانُ from I committed, deputed, delegated, aor. اَكْلُ (IY): and تُكَّاْثَةُ staff to lean upon [682] (M), the ت being orig. اَم (Jh); and [307] (M, R), as رَجْلُ تُكَّاْثَةٌ for رَجْلُ تُكَّاْثَةٌ, i.e., a man incapable, committing his affair to another, whence ٌكِيلٌ commissioner, deputy, delegate, as though he were مَوْكُولُ الْيَبِيْنِ commissioned, deputed, delegated, the root in them being one (IY); and ذِكْمَةٌ [278, 646, 682] (M, R), a malady like cholera, from رَخْما or رَحْمٍ, which is pestilence (IY); and ذِكْمَةٌ suspicion (M, R), فُعَلَةٌ from ذِكْمَة I thought, the [first] ذِكْمَة of ذِكْمَة I thought, being a subst. for the ذِكْمَة, because it is from ذِكْمَة the fancy of the mind (IY): and ذِكْمَة (M, MAR), ذِكْمَة [331, 686] (M, R), and ذِكْمَة (IY, R), respectively فُعَلَةٌ فُعَلَةٌ, فُعَلَةٌ, فُعَلَةٌ I guarded, or was cautious (IY): and ذِكْمَةٌ ذِكْمَةٌ consecutively, uninterruptedly, or at intervals (M, R), ذِكْمَةٌ (IY) from مَوْأَةٍ (IY, R), i.e. ذِكْمَة making consecutive, uninterrupted; though Lh says "There is no مَوْأَةٍ but amongst it is an interval, as ذِكْمَة اَرْسَلْنَا رَسْلِنَا ذِكْمَةٍ XXIII. 46. Then We sent Our Apostles at intervals": it has two dial. varr.
[282], Tanwīn and omission thereof; and those who decline it is a diptote make its 1 denotative of femininization; while, according to those who decline it as a triptote, the 1 is co-ordinative (IY): and ُنْفَعَة تَوْرَآ (M, R), one of the Revealed Scriptures (IY), from ُنْفَعَة producing fire (R), orig. ُنْفَعَة (IY, R) from تَوْرَآ الرَّيْدُ The fire-stick produced fire [699] (IY), because [below] is extraordinary (R); and [similarly (R)] تَوْرَآ [693] (M, R), the covert of the wild animal, into which he ْيِلَجْ enters (IY), ُنْفَعَلُ (Jh, IY, Jrb on § 693), says S (Jh, Jrb), because you hardly ever find ُنْفَعَلْ as a n. [in the language (Jh)], whereas ُنْفَعَلٌ is frequent (Jh, Jrb), as says the Rajiz [Jarīr (Jh on ضَعَا )], describing a bull [taking cover (Jh)] among thorn-trees,

Making for himself a covert among trees of the kind called ضَمَّة تَوْرَآ: the Bdd say that تَوْرَآ is ُتْفَعَلْ [above], and تَوْرَآ [678]; but the correct [opinion] is the first, because ُنْفَعَلٌ is more frequent than ُتْفَعَلٌ among ns.: and, according to us, if the Arabs did not convert the [initial] ُنْفَعَلٌ [of تَوْرَآ] into تَوْرَآ تَوْرَآ, its conversion into Hamza would ensue, because of the combination of two s, as in أَوْصَلُ pl. of أَوْصَلَة [683, 699, 730. A]; but, according to the Bdd,
that [conclusion] does not follow, because the ت, according to them, is an aug. [678], not a subst. [for a rad., serving as the ف, so that there is no initial د to be converted] (IY): and تَوَّاَم [253, 255] (R), the measure of (T) which is [construed, says Khl, to be (Jh),] تَوَّاَم (Jh, T); its o. f. being تَوَّاَم, like تَوَّاَم [above] from entered (Jh); while its derivation is from تَوَّاَم agreement, as though the child دَمْ نَيَّ إلاَّ ثْيَان غَيْرَة agreed with another in coming, i. e., تَوَّاَم (T); and تَوَّاَم (M) old property, vid. what was born in thy possession, contrary of طَارِف newly-acquired; and تَلْبِيذ, 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 دَمْ نَيَّ birth (IY): (b) a ل (M), in (a) أَخْت [277] (M, R), orig. أَخْت [234, 307]; but transferred from تَفْعَل to تَفْعَل, like تَفْعَل [646] (IY): and [similarly (IY)] دَمْ نَيَّ [277] (M, R), دَمْ نَيَّ being orig. دَمْ نَيَّ [234, 307, 667], on the measure of دَمْ نَيَّ pen; and then transferred to دَمْ نَيَّ, like دَمْ نَيَّ [646] (IY): (α) this final د in دَمْ نَيَّ, and in أَخْت also, is a rad. ت [below], existing in continuity and pause [646] (D): [for] the د is substituted for their لس (IY); and is not [really (D)] the sign of femininization [268, 277, 295] (D, IY), as is proved by the quiescence of the preceding letter (IY),
because the letter before the ١ of feminization is [only (IY)] pronounced with Fath (D, IY), like the ١ in فاطمة and the ر in شَكْرَة [254] (D), the ١ being equivalent to a n. joined on to [266], and compounded with, a n.; so that the letter before it is pronounced with Fath, like the Fath of the letter before the second n. of حضرموت [215] (IY); unless it be an ١, like the ١ in ١٤٠ and ١٤١ُث١ُب١ت [254] and ١٤٢ُث [683]: and, since the letter before the ١ in ١٤٠١٤١ُث١ُب١ت and ١٤١ُث١٤٠ُث is quiescent, and is not an ١, this proves that the ١ in them is rad. (D): (8) it is objected against ١'s saying "is a rad. ١" [above] that the ١ 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 ١ of the word; or [that it is] quasi-rad., because it is for co-ordination with such as ١٥١٢٥١ع [١٦٥١ع] (CD): (γ) the sign of feminization in ١٤٠١٤١ُث١ُب١ت and ١٤١ُث١٤٠ُث is their formation in these two shapes, and their transfer from their first formation [307]; and, for that reason, the shape and the ١ of feminization are interchangeable in ١٤٠١٤١ُث١ُب١ت [667], where the shape of ١٤٠١٤٠ُث١ُب١ت corresponds to the ١ of feminization in ١٤٠١٤٠ُث (IY): (8) the dial. var. more often used is ١٤٠١٤٠ُث١ُب١ت, with which the Kur speaks in
12. And Mary, the daughter of 'Imrān, and in Shu‘aib’s address to Moses

And 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 Bāhila also—after a period, or time, when we were entering upon the state of pilgrimage, on the evening of the tenth of the first ten (days of Dhu-l-Ḥijja): and I spoke to her two (words, one) of 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 hsd the بَنَتْ in the بَنَتْ and the like to be the sign of feminization, for which reason, says he, it is elided in the perf. pl. بَنَاتُ [234, 307]; while the quiescence of the preceding letter is because the بَنَتْ is meant to be co-ordinative (IY): (b) [263, 277, 307]
I believe Ibn Nizār to have shunned me, and loathed me, on account of things whose course was uninterrupted [690]; and is meant for co-ordination with فَعَلْ بْنُ كَرْمُه, like Bakr and 'Amr (IY): (c) كُلِّتَا [263, 277] (M), which S [307] holds to be فَعَلَى, like ذَكْرَى [272], orig. كُلَّئِيْل, the ِو being changed into ت [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 كُلُؤَ (IY): (d) أَسْتَنْوَا (M, R), i. e., They experienced drought (IY), from [the crude-form of (IY)] سِنَةَ [234, 244, 260, 265, 275, 306] (IY, R), according to those who hold its ل to be اَم, because of the sayings ء سِنَةَ سِنَوْا, a hard year and إِسْتَنَجَّرْتُهُ مُسَانَة, I hired him by the year: the ِت is said to be a subst. for (α) the ِو, which is a ل: (β) a ُي, because the ِو, when it occurs fourth, is converted into ٰى, as in أَفْرَطْتُ [685, 727]; and then the ِت is substituted for the ُي, which [opinion] is more agreeable with analogy (IY): (c) كُنْتَانِ [263, 277, 313] (M, A), orig. كُنْيَانِ [spelt by YH with Fathas (Sn)], because it
is [فعل] from كُتَبْ الْوَاحِدَ I was a second to the one, [of the conj. of قُرِيُّ (Sn)], inf. n. كُتَبْ (A), i.e., I became with him a second: so in the Msb (Sn): (α) the ت in it is a subst. for the ي, as is proved by its being from كُتَبْ I doubled, or folded, or bent [313], because one of the two is doubled, or folded, or bent, upon the other: (β) its o. f. is كُتَبْ [above], as is proved by their making its pl. كُتَبْ [307], like ابناء كُتَبْ [307, 667] and أَخْلَاء [260, 307]; but they transfer it from كُتَبْ to فعل, as they do in كُتَبْ [above]: (γ) as for the ت in كُتَبْ [307, 313, 667], it is like that in ابناء كُتَبْ [above]: whereas كُتَبْ is like كُتَبْ [above] (IY): (f) كَيْبَدَ and ذِيَتَ [277] (M, A), orig. كِيَبَةٌ and ذِئَبَةٌ [227, 277], because they say كان مِّن أَلْمَارِ كَيْبَةٌ and ذِئَبَةٌ [227] (IY, A), transmitted from the Arabs by AU (IY), the ی of feminization being elided; and a ل substituted for the [last (A)] لث, which is the ل (IY, A), of the word (A), by way of co-ordination, as in كُتَبْ [above]: so that they say ذِيَتَ كِيْبَدَ and ذِيَتَ كَيْبَدَ; Kasr, as كَيْبَدَ and ذِيَتَ; and دَامِم, as كَيْبَدَ and ذِيَتَ: whereas كِيَبَةٌ and ذِئَبَةٌ have only one form, which is uninfl. upon فَاثِ: (β) if it be said
"Why do you not say that the \( \mathfrak{t} \) is a subst. for \( \mathfrak{r} \), the o. f. of \( \mathfrak{k} \) being \( \mathfrak{g} \) \( \text{كیوه} \), but the \( \mathfrak{r} \) being converted into \( \mathfrak{y} \) as in \( \mathfrak{m} \) and \( \mathfrak{m} \) [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 \( \text{هیوه} \) [4, 685, 698], whose \( \mathfrak{e} \) is a \( \mathfrak{y} \), and \( \mathfrak{l} \) \( \text{ئ} \) (IY): (7) [Jh, however, says in article [د that possibly] the o. f. of \( \mathfrak{d} \) is upon [the measure of] \( \text{فعل} \), quiescent in the \( \mathfrak{e} \); the \( \mathfrak{r} \) being elided, so that \( \mathfrak{g} \) \( \text{کی} \) 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 \( \mathfrak{r} \) being then put as a subst. for doubling: so that, if you elide the \( \mathfrak{t} \), and put the \( \mathfrak{r} \), you must restore the doubling; [and thus] you say \( \mathfrak{d} \) \( \text{كان} \) \( \mathfrak{دیت} \) or \( \mathfrak{دییه} \): (8) if you form the rel. n. of \( \mathfrak{d} \), you say \( \mathfrak{دییه} \) \( \text{بقوی} \), like \( \mathfrak{دییه} \) rel. n. of \( \mathfrak{بنت} \) [307] (Jh): (3) the \( \mathfrak{s} \), in (a) \( \text{شست} \) basin [below].

(M, SH, A), alone [below] (SH), orig. \( \text{طلس} \) (IY, Jrb), because [its dim. is \( \text{ضبيس} \), and (IY, Jrb)] its [broken (IY)] pl. is (IY, R, Jrb) \( \text{طلساس} \) (IY) [and] \( \text{طلسوس} \) (R, Jrb), not \( \text{طلسوت} \) [below] (R): (a) Fr says "Tayyi say \( \text{طلست} \), and others \( \text{طلس} \) : the former are those who say \( \text{قصش} \) [below]; and, according to them, the pl. is \( \text{طلسوت} \) [above] and \( \text{لمست وات} \) [below]" (Jk): (b) if it be said "Its pl. is \( \text{طلسوت} \) also: then why do you decide that the
is original, and the 'a subst., and not the converse?”, we say “Because it is established that the ' is a letter of substitution, whereas such is not established in respect of the س [682, 696. A]” (Jrb): (c) IH says “alone” [above], notwithstanding سَبْت [below], because the substitution in the latter is for incorporation [682] (R): (b) the num. (A) سَبْت [307, 316, 671, 682, 758] (M, R, A): (a) its o. f. is سَدْس (IY, A), because it is (IY) from [the crude-form of (R)] سَدْسَيَة making six (IY, R), since they say [in its dim. (Jh, IY)] سَدْسَيَة [282] (IY, A), and in the pl. سَدْسَيَات (Jh): but they convert the last س into ت, in order that it may approximate [in outlet] to the د [732] before it; while [they choose the ت because], together with that [proximity to the د], it is surd, like the س [734]: so that سَدْس becomes constructively سَدْسَيَة (IY); and then, [since the د and ت are combined, and they approximate in outlet (IY),] the د is changed into ت, [because of their agreement in surdity (IY),] and incorporated (IY, A) into the ت, so that they say سَبْت (IY): (c) the saying of the poet

يا قاتل الله ربي السَّعَالِيُّ # عمرو بن مسعود شرارة النّات
غَيْرٌ أَعْفَاءٌ وَلَا أَكْبَارٌ

(M, R), meaning and أَكْبَارِ (IY), O, or O (my
people) [59, 551], God fight against, meaning slay, the sons of she-devils, 'Amr Ibn Mas'ūd, the worst of men, incontinent and not sharp-witted! (Jsh), where he substitutes a for the س (IY, Jsh), because of their agreement in being surd [734], aug. [671] letters, adjacent in outlet [732]; for extension of the vocabulary (IY), in order that أَكْيَاسِ النَّاسِ (Jsh); which is extraordinary (R): (4) the ص, in لَصَتُتُ حَيَاةَ يِلَّهٍ [below] (M, SH, A) and لَصَتُتُ (IY), for لَصَتُتُ (IY, R, A) and لَصَتُتُ [682] (IY), the لص being a subst. for the ص, as is proved by their saying تَلَصَّصَ عَلَيْهِمُ He committed robbery upon them and هو تِنْ أَلْصُوصِيَّةٍ It is plain robbery (IY, Jrb), with Damm and Fath of the ج (Jrb), and أَرْضُ مُلَصَّةُ land infested by robbers (IY): (a) the pl. is لَصُوصُ [above], as لَصَتُتُ [682] [above], as

فَتَرَكْنَ نَفْهًا عَيْلًا أَبْناءَ عَا * وَبَنَى كَنَانةً كَالْلَصُّوصِ الْمُرْدِ (IY, R) Then they left Nahd—a clan of AlYaman—with its children destitute, and the Banū Kināna like insolent robbers (MAR); and those who say that make a dial. var. [682], because the ل is substituted for the ص [in its variations also]: (b) its derivation is from لَصَتُتُ, 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 Sahāh that [according to Fr (Jh)] لَصَّتْ, with Fath of the ج, is i. q. لَصَّت in the dial. of Tayyi, who say لَصَّت [above] for لَصَّت; and that the pl. is لَصُّوت: (d) it is mentioned in the CHd that لَصُّوت is said with all three vowels of the ج, Kasr being the chastest; and لَصَّت with Fath of the ج [682], pl. لَصُّوت, like بَيْت, بَيْت, pl. بَيْوت [242, 256] (Jrb): (5) the ج, in دَعَالِيْت (M, SH, A) and دَعَالِيْت (IY), for دَعَالِب (M, A) and دَعَالِب (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., دَعَالِب (R), the ج being a subst. for the ج (IY): (a) IJ says "They ought to be two dial. vars.; but", says he, "it is not improbable that the ج is substituted for the ج, since it is sometimes substituted for the ج [above], which is the partner of the ج in [having its outlet from] the lip [732]": this is his language; and the better [opinion] is that the ج [in دَعَالِت] is orig. ج, because دَعَالِب is more often used, i. q. دَعَالِب [below], which are bits of worn-out rags (R): (b) دَعَالِب
[and ذَلَالِبُ (A)] are [bits of rags, and of (IY)] worn-out clothes (M, A), as

منسِّحًا عَنْهُ ذَلَالِبُ الْهَرْقِ

With the bits of rags stripped off him [below] (IY): (c) the sing. is ذَلَالُوبُ (IY, R, A), like ٌغُصَفْرُ [253, 396] (Sn): (d) Jh mentions in the Sahāh that (Jrb) ذَلَالِبُ are bits of rags, as مَنْسِحًا عَنْهُ آلِحُ [above]: and [that (Jrb)] IAl says “And the ends of garments are called ذَلَالُوبُ , sing. ذَلَالُوبُ”; and cites by Jarīr

وَقَدْ أَكُونَ عَلَى الْحَاجَاتِ ذَا لَبْثٍ

وَأَحْزَيْتُ إِذَا أَنْقَمَ الذَّلَالُوبُ

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 Sahāh: (e) hence one knows that ذَالِلُوبُ ذَلَالِبُ [above] by conversion of its [sing.’s s] letter of prolongation into ى, as is the rule, like ذَتْرَطَطُسَ pl. of ذَتْرَطَطُس [253, 685] (Jrb): (f) the substitution in ذَالِلُوبُ and لَصْتُ [above] is weak (SH): (6) the ط, in فْسَطَاطُ [335] (R, A), because they say in the pl. فْسَطَاطُ [390], not فَسَاطِيطُ; (7) the د, in ذَرَبُوتُ a tractable she-camel, orig. ذَرَبُوتُ, i. e., broken in,
Because it is from بُنْبَ (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 ب 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),]

[The kind when there is not any one kind, and the feeders at the time (of the question) "Where is the feeder?" (AKBj], that he means بَطَنَةً with the s of silence; and afterwards changes it into بَنْبَ, 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 [عْنَبّ والجَنَّةَ [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) [أَرْقَتْ (M, Jrb)] I poured out [658, 679, 682] (M, SH) the water
(M, Jrb), i. e., 'أَرْتَنَةٌ' (IY, Jrb): (α) in [349, 382, 671, 679] the s is aug., a quasi-compensation for the departure of the vowel from the ع, as the س is aug. in

أَرْتَنَةٌ [671, 680, 682] (IY): (b) [76] (M, R, Jrb)] [658, 682] (M, SH), i. e., أَرْتَنَهَا (IY, R, Jrb), meaning I brought the beast back to the nightly resting-place (Jrb): (c) I put a woo to the cloth, or an ornamental border to the garment (M, R), i. e., أَرْتَنَهَا (IY, R), أَرْتَنَهَا from أَرْتَنَهَا (IY): (d) I wanted the thing [682], transmitted by Lh (M, R), i. e., أَرْتَنَهَا (IY, R), aor. أَرْتَنَهَا with Fath of the s, like أَرْتَنَهَا, aor. أَرْتَنَهَا [349] (R): (α) those [four exs.] are all transmitted by ISk (IY): (b) when rad. (IY), as in (a)

أَرْتَنَهَا [658, 682] (M, SH), for إِيَانَ (IY, Jrb), whence

أَرْتَنَهَا [60] (IY, R), thus cited by Akh; and the reading إِيَانَ دَعْبَدٌ وَهُمْ أَلْقَى نَسْتَعِينُ I. 4. [Part I, p. 39A] (IY): the s being a subst., because إِيَانَ is more frequent (R): (α, it is transmitted from Ktb that some say إِيَانَ, which is read in I. 4. (K, B),] with Fath of the Hamza; and then substitute the s for it, saying إِيَانَ (IY): (b) [521, 682] (M, SH), orig. إِيَانَ (IY, Jrb), whence إِيَانَ [521] (IY): (α) when the ل of inception is prefixed, they alter the Hamza into s, because the ل is not combined with إِيَانَ.
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 لَنْ قَدْ كَانَ كَذَا in § 682): (c) 

Now, by God (M, R), assuredly such a thing did indeed happen! (M), meaning أَمَّا رَبِّي (IY, R): (d) [then ] (M, Jrb) If thou do (M, SH), I will do (M, Jrb), meaning إِنْ (IY, Jrb), in [the dial. of (M, Jrb)] Tayyi (M, SH), who convert the Hamza of the cond. إِنْ ۤ١٦٠٧١٧٩٠ (SH): the poet says (R, Jrb)

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., ۤ١٦٠٧١٧٩٠ (M, SH), the Hamza in أَنَا أَلْدَى being interrog. (Jrb); while Ktb transmits عَزِيدُ مُنْطِلِقٍ Is Zaid departing? in interrogation: (f) كَبْيَا for the voc. [p.] ۤ١٦٠٧١٧٩٠ (R): (α) they [justly (IY)] change the Hamza into ۤ١٦٠٧١٧٩٠ (in these cases (Jrb), by way of alleviation (IY)), because the Hamza is a rigid, independent letter, and the ۤ١٦٠٧١٧٩٠ 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 ۤ١٦٠٧١٧٩٠
(IY): (b) the substitution of the š 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 imulatorz for āmzd, nor burlburim for Abrahzm, nor ıtrj ıtrj for a citron; but you follow what they say, and stop where they end (IY): (2) the ı, in (a) oun [648] (M, SH, A), where the š may be (IY, R, A), (a) as is said [here] (R), a subst. for the ı in pause [upon ın]; which is most likely (IY)], because [ ın with (IY)] the ı is more often used [in pause (R)] than [ ın with (IY)] the š (IY, R), which is rare (IY): (b) as we have mentioned in the chapter on Pause [and elsewhere], the š of silence, as in ın and ır [615, 644, 671, 679] (R), affixed (A) in pause (Sn), like the ı [161, 497, 647] (IY), to make the vowel [of the ın (IY, Sn) in ın (IY)] plain (IY, A); and not a subst. for the ı (IY, Sn): (b) 5558 for ın (M, SH, A): (a) the ı in 5558 is to make the vowel plain: and (IY) the [last (A)] š [in 5558 is a subst. for the ı (IY, A) in 5558 [615, 648] (A); or may be [affixed, like the ı , ] to make the vowel plain, as is allowable in ın [above] (Sn): (c) ın in interrogation
(SH), and ١٦۶٩٨ (Jsh), as in (R) the poet's saying ﷺ ﷼ ﷺ ﷼ [١٧٥، ١٨١، ٦٤٦] (M, R, A), where he substitutes ﷺ in ﷺ for the (A), meaning ﷺ (IY): while ﷺ in ﷺ may be an instance of that [substitution of ﷺ for (Sn)], i. e., ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ ﷺ Then what (shall I do)? [below], or ﷺ ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ ﷺ Then what (is the good of my waiting for them)?; or may be i. q. ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ [١٨٧], i. e.; They have come to water from every side, and have become numer- ouse: then, if I quench not their thirst, do not thou blame me, but hold off from me (A): (a) ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ admits of two alternatives:—(α) that he means ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ Then what?; but that, pause upon the ( being disliked, on account of its faintness, he substitutes the ﷺ for it, because of their proximity in outlet [٧٣٢]; what is meant being ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ [above], or the like [١٨١]: (β) that ا٠٣ ١٣٣ is a chiding, i. e., Then hold! (O man), as though he addressed, and chid, himself (IY): (b) [on the supposition that ا٠٣ ١٣٣ here means ا٠٣ ١٣٣ ] the better [opinion] is that the ﷺ is a subst. for the ( : but it may be said that the ( is elided from the interrog. ا٠٣ ١٣٣ not governed in the gen., as it is elided from the one governed in the gen., as in ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ [١٨١، ٦١٥، ٦٤٨]; and that the ا٠٣ is then strengthened with the ﷺ of silence, as [the ا٠٣ and ﷺ ا٠٣ ا٠٣ are] in ﷺ رة and ﷺ ا٠٣ [above] (R): (d) ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ (SH), [as] ﷺ ا٠٣ ١٣٣ [Part I,
p. 15A], where the s is substituted for the | converted from the , [appearing] in َعَفَّاوْا [234] (M), according to one opinion (SH): (α) there is a dispute about its [last (IY)] s (IY, R):—(α) according to the BB (W, R), the s [in َعَفَّاوْا (W)] is a subst. for the , [below] (W, IY, R), which is the J of the word (IY), in [ ] َعَفَّاوْا and (W, IY)] َعَفَّاوْا [16, 234] (W, IY, R), [as] in َعَفَّاوْا شَأْناً [689] (IY); its o. f., [according to them (R),] being َفَاوْا (IY, R), َفَااَالَ from ُفََذْ [14]; but the , being then changed into s (IY); so that the s, being a subst. for the J of the word, may, for that reason, be pronounced with Damm [48]: while AZ says on ُمُرْحَبَة that the poet assimilates [the s in] it to the letter of inflection, [i.e., the final of the n.,] and therefore pronounces it with Damm (W): (β) it is indicated by Z [and IH] that the , being final after an aug. |, is converted into | [below], the s being a subst. for that | (IY): (γ) according to AZ, Akh, and the KK, it is the s of silence [615, 616] (R): [for] AZ holds that the s is affixed after the |, for pause, on account of the faintness of the |, as it is affixed in lamentation, as in ْزَا َرَيْداَة [55, 615]; and that it is mobilized by assimilation to the rad. s, [as he says on ُمُرْحَبَة above]: and this saying is transmitted from Akh also: while, according to them, the | [not the s ] is a subst. for the , which is the J of the
word; but this is an unsound saying, inasmuch as the s of silence is affixed only in pause, and, when you pass to continuity, you elide it decidedly; and [because] it is found only quiescent, not mobile, for which reason the saying of Al-Mutanabbi

\[\text{[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): (δ) some hold that the s [in عَنْتَاع (IY)] is original, [not a subst., but only the l of the word, as in عَصْفَة calumniated and شَفَة consumed (IY),] which is [a (IY)] weak [saying (IY)], because the cat. of سَلَسَ and تَلَقَ is rare [674, 685, 690] (IY, R): (b) the substitution of the s for the l is anomalous (SH): (3) the $\aleph$ [671], in رَقَدُ رَأْيى آلِع [above]: (a) that is disputed, the majority holding that the s is substituted for the $\aleph$ [above], the o. f. being يَا عُنْاَر: while IJ says "If the s were said to be a subst. for the l converted from the $\aleph$ occurring after the [aug.] l, it would be a strong saying, since the s is nearer [in outlet] to the l than to the $\aleph$ [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 ُكَسَأَّة [683] and ُغَطَأَة covering (Sn): (4) the ی (M, SH, A), in (a) ُهُذِة [648, 671] (IY, SH, A), with quiescence of the [long] َس (Sn), for ُهُذَی [174] (IY, A), [as] in ُهُذِة أَمَّةَ أَللَّهِ [648] (M): (a) the َس or ُهُذَی is a subst. for the ی in pause, according to the Banū Tamīm (R), who say ُهُذِة with quiescence of the َس, which is substituted because, in pause after the Kasra, the ی is faint, the َس being more apparent than it; while the َس is approximate [in outlet] to the sister of the ی [697], i.e., the اء [732]: but these [Arabs], when they continue, restore the ی, saying ُهُذَی ُجَنُد This is Hind, because the ی is made plain by what follows it: (b) Kais and the people of AlḤijāz make pause and continuity alike, [saying ُهُذِة] with the َس, as Tayyi make pause and continuity alike in ُذِنِعَی [686] (R on Pause): (c) this [substitution] is not regular in every ی, [as conversion into ی is regular, according to Tayyi, from every اء (R on Pause)]; so that ُذِئة is not said for ُذِئت [176] (R): (d) this ی 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 ُغَلَامِهِ يِهِ and ُغَلَامِهِ ُبِهِ [161, 648], and be therefore conjoined [with ی]: (e) the [conj.] ی is elided in pause: (f) ُهُذِة with quiescence is allowable in continuity and pause, but is rare
[in the former] (R on Pause): [for] some of the Arabs make this ș quiescent, like the și, in continuity and pause: while some assimilate it to the ș of the pron., because it is attached to a vague indecl. n.; so that they pronounce it with Kasr in continuity, saying ُهنَّت ُهنَّت

This is Hind [and ُهنَّت أَمَةَ اللَّهِ (IY on §. 648)], as you say and نَظَرَتُ إِلَى غَلَامِيُّو [648]; and terminate it by a și, [as ُهنَّت أَمَةَ اللَّهِ (648),] to make the Kasra of the ș plain; but [even] those who say this pause upon the ș quiescent: (g) one proof that the ș is [affixed] to make the vowel plain, and that the ș is not for feminization [648], is that, if you named a man ُدِّي ُدِّي, you would inflect, and pronounce with Tanwîn, as ُهَا ُدِّي ُدِّي This is Dhih, رَأَيْتُ دَخَّا I saw Dhih, and مَرَتُ بِذِٰهِ I passed by Dhih, eliding the și, because rendered unnecessary by the vowels and triptote declension; whereas, if the ș were for feminization, you would not decline it as a triptote, as you do not decline حَمْرَةٌ طَلَّكُهَا [18] as triptotes (IY): (b) ُعينَيَّةٌ سَنَّيَةٌ for ُعينَيَّةٌ [277] (A), which is the trifling thing (Sn): (5) the ș (M, SH, A), in (a) the cat. of ُحَمْرَةٌ [682] (SH), i. e., the n. containing the ș of feminization [646] (MASH), [e. g.] in [such as (IY, A)] ُطَلَّكُهَا (M, A) and حَمْرَةٌ (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) how to read [646], transmitted by Ktb from Tayyi (M, A), which are anomalous: (c) the measure of [readings] (A): (a) [many hold that] [with the s (Jh, K, IY)] is [a dial. var. (IY),] the dial. of the Anṣār (Jh, K, IY, KF); and the dial. of Kuraish: KIM says that [the dials. of (Jh)] the Anṣār and Kuraish do not differ about anything in the Kur except [Jh, IY]: (b) 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 [above] are rare; and because [formations] as [crude-form] may not be abandoned
it is like devil (IY), which is from exceeded in wickedness (KF); formed by transposition, because it is from (Jh); [orig.] devil (IY), which is exceeded in wickedness (KF), its  and  being transposed (B): (d) its o. f. is , the [first] of which they convert into [684] (IY): (e) as for those who read [ ] with the  (K, B), it is , according to them, except among those who make its  a subst. for the (K); [and] perhaps they [may all] substitute the  for the (B), because these two letters participate in surdity and augmentativeness, for which reason the  is substituted for the  of femininization [above] (K, B): (d) said by some, who pause upon AlLût with the  (IY): (e) which some one was heard to say, meaning: the in (a) made the thing remote, i. q. , i. e., which is said in the Msb to mean (Su): (c) praised him, i. q.: (a) some distinguish between  with the and  with the , holding to be [praise] in absence, and to be [praise] to one's face; but the correct [opinion] is that they are synonymous, except that 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 أصْيَلَانُ (A), which [substitution] is [very (S)] rare, as أصْيَلَانُ (S, SH), which is [orig. (R) only (S)] (S, R), whence

\[\text{وَتَفْتُ فِيهَا أَصْيَلَانَ أُسَأَلُّهَا} \text{سِيَّاَتُ جَوَابًا وَمَا بِالرَّبِيعِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ} \]

[682] (M), by An Nábigha adh Dhubyānī (IY, MN), praising AnNuʿmān 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 أصْيَلَانَا (ABk), meaning أصْيَلَانَا (IY), an irregular dim. of أصِيلٍ [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 "I will come to thee for a short time at evening" : and he said "It is only أصْيَلَانَ, for [the ن of] which they substitute the J; and that is verified by the saying of the Arabs أَنْتِيْكَ أُصْيَلَانَّا (S): (b) [R says that ] أصْيَلَانُ is dim. of أصلان: and [that], if أصلان be pl. of أصْيَلٍ, like رُجْفَانُ pl. of أصْيَلٍ [246], which is apparently the case, then أصْيَلَانلُ 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 أصلان be a sing., like رُمَانٍ
and °أَصْيَلَلَّةٌ oblation, notwithstanding that it is not used, then °أَصْيَلَلَّةٌ is anomalous in one respect, vid. the conversion of the ُن into ُل (R): (c) [according to ABk,] whoever fancies that °أَصْيَلَلَّةٌ is dim. of °أَصْدَّقٌ,] the pl. of °أَصْيَلَلَّةٌ, makes a mistake, because it is a pl. of multitude, which does not form a dim. [285] (ABk); and [IY holds that] °أَصْيَلَلَّةٌ is only a sing. n., peculiar to the dim., like °عُشْيْشْةٌ (KF) and ُأَبِنْرَنُ [234, 286] 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 °أَصْيَلَلَّةٌ as a name, it would be declined as a diptote, because the ُن is quasi-retained, being indicated by the retention of the ُل in the dim., as in °سَكْبِرَانُ [274]; and similarly °حَرَّاَق [690], when you use it as a name, is diptote, because the Hamza is virtually retained (R): (2) the ض (M, SH, A) in °إِضْطِجَعُ (A), as °إِضْطِجَعُ, which is corrupt (SH), whence

ماَلَ إِلَى أَرْطَاطَةٍ حَقِّفٍ نَالَطَجَعُ

[647, 682] (M, R), meaning °إِضْطِجَعُ [692, 756], the ض in which is changed into ُل: (a) there is a version °فَاضْطِجَعُ (IY, MN), according to the o. f. (IY); and °فَاضْطِجَعُ (IY, MN), where a ُط is substituted for the ض,
and then incorporated into the ٛ, because of their connection in vocality and covering [734] (IY); and ٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛٛ(unittested text)
when the ج of the word is a ص or خ، and similarly after the ط and خ، as in خُفْسَتُ عَيْنَتَهُ I sealed its eye [above] (R), and خُفْسَتُ وَرْجَلِي I scraped a hollow with my foot [693] (M, R), and خَفْسَتُ أَحْطَ and خَفْسَتُ [above] (R): (b) if the ج of the v. be a ط، it is incorporated [into the ل 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 ل 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 unil., [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 ل of اقتِمَلَ [above] (R): (2) the د: Ya'qūb transmits from آس مَّثُ أَلْكَرَفْ He prolonged the letter, for مَّدْهِ إِبْعَاطُ, removing to a distance for إِبْعَأَنَّ (A).

§. 693. The د is substituted for [three letters (A),] 
(1) the ل (M, SH, A), (a) in اقتِمَلَ after the د، the ل، the ز، 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 IA\textsubscript{1} 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 is converted into د (IY, R), as إرْدَان and إرْدَان (IY): and the د and ن [above], orig. and إرْدَان (IY): and the د and د are incorporated into it, as incurred a debt and [above]; but it is allowable for the د not to be incorporated, as [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 [732], 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 إرْدَك or إرْدَك [671, 682], and 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 اَجْتَدَّا [below] (M, SH), in some dials. (M): (α) conversion of the of اَبْتَعَال into اَعْتَاَل after the ج is anomalous, because, though the ج is vocal, and the ت surd [734], still the ج is nearer than the ز and د to the ت, since the articulation of the ت is easy after the ج, and difficult after the ز and د (R): (β) they say اَجْتَدَّا اَجْتَدَّا for اَجْتَدَّا اَجْتَدَّا [above] (IY): the poet [Muḍarris Ibn Rib'i alAsadi (MN, Jsh), according to IBr (MN)] says

فَقُلْتُ لِصَاحِبِي لَا تَخْبِسَانَا اِنْبُرْ أَصْوَالِنَا اَجْتَدَّا شَيْکَا (M, R) Then I said to my companion "Do not thou detain us from roasting the flesh with pulling out [the tree by (MN)] its roots, but cut some wormwood," a well-known plant (MN, Jsh), where تَخْبِسَانَا is in the shape of the du. by poetic license, the sing. being meant by it (Jsh); for [Jh says that (MN)] sometimes the Arabs address the sing. with the form of the du., as says the [other (Jh)] poet [Suwaid Ibn Kurā' al'Ukhl (MN, Is), addressing 'Uthmān Ibn 'Affān (Is).]

فَأَنْ تَزَجْرَإْنِي يَا أَبِنَ عَفَانَ أَرْدَحْ وَإِنَّ تَدْعَانِي أَحْمِي عَرْضًا مُضَنِعًا
Then, if thou chide me, O Ibn `Affân, 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 ḍhâ ṣe is not said [for venturing (IY, MAR)], nor ḍhâ ṣe (IY, R) for earned (IY, MAR): (b) anomalously (SH), in (a) [such as (SH)] (α) I succeeded, prospered (M, SH), like ʿaṣṣ ʿaṣṣ [692] (R), the o. f. being from ʿaṣṣ ʿaṣṣ [331], where they substitute a ʿ for the t because of the influence of the ʿ (IY); (β) ḍhâ ṣe I was liberal for ḍhâ , where its conversion after the ʿ is likewise anomalous (R): (b) ḍhâ ṣe (M, SH), for ḍhâ [689] (IY, Jrb), from ḍhâ ṣe (R, Jrb), the [first] , being converted into ṣ, and the ṣ then converted into d (R), as though, seeing the ṣ to be surd, and the ṣ vocal [734], they substituted the d for the ṣ , because it is the sister of the ṣ in outlet [732], and of the ṣ in vocality; so that homogeneity of sound is attained (IY): (α) that [theory] is [advanced] because ḍhâ ṣe is more used than ḍhâ ṣe (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 ʿ into ṣ in ḍhâ ṣe and ḍhâ ṣe [above] is from affinity of sound, as in ṣāʾe [695] (R) for ṣāʾe meal,
gruel (MAR); contrary to دُوَلْجَة (R): (2) the ط: they say for مَرْطَعٍ مَوَدَّى [248, 272], which is where the hair is plucked out round the navel (A); but, in the KF, a kind of running: while مَرْطَعٌ 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 مِرْطَعُان with Kasr; and the arm-pit: and مُرْطَعَى, with abbreviation, is the uvula (Sn): (3) the ذُكْرُ in ذَكْرَ pl. of ذَكْرَ remembrance (A), like عَبَرْ pl. of عَبْرَ admonition, as SBd says: (a) the author of the KF transmits from Lth that the ذُكْرُ is changed into ذَكْرُ for ذَكْرِ when synarthrous; but that, when anarthrous, ذَكْرُ with the ذُ is said (Sn).

§. 694. The ج is substituted for the ى (S, M, SH, A), as before mentioned [643, 682] (A), when (1) double, (a) in pause (S, M, SH), as فُقَيْبَيْج [643] (SH), for فُقَيْبَيْج [311], a rel. n. (MASH): (a) the ج is substituted for the ى 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 ى [643] (IY); while the ى, when doubled, becomes [extremely near to (R)] a ج (IY, R): Ya'kūb says "Some of the Arabs,
when they double the ى, make it become a ج, as كَٰنَََّ ىَٰلٰٓى [below], meaning 682" (IY); while both are from the middle of the tongue 732 (R, Jrb): but the ج is plainer [below] in pause, where plainness is desirable since the letter paused upon becomes faint, for which reason حَبْلُ ى حَبْلٍ with the ى and حَبْلُ ى حَبْلٍ with the ج are said 643, 685, 686 (R): (b) this substitution is orig. [employed] in pause upon the ى, because of its faintness and resemblance to the vowel (IY), as عُنْفَى عِلْمُ عَلِيٌّ عَلِمُ عَلِيٌّ عَلِيٌّ عَلِيٌّ, meaning 'Ali and عَنْفَى عِلْمُ عَلِيٌّ عَلِيٌّ عَلِيٌّ عَلِيٌّ 'Auí (S): IA1 says "I said to a man of the Banû Hanzala 'Of whom art thou?', and he said فَقِيَّيمُ فَقِيَّيمُ, [i. e., 2 فَقِيَّيمُ ّ Fuqaimî (IY);] then I said 'Of which of them?', and he said مَرَّ مَرَّى مَرَّ مَرَّى Murriî (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 Rajiz (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 149 a
that it had been recited to him by KhA, who said that it had been recited to him by an inhabitant of the desert (IY). My maternal uncle is 'Uwaif and Abū '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 [الْبَرْزٍى] (S, IY, MN) and [الْبَرْزٍى] (S, MN) and (IY, MN), which is more anomalous (SH); and the saying [of Abu-nNajm (MAR)]

[above] (M, R), cited by IAr (Jh, M), As though in their, i. e., the camels' uplifted tails, from the dry dung and urine of summer, were the horns of the mountain-goat, (MAR), meaning [الْبَيْلِي] (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., حَكَّاجَيَّ and ٍبيٍّ and
(Jrb, MN, Jsh), which is [still] more anomalous (SH), because the ج is more akin to the double ی, as we have said (R): (a) some of Tamim substitute the ج for the ی in pause, whether the ی be double or single, because of the ج's proximity to the ی in outlet [732], together with its being plainer [above] than the ی (R on Pause): (b) that also is to make the ی plain in pause (R on Substitution): and (b) [not in pause (R),] as in

\[\text{مَّنَّى إِذَٰلَا كَأَمَسَّتْ أَمٍّسِكَتْ رَأَيْسَكَا}

(M, SH) Until, whenever she entered, and he entered, upon the time of evening (Jsh), i. e., أَمْسَى أُمَسَّت and أَمْسَى أُمَسَت (R), orig. أَمْسَى (IY, Jrb, Jsh) and [أَمْسَى; which, with the letter of unbinding, becomes] أَمْسِيّا (Jrb, Jsh): (a) since the ی is converted into ج, it is not converted into ‚ [684, 719], nor elided because of the two quiescents [607, 663], like the ی in أَمْسَى and أَمَسَّت respectively (R); [or] the ‚ [of أَمْسَى] is restored to its o. f., vid. the ی, which is afterwards converted into ج (Jsh): (b) [in either case] the ج is a subst. for the ی (IY, Jrb), and is then mobilized with the vowel that the ی 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 ی plain, whereas the ی in the like of أَمْسَكَتْ أَمَسَّكَتْ [and أَمَسَّكَتْ] is not paused upon (R); [and] because they treat the supplied
The OBJECT [in 1378 and OBJECT 1378] like the expressed (Jrb). The 1378 is sometimes said to be a subst. for the 1 of OBJECT 1378; for, although the 1378 is not [ordinarily] substituted for the 1, that is permissible [here (IY)], because the 1 is sub-
stituted for the 1378 [684, 719] (IY, Jrb). This [substitu-
tion of 1378 for 1378 (Sn)] is named the  OBJECT of Kudā'a
(A), who transmute 1378 into 1378 [when it occurs] with
[immediately before it], saying  This is a herdsman that has come out with me, i. e., 1378 1378 1378 (Jh).

§. 695. The  OBJECT is [allowably (M, SH)] substituted for the 1378 (M, SH, A) before (1) a 1378 (M, SH, Sn), as
and 1378 saying XXXI. 19. And hath fully bestowed His benefits upon you (M, SH), orig. 1378 (Jrb), read
with the 1378 and 1378 (K); and 1378 (M), for 1378 (K) shedding the tooth that is behind the 1378, which takes
place in the sixth year (Jh): (2) a 1378 (M, SH, Sn), as
stripped off (M, SH), for 1378 (K, Jrb); and 1378 subjected (M), 1378 being i. q. 1378 (KF): (3) a 1378
(M, SH, Sn), as 1378 LIV. 48. The touch, or feel,
of Hell (M, SH), for 1378 (K on XXXI. 19., Jrb), a
proper name of Hell [18], from 1378 The fire scorched him or 1378, i. q. 1378 (K on LIV. 48., B);
VIII. 6. and I drove; I outstripped; [below] (M): (4) a ط (M, SH, Sn), as سراط [682] (M, SH, A), orig. سراط (Jrb); صاطع radiating; and مسيطر (M), for مُسيِّطِر, from exercised absolute authority over us, whence LXXXVIII. 22. [1] (Jh), transmitted from Ks with the س, according to the o. f. (B): (a) it is said to be pronounced [مسيطر] with Fath of the ط in the dial. of Tamīm, on the ground that سیطر set in absolute authority is trans., according to them, as is indicated by their saying تسيطر 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 صخب for hunger, صخب سعَبة for clamour, صخب سیقل for صرَاط, and صیقل for سراط [253] 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 نَصْتَ for I mea-
sured (IY, R, Jrb), nor يَخْصُرْ for He loses the commodity (IY), nor بُخْصُ for deficient, inade-
quate. 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 صَقْرُ [above]; or separated [from it] by one letter, as in صَلْحُ [above]; or two, as in صَلْقُ [for سَلْقُ level plain (MAR)] and صَرَأَطُ [above]; or three, as in مَسْلَئِيْقُ (R) for مَسْلَئِيْقُ pl. of eloquent (MAR). This conversion is regular, but not necessary. And, in such [positions], the س may not be converted into a pure ذ, except in what has been heard, as راط [682], which is [allowable] because the ذ resembles the
But the س is changed into ژ with the ق exclusively in the dial. of Kalb [696], who say مَسَّ رُقَر LIV. 48. [above] (M).

§. 696. The [pure (M on §§. 695, 696)] ژ is substituted for [two letters (A),] the س and ص, [allowably (Jrb on the س, M on the ص), in the dial. of chaste speakers among the Arabs (M on the ص),] when [these two letters occur (M, SH)] quiescent before a د, as in (1) (M, SH, A), for [ یَسْدَل] (M, Jrb, A) loosens (IY, Sn) his garment (IY); and یَسْدَل for [ یَسْدَل (A)] (M, A) The camel (A) becomes dazed (IY, A) from the intensity of the heat (A): (a) سَدَل, with the ژ is of the conjugs. of ضَرَب and نَصَر, and سَدَل with the ذ is of the conjug. of فَرَح: so in the KF (Sn): (b) the cause of this [substitution] is that (IY, Jrb), the س being a surd, and the د a vocal [734], letter, they dislike the transition from one letter to another incompatible with it (IY, R, Jrb); and especially when the first is quiescent, because the vowel is after the letter [below], being part of a soft letter intervening between the two letters [697] (R); while incorporation is not possible (IY): and therefore they approximate (IY, R, Jrb) one of them to the other (IY, Jrb), [vid.] the س to the د (R), by substituting ژ for the س, because the ژ is from the same outlet as the س [732] and is like it in sibilance,
while it agrees with the  in vocality; so that the two sounds become consonant (IY, R, Jrb): (c) S says that simulation, i.e. (M), imbuing [the  (IY, R)] with the sound of the , is not allowable (M, R) here (R), as it is in the ص (IY, R), as 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  is not like that (IY, R): (2) speaks truth; [with a ق (Sn)] for course (A); لَمْ يُحْرَمَ تَصَنُّعُ (الرَّفَد) مَنْ فَرِدَ لَهُ (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 the صّ, the ص being made quiescent (IY, A), for alleviation, as in for was struck, and for accepted [368, 402] (IY), and [afterwards (IY)] changed into (IY, A); the saying of Hātim [below] (M, R) at Tā'ī (R) Thus is etc. [648] (M, SH); and for , and for I issued [trans.] (IY): the poet says

ٍرَدْعَ ذَا الْأَلْهَوِيَ تَبَلَّ الْقِلْلِيَ تَرُكُ دِيّ الْهُرِيْ

مَتِينَ الْقُوَّةِ خَيْدٌ مِّنَ الصِّرَمِ مَرْدَأ
And let the object of thy love alone before hating (him): the leaving of the object of love, while unimpaired in its forces, is better as an issue, or a way out, than rupture (M). The ص, when occurring quiescent, before the د, may be pronounced [in three ways (IY, Jrb)], (1) as a pure ز [above] (IY, ر, Jrb), as in هُدَا فَرْزِي أَنْتَ [648], said by حاتم [above] when he had slaughtered a she-camel [for a guest (IY)], and it was said to him “Wherefore didst thou not bleed her?” (IY, Jrb): (a) that [change (IY, ر) 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 د, which is open, vocal, rigid (IY,۷۷۲ R, Jrb); so that, from this incompatibility between their sounds, the د 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 د, like the ت in إِفْتَعَلَلٍ, as in إِصْطَبَرُ [692], because it is not aug., like the ت [671] (IY, ر, 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 consequence of the quiescence, by approximating it to the د (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 ə in vocality (ΙY, R, Jrb), and openness [734] (R); so that the ѣ and ə coalesce (ΙY, Jrb), and that recoil ceases: ș says "We have heard the chaste-speaking Arabs make it a pure ѣ" (ΙY): (2) as a ș simulating, i.e., imbued with [somewhat of (ΙY, Jrb)], the sound of the ѣ (ΙY, R, Jrb); so that it becomes betwixt and between, i.e., becomes a letter whose outlet is between the outlets of the ș and ѣ (ΙY, Jrb); inclining towards the ѣ, but not changed into a [pure (R)] ѣ, [as in the preceding way (ΙY),] for preservation of the [excellence of (R)] covering (ΙY, R), in order that the sound of the ѣ may not be altogether gone, and so the covering in it be gone (ΙY, Jrb), the covering in the ș being an excellence, the removal of which would be a mutilation of this letter: whereas the ș in یُسکر ُیسُدُل [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 (ΙY), as we mentioned (R): (a) this is indicated by the saying of [Z and] IH (Jrb) "But the ѣ is sometimes simulated by the ș" (M, SH), meaning that the ș is made to simulate the ѣ, vid. through the ș's being inclined towards the ѣ (R); "not by it" [below] (SH), i.e., by the ș, which is not made to smack of the sound of the ѣ, but is converted into a pure ѣ (R), this simulation not being allowable in the ș, (a) because the ѣ and ș
are from one outlet, and both are sibilant letters; so that, with such closeness of proximity, intermixture [of sound] is difficult; contrary to the ص, which the covering makes it possible to imbue with the sound of the ِ; 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 ص made to smack of the ِ; but not س, with the س made to smack of the ِ: (b) the pron. in IH's saying "not by it" [above] relates to the س: but some commentators fancy that it relates to the ِ, the sense being that the ِ is simulated by the quiescent ص, but not the ص by the ِ; which is a mistake, the sense being what we have mentioned, as is proved by what IH mentions in the CM, and another [authority] in the CHd (Jrb): (c) if the ص [before the د (R)] be mobile, (α) it is not changed (M, R, Jrb) into a [pure (R)] ِ (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 ص plain], except simulation because of [the ص’s] vicinity [to the ج in outlet] (R); [and accordingly they sometimes make it simulate the ج (M), [so that] the ج 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 ص (IY, Jrb), and therefore does not act like incorporation (IY), as مُدَّر issued, emanated, مُدَّق spoke truth (M, SH), where that simulation is regular, constant, [because nothing but the vowel of the ص intervenes between the ص and د ] (IY): (α) [such] intermixture [of sound] is rarer in the mobile than in the quiescent [ص], 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 ج is not allowable, except in what has been heard from the Arabs (IY): (γ) if the ص and د 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 *مَصَادِر*; and [similarly] *صَرَاط* [733] (M, R), because the *د* is like the *د* (IY, R): (d) such as مَسْنُ رَتَّم. LIV. 48. [695] is Kalbr (SH), which means that, if the *س* be mobile, it is not changed into *ز* except in the *dial.* of Kalb (Jrb); [for] the clan of Kalb convert the *س* occurring before the *ق* 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 *ز*, 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 *ش* and *ج*, as

He is more worthy and أَشْدَقُ أَجَدَر

*wide in the corner of the mouth* (M), for أَشْدَقُ أَجَدَر (IY): (a) the *ش* [quiescent before the *د* (R)] is made to simulate the *ز* (IY, R), because, though the *ش* is not from the same outlet as the *ز*, still [the outlet of] the *ز* 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 *ز* [732]; while in surdity and laxity it is likely the *ص* [734]; so that the *ز* may be simulated by it, as by the *ص*, because it is from a position near the *ز*; and similarly the *ج*, which they approximate to the *ز*, because it is from the same outlet as the *ش* [732] (IY):
with simulation [of the sound of the \( \ddash \) by the \( \mathcal{J} \) and \( \mathcal{S} \) occurring before the \( \mathcal{D} (\mathcal{R}) \)] are rare (SH) : but this is contrary to what is stated by S, who says, about imbuing the like of this \( \mathcal{S} \) with the sound of the \( \mathcal{D} \), 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 \( \mathcal{S} \) by the \( \mathcal{J} \), and of the \( \mathcal{J} \) by the \( \mathcal{S} \), there being no real difference between them, since the pronunciation [of the \( \mathcal{J} \) and \( \mathcal{S} \)] in [733], when simulation is employed in them, is one (Jrb) : (d) the \( \mathcal{S} \) and \( \mathcal{J} \) may not be made a pure \( \mathcal{D} \), like the \( \mathfrak{C} \) and \( \mathfrak{S} \) above, because they are not from the outlet of the two latter, [which have the same outlet as the \( \mathcal{D} \)] (R) : (f) the sum of the matter is that this substitution and approximation are [found in letters] of three kinds, (a) a letter wherein substitution and simulation are allowable, vid. where two causes are combined, as in the \( \mathfrak{C} \), which they (\( \alpha \)) make to simulate the \( \mathcal{D} \), but do not change into [pure] \( \mathcal{D} \), in order to preserve the covering; (\( \beta \)) change into [pure] \( \mathcal{D} \), from the strength of the affinity between the \( \mathfrak{C} \) and \( \mathcal{D} \), the former being from the same outlet as the latter [732], and like it in sibilance [734] : (b) a letter wherein only substitution is allowable,
vid. the س, because there is no covering in it to be preserved [by simulation]: (c) a letter wherein only simulation is allowable, vid. the ش, which they do not change into ژ, because of the distance between it and the outlet of the ژ; and similarly the چ (IY): (3) as a pure ص, which is the 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 ص” (IY): “while sounding plain [below] is more frequent” (M, SH) “than both” (SH), i. e., than simulation and substitution (R, Jrb); or [in some MSS (MAR)] “in both”, i. e., in the quiescent س, and the quiescent or mobile ص, occurring before the د (R): (b) by “sounding plain” he means (R, Jrb) pronouncing the ص or س pure, without conversion or intermixture of sound (R), [i. e.] leaving it in its first state (Jrb): (c) in the quiescent ص before the د, sounding plain is most frequent, then simulation, and then conversion into ژ (R): (d) in the quiescent س also, sounding plain, as يِسْتَدْلُل, is more frequent than substitution, as يَردُل (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 I [684]: (3) the s [690]: (4) the e is substituted for two letters, (a) the ح, as ضَعُّ خَيْزٍ ضَعُّ for (A): (a) one says ضَعُّ خَيْزٍ ضَعُّ.

The horse snorted, like مَنْعَ اَلْفِرْسُ ضَعُّ, i. e., uttered a sound not a neigh, nor a whinny (Sn): (b) the Hamza, as عَنَزْ زِيدًا ضَعُّ [527, 580, 682], i. q. أَنِّي ضَعُّ, which is the ضَعُّ of Tamīm: (5) the خ is substituted for two letters, (a) the خَّ, as خَّضَرُ بِدْنِيَّ خَّ for (A): (a) one says خَّضَرُ بِدْنِيَّ خَّ.

He swung his arms up and down, aor. خَّضَرُ خَّضَرُ, i. q. خَّضَرُ, transmitted by IJ: (b) the خ, in خَلَفَ لَفْنَ (A), a dial. var. of لَفْنَ [537, 688] (Sn): AlFarazdak says خَلَفَ لَفْنَ.

[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 دُحُّ for دُحُّ [682], which is rare: (7) the خ is substituted for the خ, as دُحُّ دُحُّ [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 دُحُّ دُحُّ [682], transmitted by Khl: (9) the ع is substituted for two
letters, (a) the ق, as ق for ق [682]: (a) reciprocity therefore occurs between them; but substitution of the ل for the ق is more frequent than its converse: (b) the ت, in [129, 169, 682]: (10) the ج [694]: (11) the ش is substituted for three letters, (a) the ل denoting the fem., as I honored thee for، which is the كشکشة of Tamیm [617, 680, 682]: (b) the ج, in the saying

إذ ذَلَّلإذ حَبَّل المُوسَل المُدَمَّش

At that time, when the bond of union was strong, i. e., مدمش: (a) IU says “But no other [ex.] has been preserved; and that is facilitated by the agreement of the ج and ش in outlet” [732]: (c) the س، as جُعَشوش for جعشوش، which is despicable, mean; and forms its pl. جعسيس (Jh)] with س، not ش، by which the substitution is known [682]: (12) the ي [685]: (13) the ض is substituted for the ل، in رَجل جَفْض، i. e., جِلْد [682] (A): (a) some MSS have “the ص is substituted for two letters, the س in سرَءاط for سراط، and the ل in رَجل جَفْض i. e., جِلْد”; and, according to this version, A’s saying below “the ص is substituted for the س، as سرَءاط” [695] is a repetition: but other MSS have “the ض”, i. e., the dotted, “is substituted for the ل، etc.” [above]; and,
according to this version, there is no repetition: [and moreover the prescribed “order in outlets” necessitates the placing of the ٌ here, and the ِ below, because in order of outlets the ٌ is the 13th letter, and the ِ the 20th:] (b) the two versions are opposed in ٌ، ِّ جَعْلُ ِّ جَضَّدُ، which the first requires to be with the undotted ِّ, and the second with the dotted ِّ: therefore examine it carefully; for I have not found in the books on lexicology, after consulting [then], anything about the two expressions (Sn): but Sn’s saying “I have not found etc.” requires consideration, because the author of the KF writes [ٌ، ِّ جَلَدُ جَضَّدُ], where they change the ٌ into ِّ (KF), distinguishing] it with the red color indicating that it is one of his additions to the ساه: while his Glossator objects that it is found in the ساه, i. e., where Jh says, in the crude-form ِّ جَلَدُ، “And sometimes they say ٌ، ِّ جَعْلُ جَضَّدُ, making the ٌ with the َّ ِّ، 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 داد [by Frb (H.Kh)] the like of what is in the ساه: and God is the guide! (Note by Naṣr al-Hūrinī on the margin of the Sn): (14) the ِّ [691]: (15) the ِّ ٌ لَعْلَلٌ جَعْلُ جَضَّدُ [682], and ِّ لَعْلَلٌ ِّ ٌ ٌ ُّ ِّ ِّ ِّ ِّ ِّ ِّ ِّ ِّ [537]: (16) the ِّ [688]: (17) the ِّ [692]: (18) the ِّ [693]: (19) the ِّ [689]: (20) the ِّ [695]: (21) the ِّ
[696] (A): (22) the س [below] is substituted, [say they (R),] for [three letters (A),] (a) the ﺖ in ﺇْسَـْتَـڪَـد [671, 682, 759] (R, A), according to one of the two accounts [759] (A), its o. f. being ﻓَإِنَّـتَـڪَـد (R, A), from ﻓَإِنَّـتَـڪَـد [702] (R), i. q. ﻓَإِنَّـتَـڪَـد (MAR): (a) its o. f. is also said to be ﺇْسَـْتَـڪَـد [759]; but in that case it contains no proof [of substitution of the س]: (b) it is the like of ﺇْسَـْتَـڪَـد that Z lays hold of [as evidence that the س is a letter of substitution]; not ﺇْسَـْع , as IH says [682] (R): (b) the ش , in ﺮَـﺟُـل ﻧَـتركيز ﻧَـتركيز (R, A), and ﺍ(577,461),(597,500) for ﺍ(609,461),(629,500) [337], where the ش is original, because it is more often employed (R): (c) the ﻝ , in ﻟَـڪَـد , which [substitution of the س for the ﻝ (Sn)] is extremely anomalous: (23) the ط [below]: (a) I have not seen any instance of its [unincorporative] substitution: (24) the ﻤ is substituted for two letters, (a) the ﺱ , in the reading ﻧُـڪَـرَد ﻱِـﻬَـمٌ VIII. 59. [682]: (b) the ﺖ , in the reading ﻴْﻠَـعْـبَـم أُـرْـﺟُـل for meaning The man was slow, or backward, in answering [682] (A): (a) IH does not reckon the س [above] of such as ﺇْسَـْع , nor the ﺱ and ط [above] in ﺇْلَـم and ﺇْلَـم [682], among the letters of substitution, because the substitution in these things is not intended for itself; but, since the ﺱ , ﺱ , and ط are
approximate to the ٞ in outlet [732], they intend incorporation, which is not possible in two approximate letters until they are made alike [735]; so that the ٞ is converted into س، ذ، and ط respectively; and, since the substitution is for the sake of incorporation, he does not take it into account (R): (25) the ٞ is substituted for two letters, (a) the ف، in مغفور [676]; (b) the د، in جدتة مِن آلنانِ جَمْعًا a brand from the fire: (26) the ف is substituted for two letters, (a) the قَامُ، in الْمَدْعَةُ مِمْ عِمَّرَهُمْ زَيَّدْ فَمّ عمرو [540, 682], transmitted by Ya'qūb: (b) فَومُ، [which is wheat (K, B on II. 58)]; and is said for bread (B), whence نَّاقِوُمْ لَنَا Make bread for us (K, B), i. e., إِخْبِرُوا (K); and is said to be (K, B)] i. q. ُٞدُومُ garlic (A), which is indicated by the reading of [‘Abd Allāh (Jh)] Ibn Mas‘ūd رُمْهَا وَعَدْسِهَا وَبُصْلِهَا II. 58. And its garlic, and its lentils, and its onions, being more congruous with the "lentils" and "onions" (K): (b) the بُ، in خَدْهُ بَيْانَكَهُ Take it in its time, i. e., بَيْانَكَهُ [meaning في Mounted (Sn)]: (27) the ب is substituted for two letters, (a) the م، in بَا أَسْمَكَ [682], meaning مَا أَسْمَكَ: (b) the ف، in پُسْکِلُ meaning فُسْکِلُ (A), like تُنْفُدُ male hedge-hog and زُيرُ[392], the horse that
comes in last in the race; whence \textit{رَجُل فَسْكُل}, like \\textit{زنيرج}, \textit{a low man} (Sn), for which the vulgar say \\
\textit{فَسْكُل} with \textit{Damm} (Jh): (28) the \textit{م} \[687]\; (29) the \textit{,} \\
\[686]\; (A).
CHAPTER X.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNSOUND.

§. 697. Unsoundness is the liability of the affected [letter or formation] to alteration from its [original] state. The meaning of transformation is alteration [703] (IY). Transformation [in their conventional language (R)] is [peculiar to (R)] alteration of the unsound letter, [i. e., the l, , or ] , 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 [691], are excluded; and, when he says “for alleviation”, then such [a substitution] as [in] [683] for [682] 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 [684, 703]; while transformation without substitution is found in [below], and substitution’ without transformation in [above] (Jrb). Alteration of the Hamza by one
of the three [modes], as in Ṣaṣ [658], Ṣaṣ [693] for ١٥٥٣٨١, and ١٥٥٣٨١ 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 ﻋﺎد [690] and ﻋﺎد [694] for ﻋﺎد and ﻋﺎد; nor their elision, as in ﺟِر for ﺟِر [275]; nor their quiescence, as in ﺟِر for ﺟِر [368]. IH's saying "for alleviation" is to exclude the alteration of the unsound letters in the six ns., as ﺳ١٩٦٩٣٦٨ [16], ﺳ١٩٦٩٣٦٨; and in the du. and perf. pl. masc. as ١٥٥٣٨١ and ١٥٥٣٨١: that being for inflection, not alleviation (R). Transformation includes [three things (Jrb),] conversion, [as ﺳ١٩٦٩٣٦٨ (Jrb);] quiescence, [as ﻤُسْرِدَ (Jrb);] and elision (SH), as ﺳ١٩٦٩٣٦٨ (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 أَعْفِلُ، in which case the Hamza is elided [347, 428, 661, 699] in the paradigms of its wār. and act. and pass. parts., as مَكَرُّ, تَكَرُّ, يَكَرُّ, نَكَرُّ, اَكْرِمُ; while the saying [of Abū Ḥayyān al-Fakāṣi (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 أَهْلٌ لَّن يُؤْعَدُوا
[above]; or in a word deemed extraordinary, as أَرْضٌ مِرْبُوَةٌ with Kasr [or Fath, as in the KF (Sn),] of the ن, i. e., land abounding in hares, and كَسْاَبَ مُرْبَ بِن. i. e., wrapper whose wool is mixed with fur of hares, according to the saying that the Hamza of أَرْبَبٍ is aug. [672], which is the more obvious [hypothesis]: (b) if the Hamza of أَعْفِلُ be changed into س, as مَعْنِهُ لَّنَّ أَهْلُ i. e., watered the camels for أَهْلُ, it is not elided, because the motive for elision is lacking: so that you say يَهْرِيقُ [with Fath of the س (Sn)], and [similarly (Sn)] مَهْرَقٌ and مُهْرِيقٌ; and مَعْنِهُ لَّنَّ، act. part. مَعْنِهُ لَّنَّ، pass. part. مَعْنِهُ لَّنَّ (A): (2) what appertains to the ف (Aud, Sn) of the v. [699] (Aud): (3) what appertains to the
(Aud, Sn) or J, according to different opinions (Sn), of the v. [759] (Aud). "Euphonic elision" [281] is a term well-known, in their conventional language, to denote elision regularly made for a necessitating cause, like the elision of the I of عَصَمَةٌ قَاَمِي (16, 643); and "curtailing elision", or ["arbitrary elision", i. e.,] "elision for no cause", to denote irregular elision, like the elision of the J of يَدٌ دم [719], though it also is an elision for alleviation (R). Transfer of the vowel [667] of the unsound [mobile (Aud)] letter to the preceding sound quiescent [706] occurs in four cases, vid. when the unsound letter is the ع of (1) a v. [703]: (2) a n. resembling the aor. in its measure, but not in its augment; or (Aud, Sn) conversely (Sn), in its augment, but not in its measure [712] (Aud): (3) [an inf. n. commensurable with (Aud)] or إِسْتَفْعَالُ (Aud, Sn), as [338, 703] (Aud): (4) [the form (Aud)] [703, 709, 714] (Aud, Sn). And, in the four cases, after the transfer, you must (1) retain the unsound letter, if it be homogeneous with the vowel transferred [from it (Tsr)], as يَقْتُلُ يَبْيِعُ [703, 704, 721], orig. يَبْيِعُ يَقْتُلُ, like يَقْتُلُ يَبْيِعُ [482]; (2) convert it into a letter akin to that vowel, if it be not homogeneous therewith, as يَخْفَى [703, 704, 721] and يَخْفَى [aor. of frightened (Tsr)], orig. يَخْفَى and
like \( \text{\`y} \) and \( \text{\`r} \). The 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 \( \text{\`f} \), \( \text{\`m} \), and \( \text{\`y} \) \([\text{M}, \text{SH}]\), which are so named because of the regular alterations that occur in them \( \langle \text{Jrb} \rangle \). These \( \langle \text{three} \rangle \) letters are \( \langle \text{also} \rangle \) named "unsound letters" \( \langle \text{below} \rangle \), because they \( \langle \text{often} \rangle \) alter \( \langle \text{IY, R} \rangle \), and do not remain in one state; like the invalid disordered in constitution, and altering from one state to another \( \langle \text{R} \rangle \). And, for that reason, some make Hamza \( \langle \text{below} \rangle \) one of the unsound letters; but the majority do not reckon it, since, in many \text{cats.}, that invariable regularity, which obtains in the unsound letter, does not obtain in it \( \langle \text{Jrb} \rangle \). The alteration of these \( \langle \text{three} \rangle \) letters, however, in quest of lightness, is not because they are extremely heavy, but because they are so extremely light \( \langle \text{671} \rangle \) 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 \( \langle \text{below} \rangle \)—is impossible; while every \[\text{letter} \] frequent \( \langle \text{in occurrence} \rangle \) is deemed heavy, even if it be light \( \langle \text{R} \rangle \). The vowels \( \langle \text{663} \rangle \) are really parts of the unsound letters; to pronounce a consonant with \( \text{Damm, Kasr, or Fath} \), being really to put, immediately after it, part of the \( \text{,} \), \( \text{,} \), \( \text{,} \).
or I, 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 Basīt and others, “The vowels are six:—(1—3) the well-known three; (4) a vowel between Fatha and Kasra, which is the one before the \(l\) pronounced with Imāla \([626]\); (5) a vowel between Fatha and Damma, which is the one before the broad \(l\) in Warsh’s reading of such as \(\text{쪽} \), and \(\text{حيح} \); (6) a vowel between Kasra and Damma, which is the vowel of Ishmām \([436, 668, 706]\) in such as ة and غيف in XI. 46. \([436]\), according to the reading of Ks” (Sn on the Pro-Agent) and Hishām (MKh). All three \([\text{letters (IY)}]\) occur in the three kinds \([625]\), \([\text{ns. (IY)}, \text{قحَرَض} [703], \text{مَال} [703]\), \text{eistern, pool and (IY)}\] cistern, pool and (IY)) \([674]\), and \([\text{تَبيَت} \text{سَوُط} [703], \text{تَبيَت} \text{جَيَر} \text{أَوْلَد}, \text{كَحَارِل} [703], \text{قَالَ} [703] \text{tryed to get,} \)
and [683, 698]; and [ps., as م and (IY)] ل [546, 547], ن [585], and ل [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 ل (M, SH), because, (a) in the decl. n., (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's], because of what has been mentioned [about the initial, medial, and final] in the tril.; while the third [also] is mobile in the dim. [274]: (c) when quin., the first, second, and third [cannot be an 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 حاَى and حاَيَتُ [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 *aug.*, for lack of a derivation wherein its *f* is missing; nor to be a *subst.*, because substitution is a kind of plasticity, and is not recognized for *ps. (Jrb)*: (a) similarly, [for lack of derivation (Jrb),] in (a) *uninf. ns.* [673, 686] (IY, Jrb), which go far in resemblance to *ps.* [147, 159]; (b) imitative *ejs.* [200] (IY); (c) foreign names [673, 676] (IY, Jrb), which follow the course of *ps* in that their *f*s are *rad.*, not *aug.*, nor converted, because we decide that, in the case of *ps.*, for lack of derivation, which [lack] is found in these names (IY). The formations, [whether unaugmented or augmented (R),] are divisible into sound and unsound (SH), because they either have not, or have, an unsound letter for one of their *rad.* letters (Jrb). The *quad.* *n.* or *v.* is not unsound, nor reduplicated [below], nor formed with Hamza [below] in the *f* [672]. Nor is the *quin* reduplicated: but, in the *f* alone, it is sometimes unsound, as ارَنْتُلَ [671, 675]; or formed with Hamza, as *عَصَبَلَنْ* [283, 672]. The *quad.*, however, is reduplicated, on condition that a *rad.* letter be interposed between the two likes, as لُرَلَلَ [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 *f*, *ع*, or *ل*, [this clause being added by R] in order that the definition may not [appear to] be infringed by such as *بَيْطَر* [482, 483] and *بَيْضَرْ* [404, 674]. By the
unsound letter” IH means the ى, the َ, and the ِ, 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 َأَمَرْ commanded, َسَأَلَ asked, and َتَرَأَ read; and sometimes unsound, as أَلَ and أَلَّ [357]: and similarly the latter, as َضَرَبْ [482, 671] and َرَعَعْ [699]: (2) reduplicated and unreduplicated, the former being either sound, as امَّم extension [731]; or unsound, as أَفْتَرَى affection, أَنْحَيَّ living [698, 723], and أَتَّول [685 (case 1, a, a)]: and similarly the latter, as أَضْرَبْ [331] and أَرَعَعْ [698, 699]. But IH omits these two divisions. And similarly the reduplicated is either formed with Hamza, like أَزَ [rousing and inciting (MAR)]; or not so, like مَدْ [above]. The “formed with Hamza” is what has a Hamza for one of its рад. letters, like َسَأَلَ, أَمَرْ, and َتَرَأَ [above]. And the “reduplicated” is what has its إ and ل alike, which is the frequent [formation, like مَدْ above]; or its ِن and ِن, like دِنْ [357], which is extremely rare [672, 674, 683]: or has
two *rad.* letters repeated after two *rad.* letters, as قليق قليق [332, 674]. As for what has its ف and ل alike, as [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, (α) conjoined in the (α) ف and ع, as ريدل ووئ and يوم *day* [698], from which [division] no v. is formed [41]; (β) ع and ل, as قوى قوى [728]: (b) separated, [as وى and وى below]:

(b) more than two, as زار and يا [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 معد معد [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]) (α) hollow (SH), by assimilation to the thing whose inside we have taken, so that it remains hollow, because its ع is often gone, as بعث and قلت [703], بعث and تعل [663, 703], لم يبيع and لم يقبل [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 صرطت *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 قفت and بعت [above] (R): (3) in the َل, 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 نفغ, إخش, َورم, and apoc., as لا، تفخ, and َورم [428, 431, 719], and apoc., as لا، تفخ (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 عزوت I raided and َرميت I shot] (Jrb): (a) their being named “tril.” and “quad.” [above] is from regard to the َه, not the َن. (R): (4) in the َف and َع, [as َيَوم and َؤمن mercy (R),] or in the َع and َل, [as َنَوى purposed, حبي َلived, and َتَرة (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
(Jrb): (5) in the ف and ل, [as زُيُّ was governor and مَرْثى guarded (R),] is [named (J.r.b)] complex-separate (S.H), because of the complexity and separation of the two unsound letters in it (Jrb).

§. 698. Z [followed by IH] now begins to show you the positions of these letters in words. As for the ُ, its matter has been mentioned; and that it is not rad. in decl. ns., nor in vs. [697]. But, as for the و and ى, they are sometimes rad.; and occur as ف, ع, or ل (IY). The [unaug. (M)] و and ى agree [in their positions (M),] in that (1) both occur as (a) ف s, as زُعَد [683, 697, 699] and ُيُّ [368, 689] (M, SH), رَمَل arrived and ُيَسُّ was dry (IY): (b) ع s, as ُتَلَّو and ُبِنَع [663] (M, SH), قَارَم withstood [713] and ُبَعَتَ [683, 697] (IY): (c) ل s, as ُرَمَيَت and ُتُرَى [719] (M, SH), ُتَرَى جَزَّر and ُبِنَع [697, 719] (IY): (d) ع and ل (M, R), together, as ُقَّة [697] and [729] وَبَر [a she-camel's young one (MAR)], ُمِّي [697, 730. A] and ُمِّي incapable: (a) both [double ُ, and double ى] are as rare as a double guttural for ع and ل, like مُّثِّي [stuck together (MAR)], تَّعَ [vomited (MAR)], and ُبِن [200]: (b) double Hamza is not used for ع and ل; and double s for them is extraordinary, as فَع [failed, broke down, in his speech (MAR)], and ُفِي ُرَجَّح ( ) he (the drunken man)
belched in my face (MAR): (2) either of them precedes the other, when [they are combined at the beginning of the word, one of them being (IY)] a ف، and [the other (IY)] an ع، as یوم and یوم [697] (M, SH): (a) precedence of the ی is more frequent; as though they disliked the transition from the ی to what is heavier than it, vid. the ی (IY): (b) the ف as a ی and the ع as a ی have not been heard [together], except in یوم and یوم [a name of The sun (Jh on پو، KF)]; nor the converse, except in یوم، یوم، and یوم، یوم، یوم، and یوم woe or mercy [41, 200] (R). And they differ in that (1) the ی precedes the ی (M, SH) as [ ف or] ع and ی respectively (SH), as [زتیت I guarded and (M)] تزتیت I folded (M, R, Jrb), where they put the، before the ی (IY), which is frequent, as [زتیت I was governor and زتیت I fulfilled.] تزتیت [I perished (MAR)] and نزتیت (R) I erred (MAR): whereas [the converse (SH)] precedence [of the ی before the، (M, Jrb)] does not occur (M, SH), with the ی as [ ف or] ع، and the، as ل (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) و and ی for ع and ل respectively, as in یوم [above], are more frequent than double،، as in یوم [above]; so that, when the o. f. is obscure, conformity with the first is more proper, for which
reason the dem. ی is said to be orig. َذَرَى [293] (R): (b) the ی in َحْيَوَان (M) [and َحَيْرَة (M)] is a subst. for a ی (M, SH), according to S and his school (R), like the ی in َحَبْاية [686] (M), orig. َجَبَاية (IY), the o. f. being ُحَبَّيَان [730. A] (M, Jrb) and ُحَيْيَة [Part I, Note on p. 8, l. 1] (M), where they substitute ی for the second ی, from dislike of the reduplication: this is the opinion of S and Khl (IY): (a) by analogy ُحَبَّيَان should be ُحَابَيَان, because the [first] ی 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 ُجَوَالَن [331, 684 (condition 11, a), 703] and ُخَفَقَان fluttering; while in ُمُسَتَّنِان inanimate object [703] they make opp. conform to opp.: (b) for the same reason they do not incorporate [the two ی in] [ُحَيْوَان o. f. of ُحَيَوَان]; but, since they dislike the combination of two similar letters, they convert the second into ی; not the first, because alteration is more appropriate in [the second as being] the final [of the crude-form] (Jrb): (c) Mz holds that the ی of ُحَيَوَان is [not substituted, but (IY)] original (IY, R); nor is there in ُحَيَتُ I lived [728, 730. A] any proof that the second [unsound letter] is [orig.] ی, because it may have been converted into ی on account of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Kasr.
[685 (case 1, a), 724]: but S arrives at his decision because, if the ٰ were made original, ٰ 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, γ), 689, 716] in their language, i. e., none whose ٰ is a ی, and ل a ٰ; while ٰ [itself] is orig. ٰ [above], because it is from ٰ [697, 728]: (e) the substitute a ٰ for the last ی, irregularly, for a kind of alleviation, through the difference of the two letters, because they deem reduplication, and uniformity of the two letters, to be heavy (IY): (2) the ی occurs as (a) ف and ی [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 [ٰ، orig. ّى] with quiescence of the د, its being proved to be a ی by their saying (IY) ّى. ّى (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

ٰ ّى

ٰ ّى
[I bestowed upon the son of Ḥassās, or in one version Ḥassās, Ibn Wahh, in the lowest part of Dhu-l-Jidhāt, the favor of the generous (T)]: and in the ḏu. they say يِدَيْانِ بِبَضَارِفِ آخَرَ يِدَيْانِ, 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) لْلَّفُّ [357, 683, 699], according to the soundest [opinion] (SH), i. e., that its ف and ع are: (a) the truth is that the, and agree here in being, each of them, ف and ع together; but each in one word only: (b) in the sound letters also homogeneity of the ف and ع, as in بَبْرَ [with two ب, which I think to be exotic, not of the speech of the Arabs, a kind of wild beast, which the Persians name بَبْر 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 كَوْكِب [373]; or by the existence of a cause necessitating incorporation, as in لْلَّفُّ [above] (R): (b) لْلَّفُّ [683 (case 1, c, a), 697, 723], according to one account (SH): (a) F holds that its o. f. is لْلَّفُّ, from dislike to forming the word of [three] ب, which [sort of formation] does not occur [even] in the sound letter, except in the single word بَبْر.
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 ᵃ ṣ, because the ʕ does not precede the ʕ as ʕ and ʕ respectively [above] (R):

(b) if we say that ʕʕ is composed of ʕ, ʕ, and ʕ, because the cat. of سِّلسَس [below] is more numerous than that of ُبَّة [above], then the ʕ is like the ʕ in occurring as ʕ and ʕ [above]; but, if we say that it is composed of ʕ, ʕ, and ʕ, then the ʕ is like the ʕ in occurring as ʕ, ʕ, and ʕ [below]:

(c) the reasons for saying the latter are (α) that, in the dim. of ʕʕ, they say أَرْيَةٌ, by converting the ʕ into Hamza, because it is the first of two initial ʕs [683, 699]; whereas, if its ʕ were a ʕ, then ُوْيِّةٌ would be said; (β) that the ʕ is a ʕ, as in حال shifted, was transmuted, more often than a ʕ, as in بَعْد sold [684, 703]; while conformity with the more numerous [cat.] is better (Jrb): (d) you say, according to the opinion of F, ْعِيَتْ ُوْا I wrote ʕ, converting the last ʕ into ʕ [685 (case 4), 727], as in ْعَلَْيَتْ أَعْلَيْتَ and ْعِيَتْ أَعْيَتْ I elevated, exalted: but according to the opinion of Akh, أَعْيَتْ; while Th says ْعَيَتْ, which is rightly rejected by IJ, because the heaviness in ْعَيَتْ is more than in ُوْاصل [683, 699], on account of the combination of [three] ʕ, s (R); (e) they say that in Arabic there is no word whose ʕ and ʕ are, except ʕʕ [above]; and
for that reason they prefer the fray to be written with ى (M), lest the ف and ل become , : (f) similarly we decide that the in وَخَيْتُ I fraternized is substituted for the Hamza in آخْيَتُ, not that they are two dial. vars., because, the ل in فٓ[16] being أٓ, as is proved by the du. فٓ[231], the decision that the ف is أٓ, 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 سَلسَلٓ and قَلِيقٓ [674, 685, 690, 697] (R): (3) the ى occurs as ف, ع, and ل [together] in ىَبِيَتٌ [I wrote a ى (Jrb)], contrary to the ى, except in ىَوْاَوٓ [above], according to one account (SH): (a) the opinion of F is that the o. f. of يَاَوٓ [697] is ىَبِيَتٌ, so that he says ىَبِيَتٌ يَاَوٓ حَسَنَة َ I wrote a beautiful ى; but, according to others, its o. f. is ىَبِيَتٌ: (b) there is a similar dispute between them about all the names of the letters of the alphabet whose second [letter] is an ى, as , and فَا , ىَبِيَتٌ, ىَبِيَتٌ, ىَبِيَتٌ, ىَبِيَتٌ, ىَبِيَتٌ, ىَبِيَتٌ, ىَبِيَتٌ, etc.; but F says ىَوْاَوٓ, ىَوْاَوٓ, ىَوْاَوٓ, ىَوْاَوٓ, etc.: while their pl. [234], according to F, is ىَوْاَوٓ and ىَوْاَوٓ; but, according to others, ىَوْاَوٓ and ىَوْاَوٓ: (c) the reason why the others decide that [the ى's here are orig. ى] is the occurrence of Imāla [639] in the whole of these names,
which is of no account, because they are pronounced with Imāla only when they are *indecl.* [159, 321, 663]; and at that time their \( \text{I} \) s are original, like the \( \text{I} \) of \( \text{ما} \) and \( \text{l} \) [697]: while their \( \text{I} \) s are judged to be converted only when another \( \text{I} \) is added at their end, and made into Hamza, by analogy to such as ِْكَسَّاء [683 (case 1), 723], vid. when they occur constructed, *infl.*, in which case their \( \text{I} \) s are co-ordinated with the \( \text{I} \) s of the rest of the *infl. ns.* [697] in being [regarded as] converted [from a \( \text{و} \), or \( \text{ي} \)]; 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 \( \text{I} \) s are *orig.* \( \text{ي} \): (d) the reason why \( \text{F} \) decides their \( \text{I} \) s to be *orig.* \( \text{و} \), and their \( \text{L} \) to be \( \text{ي} \), is that the *cat.* of ُطَوْيَت [above] and دَوْيَت [697] is numerous, and more prevalent than the *cat.* of ُحَبْيَت and ُقَرَة [697, 728]; while the \( \text{و} \) of جِهَواَن is *orig.* \( \text{ي} \), according to the sounder [opinion], as before mentioned: (e) as for those names [of letters] which have an \( \text{I} \) for their second, followed by a sound letter, like ُكَاف، ُضَاد، ُصَاد، ُدَال، ُدَال، and ُلَام، their \( \text{I} \), before their construction and inflection, is original, because they are *orig. indecl.*, as before mentioned; and, after their inflection, should be regarded as *orig. \( \text{أ} \)*, rather than a \( \text{ي} \), because the *cat.* of ُكَار is more numerous than that of ُبَكَاب [684, 703, 711]: so that we
say I wrote a ل, and I wrote a د, while the pl. is أَكْوَافُ, أَصْوَانُ, and دَوَّلَتُ دَالَاَلَّا (f) as for عِينُ, سِبِينُ, جَيْمُ, their ع is a ی, like that of بُيْتٌ [674, 697], since the ی is present, and there is no proof of its being [converted] from ی; and, according to S, جَيْمُ may be orig. نَعْلُ with Damm or Kasr of the م, contrary to the opinion of Akh [710] (R).
\[ \begin{align*} \text{§. 699. The } & \text{ (1) remains sound in such as } \text{ءُعَدَت} \text{[663, 697] and } \text{بَلَد} \text{ begot; and } \text{ءُعَدَت} \text{[683, 697, 698] and } \text{بَلَد} \text{[below] (M), pl. of } \text{بُلَدُ child (KF): (a) the } \text{ in all of that is sound, because nothing to necessitate alteration or elision is found in it: (b) hence } \text{هُوَ مُقَلِّبِهَا} \text{II. 143.[below] (IY) And every (sect) hath a point, to which it turneth (its face) (K, B): (2) is elided in (a) that aor. of } \text{قَلُت} \text{ or } \text{قَلِتُ whose } \text{ is pronounced with Kasr, literally, as in } \text{بِعْدُ promises [333, 482, 671] and } \text{يَبِقُقَ loves; or constructively [below], as in } \text{يَضَعُ يَعْدُ puts, lays [333, 482, 700] and } \text{يَسُعُ is ample, where the o. f. is Kasr, the Fath being on account of the guttural letter (M): (a) the o. f. of } \text{يَعْدُ يَزِنُ weighs is } \text{يُعَدُ 333, 482] and } \text{يَزِنُ (IY): (b) the } \text{ is elided [from such as } \text{بَلَدُ begets and } \text{يَعْدُ (SH)] because of its occurrence [quiescent] between a } \text{[pronounced with Fath (R)] and [an original (SH)] Kasra [below] (IY, SH), expressed, as in [ } \text{يَعْدُ and ] } \text{يَعْدُ; or supplied, as in } \text{مُقَلِّبِهَا [below] and } \text{يَسُعُ (R): (a) the } \text{ is then elided (IY, R), from desire of alleviation (IY), because combined with the } \text{ in such a way that incorporation of one into the} \end{align*} \]
other, as in ُكْلِيَ [685 (case 7, a, b)], is not possible: and especially [is elision necessary] when the ُ, is followed by Kasra, which is part of ُي [697]; and preceded by a vowel not congruous with it, as in ُّيَرُعَد [below], aor. of ُّيَرُعَد threatened (R): for the ُ, is homogeneous with Damma, being considered as equivalent to two Dammases; while the Kasra after it is homogeneous with the ُ before it; and the occurrence of a thing between two things opposed to it is deemed heavy, and must therefore be avoided (Jrb): (β) the ُ, and not the ُي, is elided, because the ُ, is the heavier of the two, while the ُي is the sign of the aor.; and because the heaviness arises from the ُ, since it is second (R): (γ) the Kasra may not be elided, because by it the measure of the word is recognized [482]; so that there remains nothing [to elide] but the ُ, which is therefore elided: and its elision is most effective in alleviation, because it is heavier than the ُي or the Kasra; while it is quiescent, [and consequently] weak, so that the cause of its elision is strong (IY): (δ) the ُ, is not elided from such as ُّيَرُعَد [above], because it is orig. not between a ُي and Kasra, but between a Hamza and Kasra since the o. f. is ُيَّرُعَد [428, 661, 697] (Jrb): (ε) the KK say that the ُ, is elided only to distinguish the trans. [of this cat. (IY)] from the intrans., because you say, [in the trans.,
promised it, aor. 'عَدَّة, and نَزَّة weighed it, aor. 'يَعْدَة, and (IY),] in the intrans., [رَجَل fell into the mud, aor. (IY)] 'يَوْحَل, and [رَجَل feared, aor. (IY)] [333, 700] (IY, R): but that [theory] is vicious, because the is sometimes elided in the intrans. of this cat., as The tent, or house, dripped with rain-water, aor. يَكْف, and وَدُمُ الدَّبَابُ The fly dropped excrement, aor. يَكْف, and رَدَّدُ الْبُعِيرُ The camel went along, throwing his legs out like an ostrich, aor. يَكْف; so that what we have said is thereby established (IY); whereas what they say is of no account, since, if the case were so, the would not be elided from aor. of حَرَن i. q. حَرَن grievances (R): and one proof thereof is that there are some vs. whose aor. occurs on [the measure of] يَفْعِل with Kasr and Fath, in which case the is elided from يَفْعِل, and retained in رَجَل صَدْرَهُ يَفْعِل, as رَجَل. His breast was filled with rage, aor. يَحْرَر and يَوْحَل [482]; which proves the truth of our reason, and the falsity of theirs: ( pakistan ) if the letter after the , be pronounced with Fath in the aor., as in and [above], the remains, and is not elided, because one qualification [for elision], vid. Kasr, is removed, as in the pass. يُرْعَدُ is promised and يُوزَّر is weighed, whence CXII. 3. [404], where the
is elided from ٌبِلْدَد, because the letter after it is pronounced with Kasr; but remains in ٌيُرَلَد, on account of the Fatha (ٌIY): (η) IH's saying "an original Kasra" [above] comprises such as ٌيَعْدُ [above] and ٌيَقَع [362, 482], orig. ٌيَقَعُ (R): (θ) as for ٌيَضَع [above] and ٌيَضَع [482], the reason why the ٌ is elided from them is that the o. f. is ٌيَضَعُ and ٌيَضَعُ, since the aor. of ٌنَعْلُ in this [cat., whose ٌفْ is a ٌو, ] occurs [orig.] only on [the measure of] ٌيَعْلَع with Kasr [482, 671], being pronounced with Fath in ٌيَضَعُ and ٌيَضَعُ through the influence of the guttural letter; so that the Fatha is then adventitious; and, the adventitious not being taken into account, because it is like the non-existent, the ٌ is elided in them, because the Kasra is virtually pronounced (ٌIY): and, as for ٌيَسَع [above] and ٌيَسَع [482, 671, 700], [whose prets. are on the measure of ٌنَعْلُ,] it is plain to us, by the elision of the ٌ, that their ٌع [also] is [orig.] pronounced with Kasr [in the aor.], being pronounced with Fath because of the guttural letter; while these two expressions have no third (R): and for that reason Z says "literally ....... or constructively" [above], the lit. being in ٌيَعْدُ [and ٌيَبِقَ], because the Kasra is [actually] pronounced; and the constructive in ٌيَضَع and ٌيَسَع, because the ٌع is virtually pronounced with Kasr,
though literally with \textit{Fath} (IY): (c) the \textit{ is} elided in leaves [482] for conformity with \textit{yad} [above], because it is \textit{syn.} therewith: (k) \textit{yachd} finds with \textit{Damm}, according to the Banu ‘Amir [482], is anomalous, the \textit{ is} being elided from it either because it is \textit{orig.} \textit{yachd} with Kasr; or because \textit{ is} is deemed heavy between the \textit{ is} pronounced with \textit{Fath} and the \textit{Damma} in a \textit{conjug.} other than that of \textit{Nael}, \textit{aor. yafal}, with \textit{Damm} of the \textit{ in both (R): (c) the remaining variations of the \textit{aor. (IX, R), [being] the congeners of \textit{yed} (SH), are made to accord with it [in elision of the \textit{ (MASH)], as \textit{tud }, \textit{a’ud}, and \textit{tud} [Note on p. 246, l. 19] (IY, SH), the \textit{ being elided, although it does not occur between a \textit{ and Kasra (IY),] in order that the \textit{conjug.} [of the \textit{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 \textit{imp. mood} [428, 482, 667, 668] (SH), because derived from the \textit{aor.} whose \textit{ is} is elided, as \textit{tud} (R): (b) such \textit{inf. ns. as \textit{uda} [482] and \textit{maqa} (M): (a) the o. f. of \textit{uda} [and \textit{ran} (IY)] is \textit{uda} (IY, Jrb, Tsr) and \textit{zar} (IY), with Kasr of the \textit{ and quiescence of the \textit{ as} they distinctly declare (Tsr): (a) the \textit{ is} elided because of the heaviness found in the Kasra upon the \textit{, together with [the fact] that the \textit{ is} is transformed; so
that the Kasra of the ِ is transferred to the ّ, and the ّ then elided [below] (Jrb): (β) what necessitates elision of the ّ here is two matters, that the ّ is pronounced with Kasr, Kasra being deemed heavy on ّ; and that the v. is transformed, as in يَعُدُ َّ ََّّ [above], the inf. n. being transformed by reason of the transformation, and sound by reason of the soundness, of the v., as َََّّّ inf. n. of ِّنَََّّّ ََّّ and ِّلَّاََّّ inf. n. of َّلَّيََّّ ََّّ [685, (case 2, b), 713]: (γ) the combination of these two qualifications is the cause of the elision of the ّ from the inf. n.: so that, if one of the two qualifications stand alone, the ّ is not elided because of it, as ِّرُدُّ [above] and ِّرُوْـَِّّ، where, since the ّ is pronounced with Fath, and Kasra is removed, elision does not ensue, although the v. is transformed in يَعُدُ ََّّ ََّّ and ِّبُرُّّ; and as ِّدَّرَّ inf. n. of ِّدَّتُّهُ I loved him in return for his loving me and َرِصْالَّ inf. n. of ِّقُلْتُهُ I held close intercourse with him, where the ّ, 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 ِّلَّنَّ [above], the ّ is not elided: (ε) the transformation of such as ِّعَدَّة and ِّنَّيْنَة is only by transfer of the Kasra of the ّ, which is the ّ, to the ّ: but, since the ّ 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 ُليِعَنَّ , 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: (٣) it is said [by some] that, since transformation of ُعَدَةَ and ُرَِّذَةَ is necessary, the intention is to elide the ُ, as in the v.; so that they transfer the Kasra of the ُ to the ِ, in order that a mobile ُ may not be elided in the inf. 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 ِ, 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): (٣) [some say that] the o. f. of ُعَدَةَ [and ُرَِّذَةَ (MASH)] is ُودَدَ (A, MASH) and ُمَقَ (MASH), on the measure of ُعَدَشَ [without a ِ] (A);
and [this description of the o. f. seems to be more consistent with the statement that] the š of feminization is inseparable [from such inf. ns.], like a compensation for the elided [265 (reason 11, a)] (IY, Jrb): (α) its ʕ is elided for conformity with the aor.; and its ʕ mobilized with the vowel of the ʕ, vid. Kasra, in order that the Kasra may remain as an indication of the [elided] ʕ; while the š of feminization is put as a compensation for the ʕ, for which reason the two are not combined (A): (β) if it be said that the ʕ 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 ʕējēhē is not an inf. n. conformable to the v. [331], but a simple substantive denoting the direction turned to; while the ʕ remains in the simple substantive, like ʕlādī [above], pl. of ʕlīdī meaning boy and slave: and secondly that it is an inf. n.; but remains sound for a notification of the o. f., like ēstāsakrūd and šūrūd [635 (case 6, c), 703]; and this is the saying of Mz (Jrb): (γ) the š as a compensation is necessary here (A); so that its elision is anomalous, according to the preferable opinion (Sn): but some allow it to be elided, on account of prefixion, [because this supplies the place of the š (Sn),] relying upon ʕēhulˈlafūl ʕalīm [331, 338], which is the
opinion of Fr; whereas some explain عَدَ وِلِّي here as عَدَ عِدْتُ pl. of عَدَة i. q. نَامِيَة 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 عَدَتِ to be عَدَتُ, 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 ٍقَبَال [above]; or [when] it corresponds to the v. in initial augment, like ٍقَبَال and ٍقَبَال [703, 714]: and, for this reason, the ُ in the inf. n. of عَدَتِ يُعْدِد ُmay be elided, as عَدَتِ; or retained, as عَدَتِ; since it does not contain any cause for elision, nor the correspondence mentioned: and, when anything is elided from the inf. n. by transfor-
mation, the elided is not quietly forgotten; but the ُ of femininization is put at the end as a compensation for it, as in عَدَتِ and ٍقَبَال [265 (reason 11, a, b), 388], because the transformation in it is not according to the general rule, since it is an imitation of the deriv. by the original: (α) the ُ in عَدَتِ, which is orig. ُعَدَتِ, is pronounced with Kasr, because the quiescent, when mobil-
ized, is generally pronounced with Kasr [664]; and also in order that it may be like the ُ of the v., to
which is made to conform: and therefore the conj. Hamza is not imported after elision of the ٰ when the ٰ in the aor. is pronounced with Fath because of a guttural letter, it may be pronounced with Fath in the inf. n. also, as يَسَعُ [above], inf. n. سَعَةٌ [306]; or not, as يَهِبُ gives [482, 671], inf. n. صَلَةٌ (γ) صَلَةٌ with Damm for صَلَةٌ junction, union, is anomalous: (δ) when the ٰ is guttural, the inf. n. of َقَعُلٌ, aor. يَقَعُلُ, with Damm of their ٰ, is sometimes treated like the inf. n. of يَسَعُ [above], as َوَدُّعَ was tranquil, aor. ٰدُّعَ, inf. n. دَعَّةٌ [306]; and ُوَطْرُ was level, aor. ٰوَطْرُ, inf. n. طَرَةٌ and ٰطَةٌ: this being to notify that the ٰ of its aor. ought to be elided, because its occurrence between a ٰ 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 َقَعُلٌ denotes inseparable natures [482, 484], continuing in one state: and likewise [to notify] that the ٰ of its aor. ought to be pronounced with Fath, because the ٰ is guttural: (ε) لِدْهُةٌ born at the same time as another [234] is orig. an inf. n.; but is made a simple substantive to denote the َضَرْبُ آلِمٍ struck, or coined, by the sovereign means مَوْلُونُ; (η) as for َكَرَةٌ direction and َمَصْرَبةٌ coined silver [234], they are anomalous, because they are
not inf. ns.; so that their š is not a compensation for the ِ: (η) the ِ is not elided in such as َيَتْمِعْ ِبَعَدَ [a fictitious word (MAR)], on the model of َيَقْطَيْنِ an acaulous plant, from َرَعْدَ, because the reason for elision is weak (R): (3) converted [below] in what has been mentioned under substitution [683, 685, 689] (M), as [ مِيْرَٰنَ ] أَرَاصِلَ , َتُكْسِةَ [below], and the like (IY). The ى is like the ِ, except in elision (M). The ى remains where the ِ is elided (IY); [so that,] when ى occurs in the aor. between a ى pronounced with Fath and a Kasra, it is not elided, like ِ, because the combination of two ى s is not so heavy as the combination of ِ and ى (R). You say َيَتنع ripened, aor. َيِسَرَ [played at hazard with unfeathered and headless arrows (IY)], aor. َيِسَرَ [482], retaining it, [because of its lightness (IY),] where you drop ِ (M) in َيَعُدَ, etc. (IY). The ى is not elided from such as َيِسَرُ ِبَسَرُ because it is homogeneous with the Kasra: nor from such as َبَسُشُ also, for the same reason; though here elision of the ى does occur, because two ى s are deemed heavy with Hamza (Jrb). S relates that (IY) some of them say َبَشُشُ [482, 684], aor. َبَشُشُ, like َبَقَ، aor. َبَقَ [above] (M); and aor. َبَشُشُ [482], [like َرَعَدَ, aor. َبَعُدَ;] eliding the ى, as they elide the ِ, since ى, though lighter than ِ, is deemed
heavy in comparison with ] [643, 671], for which reason
they elide it (IY), treating it like the ُ: but this is rare (M). S transmits elision of the ی in [only] two
words, یَسَرُ العَمْر [divided the limbs of the camel (MAR)],
aor. یَسَرُّ یَسْرَهُ; and یَسَرُّ, aor. یَسِسُ: and both are anomalous (R). Its conversion [686, 689] is in such as [焕发ُ
and] یَسَرُ اَلْعَمْر [below] (M). The ُ is converted into Hamza [683], (1) necessarily in such as أَرْبِيْلُ [730. A],
أَرْبِيْلُ, and ُ، [i.e. (Jrb),] when [two ُ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 [ُ ُ]
heavy (Jrb); contrary to دَرَى (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 ُبَرَ and ُدَدُن [697, 698] are rare: so
that, if two ُs occur at the beginning, then, the ُ 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 زُرَى from زُرَى [683, 730. A],
in which case conversion of the first into Hamza is not
necessary, because the second is adventitious in respect
of its augmentativeness and conversion from the †, and because the prolongation relieves some of the heaviness: (b) conversion of the first into Hamza is [therefore] necessary, if the second be (α) not a letter of prolongation, whether it be converted from an aug. letter, as in ُهُمِّل ُهُمِّل [above]; or unconverted, as in ُهُمِّل ُهُمِّل [above]; (b) a letter of prolongation, but [either] not converted from anything [below], as in ُهِّل ُهِّل 683]; or converted from a rad. letter, as Khl says ُهُمِّل for ُهِّل from ُهِّل [716], when [its Hamza is] alleviated [by conversion into ُهِّل ]: (α) hence the opinion of the KK on ُهِّل 357], which, according to them, is orig. ُهِّل ُهِّل ُهِّل ُهِّل ُهِّل [683]: (β) Mz refutes Khl with [the argument] that the [second] ُهِّل in the like [of ُهِّل alleviated from ُهِّل o. f. of ُهِّل ] is adventitious, not inseparable, since alleviation of the Hamza in such a case is unnecessary [658]; and he says that ُهِّل for ُهِّل is allowable because of the Damma of the ُهِّل, like ُهِّل for ُهِّل [below], not because of the combination of two ُهِّل, s: (c) original, not converted from anything [above], whether it be a letter of prolongation, as in ُهِّل 357, 683], according to the BB, orig. ُهِّل ُهِّل; or not a letter of prolongation, as in ُهِّل 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 \( \text{i} \) [above]: while F also says "When two \( s \) are combined, the first of them is changed into Hamza, as in \( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a} \); and then says "and hence their saying \( \text{i} \) for the fem. of \( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a} \); and afterwards says "but, if the second be not inseparable, it is not necessary to change the first of them into Hamza, as \( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a} \) [above]: and S says "When you form a \([n.]\) like \( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a}\text{a} \), you say \( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a} \) [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 \([\text{i}]\) in \( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a} \) [above] is unnecessary; and that the [first] \([\text{i}]\) in \( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a} \) o. f.] of \( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a} \) is necessarily converted into Hamza [only] for conformity of the sing. to the pl. [\( \text{j}\text{u}\text{a}\text{j}\text{a}\text{a} \) below]: (d) the \( s \) deemed heavy is converted into Hamza, not into \( \text{g} \), because of the excessive affinity between the \( s \) and \( \text{g} \), whereas the Hamza is more remote; for, if the \( s \) were converted into \( \text{g} \), that combination of two \( s \), which is deemed heavy, would be, as it were, remaining (R): (2) allowably, [with unbroken regularity (R),] in such as \( \text{g}\text{a}\text{r}\text{e} \) [683] and \( \text{g}\text{a}\text{r}\text{e} \) [for the mentioned (MASH)]; and, says Mz, in such as \( \text{g}\text{a}\text{r}\text{e} \) [683] (SH), \( \text{g}\text{a}\text{r}\text{e} \) [above], and \( \text{g}\text{a}\text{r}\text{e} \), because in Kasra also there is heaviness, though less than in Damma (R): (3) invariably in \( \text{g}\text{a}\text{r}\text{e} \),
[notwithstanding the quiescence of the second (Jrb, MASH),] for conformity with [its pl. (MASH)] أُوُجُدُ [above]: (4) irregularly, [by common consent (R, MASH),] in ئَنَاقَةٌ and أُحَدَّ [683] (SH), أُجْمَأَ for أُجْمُمُ (R) morose, looking down from intensity of grief (MAR), and أُسْمَا (SH), because a single , pronounced with Fath is not heavy at the beginning of the word (MASH): (a) S says that أُسْمَا is orig. ئَسْمَاءٌ from ئَسْمَتُ meaning beauty of face, diptote because of the أ of feminization [18]; while Mb says that it is pl. of أُسْمَاءٍ [667], its measure being أُقْتَالُ, diptote because of the quality of proper name and id. femininization: but the first is more obvious, because éps. 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 أُحَدَّ took is orig. أَحَدَ, on the evidence of أَتَصَلَّ [702], like أَتَصَلَّ [689]. No word, whose initial is a س pronounced with Kasr, occurs in the language of the Arabs, like words whose initial is a س pronounced with Damm, except سَارُ a dial. var. of سَارٌ left hand [701] and يُقَطَانُ pl. of يُقَطَانَ awake [and يُعَار (248)]. Sometimes they escape the combination of two س, at the beginning of the word, by converting the first of them into ت, as in تَرْوَأَ and
which is rare; as a single at the beginning of
the word is escaped by conversion into ﺕ, as in ٛات
[689]. The ﺕ occurs as a subst. for the ,
frequently, as ٛاجة ٛات [above], ٛرٛى ٛات , and
ٛوْرَى ﺪٛنٛد ٛىٛعْمٛلة [689], since the Book of
God is a Light; but not regularly, except in the conjug.
of ﺪٛنٛع [689] (R). The , and ﻰ are [necessarily, regu-
larly (R),] converted into ﺕ, [and incorporated (Jrb),]
in such as اٛسْر اٛتْعُد [played at hazard (Jrb,
MASH), where the unsound letter is not converted
from a Hamza (Jrb)]; contrary to ﺪٛنٛع [689, 702] (SH),
orig. اٛتْرَز, where the second Hamza, being quiescent,
and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is con-
verted into ﻰ [661], which is not converted into ﺕ, because it is accidental, being removed in continuity, as
ٛاتْرَز and wore a waist-wrappmer (Jrb). The [quiescent
(Jrb)] ﻰ is converted into ﻰ [685], when the letter before
it is pronounced with Kasr, as مِبْرَان [above] and
مِبْقَات; and the [quiescent (Jrb)] ﻰ into ﻰ [686], when the letter
before it is pronounced with ﺪamm, as مُوْقَت awakening
and مُوْسِر [above] (SH).
§. 700. What differentiates \( \text{رفجُع} \) \( \text{أوَّرَحل} \) aor. of \( \text{رفجُع} \) \( \text{دَح} \) a pain and \( \text{شفَحُد} \) \( \text{أوَّرَحل} \) aor. of \( \text{رفجُع} \) [699] from aor. of \( \text{رفجُع} \) \( \text{يَضْعُ} \) \( \text{يَضْعُ} \) \( \text{يَضْعُ} \) \( \text{يَضْعُ} \) [482, 699], so that the remains in one of the two [classes], and drops off in the other, though both classes contain a guttural letter, is that in the Fat\( \text{ّ} \)a [of the \( \text{ع} \)] is original, like that in [333, 699] (M), where the Fat\( \text{ّ} \)a is original, because \( \text{رفجُع} \), \( \text{أوَّرَحل} \), belongs to the conjug. of \( \text{فَعَّل} \), aor. \( \text{يَفَعَّل} \), with Kasr of the \( \text{ع} \) in the pret., and Fath in the aor., like \( \text{كُنَّا} \), aor. \( \text{يَعَلَّم} \), imported on account of the guttural letter (M), because \( \text{يَضْعُ} \), aor. \( \text{يَضْعُ} \). \( \text{بَّلَيشَرَب} \) (IY): whereas is it is adventitious, accounted, aor. \( \text{يَفَعَّل} \), like \( \text{حَسَب} \), aor. \( \text{يَفَعَّل} \), and \( \text{يَخْسَبُ} \), aor. \( \text{يَخْسَبُ} \); and similarly, in the unsound, as \( \text{يُمْلَى} \). aor. \( \text{يُمْلَى} \), \( \text{يُمْلَى} \), aor. [482, 682], and \( \text{يُمْلَى} \), aor. [482] (IY). The antagonism of the two [Fat\( \text{ّ} \)as mentioned] is therefore [like] that of the two Kasra of the \( \text{ر} \) in and (M). The Fat\( \text{ّ} \)a in [and] (IY)] is likened to the Kasra in rivalry, competition, where the Kasra is adventitious, the o. f. being (332). For they convert the Damma into Kasra [724] (IY,
(1433)

Jrb), because of its occurrence before a final ی(Jrb), in order that the ی may be sounded true, since, if ئdamage occurred before the final ی, the latter would be converted into ١; and you would arrive at a paradigm unprecedented among [decl.] Arabic ns., in which there is none whose final is ی preceded by ئdamage [721]. And, since the Kasra in تَجَّارِبْ is adventitious, the paradigm is not accounted a preventive of triptote declension [18], because it is [not تَفَاعَلٍ تَفَاعَلٍ، but] virtually تَفَاعَلٍ تَفَاعَلٍ with ئdamage of the ع [256] (ІV). And the Fatha in تَجَّارِبْ is likened to the Kasra in تَجَّارِبْ trials, where the Kasra is original, because تَجَّارِبْ [339] is pl. of تَجَّارِبْ [332] (Jrb).

§. 701. Some Arabs [of the Ⲯیًجذز are induced, by desire for alleviation, to (ІV)] convert the [unsound letter, whether (ІV)] ی or ی, in the aor. of إِفْتَعَالٌ, into ی (M), notwithstanding that it is quiescent [684, 703] (ІV), saying يَتَأَسَّرُ یاتَعَدَدٌ and يَتَأَسَّرُ [below] (M), because the combination of ی with ی is lighter, according to them, than its combination with ی, for which reason they say يَتَأَسَّرُ یاتَعَدَدٌ, substituting an ی for the quiescent ی, as they substitute it for the ی in يَتَأَسَّرُ (ІV). Some inhabitants of the Ⲯیًجذز do not regard the difference between ی and ی in the formations of the v., saying [pret. ]یتَعَدَدٌ and
aor., يَأْتَعَّذٍ and يَأْتَعَّذٍ [above]; not يَأْتَعَّذٍ and يَأْتَعَّذٍ [689], because the, and ى are deemed heavy between the ى pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha, as in ىَبَّاسٍ and ىَبَّاسٍ [below]: act. part., مُؤْتَعَّذٍ and مُؤْتَعَّذٍ [below]: imp., إِيْتَعَذَّ and إِيْتَعَذَّ [689]. This, according to them, is an universal rule (R). And, agreeably with it, مُؤْتَعَّذٍ and مُؤْتَعَّذٍ occur in the dial. of [the Imām (Jrb)] Shf (SH), who used to pronounce so in speaking (Jrb). Some convert the، occurring [in the aor.] between the ى pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha, as in ىَيْوَجَّلٍ [333, 699, 700], into ى، as ىَيْوَجَّلٍ [below], because there is heaviness in this، though not so much as to cause it to be elided [699]; and others convert it into ى، [as ىَيْبِكْرُبٍ،] because ى is lighter than و، while some, disapproving conversion of، into ى for no apparent cause, pronounce the ى of the aor. with Kasr، [as ىَيْبِكْرُبٍ،] in order that the conversion of the، into ى may be because of its occurrence after Kasra [685 (case 5), 699] (R). There are [thus] four dial. vars. in the aor. of [ثُقَلٍ، aor. يَفْعَلٍ، whose يُؤْرِخَ، غُرْجَلٍ، غُرْجَلٍ، aor. يَوْخَلٍ (IY)], [ىَوْجَّلٍ، غُرْجَلٍ، غُرْجَلٍ، aor. يَوْخَلٍ (IY))]:—

(1) [above] (Jh, M), the most excellent of them, and the one used in the Kur، as ٌتَوْجَلٍ. XV. 53. They said، Fear thou not، because the، does not occur
between a ی and Kasra [699], and therefore remains (IY); (2) یِبَجَلُ [333, 674, 684, 708]; (3) یِبَجَلُ [333, 685]; (4) یِبَجَلُ [404] (Jh, M), with Kasr of the [aoristic] ی (Jh). But یِبَجَلُ, يِبَجَلُ, and یِبَجَلُ, [which is the most outrageous of them (Jrb),] are anomalous in the aor. of یِبَجَلُ [below] (SH), the chaste [form] being یِبَجَلُ یِبَجَلُ یِبَجَلُ یِبَجَلُ [above], according to analogy (Jrb). This Kasra is not like the Kasra in [the dial. of those who say (M, Jrb)] دُعَلَمُ (M, R, Jrb) and دُعَلَمُ (R), since they [who pronounce the aoristic letter there with Kasr (IY, R)] do not pronounce the ی with Kasr (IY, R, Jrb), as دُعَلَمُ [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 Sahāh (Jrb), یِبَجَلُ with Kasr of the ی is according to the dial. of the Banū Asad, who say نَخَسُ نِبَجَلُ َآْنَا یِبَجَلُ I fear, and َآْنَت ِبَجَلُ Thou fearest, all with Kasr; and, while not pronouncing the ی with Kasr in یِعَلَمُ, because they deem Kasr upon the [initial] ی to be heavy, pronounce [it] with Kasr in یِبَجَلُ, in order that one of the two یs may be strengthened by the other (Jh,
Jrb). And its imp. is ُيَبْجَلْ, the ُبَجْلُ becoming ُى from the Kasra of the letter before it (Jh). The language of Sf and F appears to indicate that conversion of the ُيَوْجَلْ [above] and ُيَوْحَلْ [699, 700] into ى or ُى is regular [703], even though it be rare. Sf says “They convert the ُوَجَلْ and ُيَوْجَلْ and what resembles them, saying ُياَجَلْ and ُيَأَجَلْ”; and F says “As for [the aor. of] ُيَوْجَلْ, ُيَفْعَلْ, ُوَجَلْ, ُيَوْجَلْ, ُيَفْعَلْ, ُوَجَلْ, ُوَجَلْ, ُيَوْجَلْ, it has four dial. vars.”; [while the language of Jh and IY above is to the like effect]. But this is contrary to what IH appears to say—I mean his saying that such and such [forms] “are anomalous in the aor. of ُوَجَلْ” [above], which imports that the forms mentioned are peculiar to [the aor. of] this word (R). And some of the Arabs say ُيَبْسَس [above] and ُيَبْسُس [684] (M, R), for ُيَبْسَس and ُيَبْسُس [482] (M), converting the ُى that occurs in the aor. between the ُى pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha [into ى], for conformity with the ُى [above]. This [conversion], like [that in] such as ُيَأَجَلْ and ُيَأَجَلْ [above], is [found] only in the [aor.] pronounced with Fath of the ُى; and, says S, is not regular. The [initial] ُى is not pronounced with Kasr here, as in ُيَبْجَلْ [above], because that is [done], in the aor. whose ُى is a ُى, with the intent that the cause
for conversion of the, may appear, as before explained (R).

§ 702. When is formed from [a v. whose is Hamza, as (IY)] 

was safe (IY),] in which case was eaten away, corroded, obeyed, [and trusted (IY),] are said (M), ف being substituted for the Hamza, because quiescent and preceded by the conj. Hamza pronounced with Kasr [661], on the principle of its conversion in ذيب and بير [658, 685] (IY), the ف is not incorporated into the ت, [as یزد and یم (IY),] as it is in یسر [689, 699], because here it is not permanent (M). As for the whose ف is Hamza, as put on, or wore, a waist-wraper [below] and [above] its ف is not converted into ت, because, though conversion of its Hamza into ف 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 [prounced] He said "Put on a waist-wraper", in which case the Hamza returns to its o. f., the general rule of
Hamza [738] is observed (R). In ṣāfār from اَنْتَعَلَكَ you say اِیَنْتَرَزَ [above] (Aud), by changing its Hamza into ی (Tsr); but change of the ی into ت, and incorporation of the latter into the ت, are not allowable, because this ی is a subst. for a Hamza, and is not original (Aud). The saying اِیَنْتَرَزَ [from اِیَنْتَرَزَ (Tsr)] is wrong (M, Tsr): so says Sd (Tsr). And اِکْتَلَد [661] from اَکْتَلَد is anomalous (Aud), which IM indicates by his saying [in continuation of the passage quoted in §. 689] (Tsr) "But this [change of the ف of اَنْتَعَلَلَ into ت (A)], in the case of Hamza, as in اَیَنْتَرَزَ and اِیَنْتَرَزَ for (A) اَیَنْتَرَزَ, with the ی changed into ت, and then incorporated into the ت, and similarly in اَنْتَعَلَلَ for أَنْتَعَلَلَ (661, 689), with the , changed into ت (A), is anomalous" (IM): whereas in the Tashil he makes it rare, saying "And sometimes it is changed, when it is a subst. for Hamza"; while the author of the Aud, in his Glosses on the Tashil, says "The ex. of it in the , is the saying of some أَنْتَعَلَلَ, and in the ی is the saying of some اِیَنْتَرَزَ" (Tsr). The chaste dial., in all of that, makes no change [of the ی or , into ت], otherwise two transformations would occur consecutively (A). And the saying of Jh that اِتْخَذَ اَنْتَعَلَلَ took for himself [699] is اَنْتَعَلَلَ from اَنْتَعَلَلَ is a mistake (Aud,
A), because, if it were from without 
change and (Sn)] incorporation would necessarily be 
said: so says Sd (Tsr, Sn), as [is stated] in the Tsr 
(Sn). Its [first (Sn) ت is original; [not a subst. for a 
being from ت ت ت ت ت [took for himself (Tsr)], like 
t ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
followed (Aud, A) : so says F (Tsr). Zj contests the 
existence of the crude-form ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
orig. [ from ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
as Jh asserts; or from ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
as A transmits below (Sn) ; ] but is cut down (A), 
the conj. Hamza and the ت of ت ت ت ت ت ت 
being elided from it; and, the ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
which is the ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
pronounced with Fath, and the ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
with Kasr (Sn). But 
F’s opinion is verified by their saying, transmitted by 
AZ, ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
, aor. ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
[696A] (A), of the 
conj. of ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
; though the ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
of the inf. n. is som-
times made quiescent: so says Fm in the Msb (Sn). 
Some [of the moderns (A)] hold ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
t ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
t to be an instance 
of the ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
whose ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
is changed into ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
(A, Tsr), 
according to the chastest dial. [689] (A), because 
has a dial. var. ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
[699] (A, Tsr), in which case 
the ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
is not original; and, according to this, ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت ت 
is 
said, like [689, 699] (Tsr). And, though this dial.
var. is rare, still the formation of 

\[\text{\textit{إِنَّهُ}}\] in accordance with it, [i.e., as 

\[\text{\textit{يَخْدَعُ}}\ (\text{Sn})\], is better [than making it 

\[\text{\textit{فَخْدَعُ}}\ (\text{Sn})\], because they unequivocally lay down that 

\[\text{\textit{إِنَّهُ}}\ [661]\] is a corrupt dial. var. (A). But [some of (R)] the Bdd [are reported to (Tsr)] allow conversion [of the 

\[\text{\textit{ى}}\] into 

\[\text{\textit{ت}}\ (R)\] in the case of Hamza, [transmitting certain words (Tsr)] as [instances of that, vid. (Tsr)] [661, ] [661, ] [661, ] [661, ] (R, Tsr), and 

\[\text{\textit{إِنَّهُ}}\ [661]\] took example (R), whence the tradition 

\[\text{\textit{فَلَيْبُدُ أَلْدَيْنِ أَبَسَنَ أَمَانَتُه}}\ [661]\]: so in all the versions of the Muwatta (Tsr) on Tradition, by the Imam MIAAn (HKh). And 

\[\text{\textit{فَلَيْبُدُ}}\ (K, B), by analogy to 

\[\text{\textit{إِنَّهُ}}\ (K)\]; but it is wrong, because the [\[\text{\textit{ي}}\ (K)\] converted from the Hamza is in the predicament of Hamza (K, B), and is therefore not incorporated [738] (B). And [above] is vulgar; and so is [685, 716] for [272, 658] (K).
§. 703. They are transformed, elided, or preserved (M). Transformation is alteration [697] of form (IY). The transformation occurring in the ē is by conversion, by transfer of the vowel and quiescence, or by elision. As for the first [mode], it has three divisions, conversion of , and ē into  [684]; conversion of both into Hamza [683]; and conversion of one into the other, i. e., of , into ē [685], or the converse [686] (Jrb). The , and ē are converted into  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  light and  [658], when alleviated; and “permanently”, to exclude such as  and  [240], according to the Banū Tamīm (R), or rather Hudhail (MAR). They are then converted into  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 , or ē into  , in order that it may be homogeneous with the vowel of the preceding letter:
(2) that the , and ٌ, 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 ٌ, and two ٍ and َ, respectively; while the predicament of the ِ is similar: and, the combination of unsound letters being deemed heavy, they convert the , or ِ into ٌ, because this is a letter with which one is safe from any vowel [711] (Jrb). The cause for conversion of the mobile ْ and ِ, 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 Fatḥa does not require ٌ to occur after it, as Ḥamma requires َ ٌ and Kasra ِ ٌ, since such as ُ ْ ٍ ٌ ٌ and ُ ْ ٍ ٌ ٌ [below] are frequent, while such as ُ ْ ٍ ٌ ٌ and ُ ْ ٍ ٌ ٌ ٌ with Ḥamma, and ُ ْ ٍ ٌ ٌ ٌ and ُ ْ ٍ ٌ ٌ ٌ ٌ with Kasr, of the َ َ َ َ َ َ of them, 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 Fatḥa is akin to ل [697]. And, from the infirmity of this cause, (1) they are converted into ل only when they are at the end, i. e., when ج's [719, 723, 728]; or near the end, i. e., when ع s; not when ف s, as in وُودُ [668, 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 رَوَى drew water, related and كَرَى twisted, would be worthier of conversion; so that, [since the ج is not converted into ل] when the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr, [as in طَوَى hungered and حَيَى lived (M.A.R.),] the ع [also] is not converted into ل [728, 729], although the conditions of its conversion are combined. The weakness of this cause, then, being established, we say
that it is principally effective in the v. [667, 684 (condition 11, a), 711, 712], to which, because of its heaviness, alleviation is more suitable. And in the v. this transformation is of two kinds, (1) original, vid. where the or ی is mobile, and preceding by a letter pronounced with Fath, as 絷عَ تَول and ی‌هَاب [684]: (2) conformable to the original, vid. where the or ی is pronounced with Fath after a letter pronounced with Fath in the tril. pret., which occurs in (a) the aor., (a) act., like یَكَف فears [697, 704] and یَهَاب الر reverences [704]; (b) pass., like is feared and یُهَاب is reverenced: (b) the pret. of two conjugs. in the augmented tril., as أَصْلَتْ اَقْتَامُ اَبْانَ ِإِسْتَقْعَدُ set upright and اَبْانٌ أَمَانَ ِإِسْتَقْعَدُ, as ِإِسْتَقْمَْ ُة appraised and اَبْانٌ اَمَانَ ِإِسْتَقْعَدُ made plain: and their pass. aors., as یَقَلُ يُبَنَان ِإِسْتَقْمَْ ُة is set upright and یُبَنَان ِإِسْتَقْمَْ ُة is separated, ِإِسْتَقْمَْ ُة is appraised and یُبَنَان ِإِسْتَقْمَْ ُة is made plain. Only the aor. whose or ی is [orig.] pronounced with Fath, [as یَهَاب and یَكَف and ] not the one whose or ی is [orig.] pronounced with Damm, as یَقَمُ, or Kasr, as یَبِعَ, and یَيِفَمُ, is conformable to the tril. pret. in this conversion, because the inducement to transfer [697], in the whole of that, whether the ی be pronounced with Fath, Damm, or Kasr, is imitation of the original by the deriv. in quiescence of the ی, together with indication of the mode of formation, which [indication] is not possible
with conversion of the whole into I [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 I], not being strong, is more suitable to the v. :—(a) that [tril. n.] which is commensurable with the v., as (a) َنَّابٌ بَابٌ and ُبَابٌ ُنَّابٌ [278, 684], orig. ُرَجْلُ مَالٌ and ُبَوْبٌ ُرَجْلُ مَالٌ [278, 682, 683] and ُنَّالٌ ُمَوْلَ مَالٌ liberal, orig. and with Kasr of the 

and similarly ُكَبْشٌ صَائِفَ 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 مَفَعُّل ُيَفَعُّلُ مَفَعُّل ُيَفَعُّلُ [712, 714] is on the measure of ُيَفَعُّلُ ُيَفَعُّلُ, though its augment is not that of ُنَّالٌ ُيَفَعُّلُ; and ُنَّالٌ ُيَفَعُّلُ [708] is commensurable with ُيَفَعُّلُ ُيَفَعُّلُ [343, 712, 714], though its augment is not that of ُيَفَعُّلُ ُيَفَعُّلُ, nor is the place of its augment that of the augment of ُيَفَعُّلُ ُيَفَعُّلُ: (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 ُجَعْفَر [392], as ُجَهْرٌ [374], where the ُجَعْفَر ُجَهْرٌ, being co-ordinative [712], because the ُو and ُس with three
rads. are only *aug.* [674, 675], is not transformed, in order that the formation of co-ordination may be preserved: (b) the *n.* containing *א* or *י* 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 *אִּשָּׁמָאָם* and *אִשָּׁמָאָם* [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 *א* and *י* to the preceding letter, and converting them into *י* : (3, 4) two sorts of ultimate *pl.* [256], vid. the *cat.* of *בְּוָאֲנִי* [715], and the *cat.* of *עְבָדָן* [246, 683 (case 3), 717], which, though they do not resemble the *v.*, are subjected to the transformation mentioned, because of the *י* of the *pl.* in one of them, and the intention to distinguish in the other [708] (R). That [conversion into *י* ] is [found] (Jrb) in (1) a *tril.* *n.*, as (a) *בָּברָבُ נָאָב* [above] (SH) : (b) *לַע* (R) and *רַגְּלֵל מַלָּל* [above], and (M) cowardly, which is *לַע* *חֶזֶר* *כּּפֶּשׁ* *סָלָק* (348, 368), from *לַע* *כּּפֶּשׁ* *סָלָק* was cowardly, aor. *יָלִּיבּ* ; though ISk transmits *לֹעְת* for *I* was cowardly, aor. *לֹאָלע* (IY) : (2) a *v.*, (a) tril., as *יָאָמ* and *בָּלָע* [684]: (b) conformable to the *tril.*, as *אָטָמ* *בָּלָע* *אָבָע* [above] and *אָבָע* offered for sale (SH), *אָסְטָמָא* and *אָסְטָמָא* [above] (R) : (a) hence *אָסְטָמָא* [was humble,
submissive (H)], contrary to the opinion of most (SH), because it is from ٌکْان َوَس (Jrb), meaning came to have a being contrary to his being, like ٌکْسَتَكْال اَلَّٰثَرَ مِنْ ٌدِّي ٌلِجَال ٌبَنْتَزَرِّح (H), is general, applicable to every state, while ٌکْسَتَكْال اَلَّٰثَرَ مِنْ ٌدِّي ٌلِجَال ٌبَنْتَزَرِّح is peculiar to alteration from a particular being, vid. the contrary of humility and submission; or from ٌکْيْبَى elitoris, because it is in a most low and humble position, meaning became like it in contemptibleness (H): not ٌسْكُون اَنْتَعَلَ from quiescence (Jrb), with | added for impletion of the Fatha (H), because [such] addition [of the letter of prolongation, as in ُمُنِّتَزَرِّح (Jrb), whence

فَأَدَّت مِنْ الْقَوَائِلَ ِحِينَ تُرُمِّي ٌوَ مِنْ ْذَٰلِكَ الَّٰلِجَال ٌبَنْتَزَرِّح (H), 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., ُبَنْتَزَرِّح (H),] is improbable; and because they say ٌکْسَتَكْانَة (SH) for its inf. n. (Jrb); and, says F, ُمُسْتَكِئْسَى for its act. part, as in the saying of Ibn Aḥmar

فَلَا تَصْلُى بِمَطْرُقٍ إِذَا ما ٌسَرَى فِي الْقُوَٰمِ أَصْحَبُ مُسْتَكِئَا

Then put not up with a flabby man, who, whenever he journeys by night among the folk, is humble in the
morning; and also يُسَتَّكِينُ [for its aor.] (H): (b) the tril. v. is sometimes conformable to the tril., as يَخَافُ [above], يُقَالُ يُهَابُ [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 إِسْتَقَامَةٍ and إِسْتَقَامَةٍ [338, 697] (SH), conformable to أَنَامُ and إِسْتَقَامَةٍ respectively (Jrb); and مَقَامٌ and مَقَامٌ [712] (SH), conformable to أَنَامُ and مَقَامٌ تَلَامُ and بِبِعْ [663, 684 (condition 1), 698] (SH), where the and یَ are quiescent (R, Jrb); طَائِبٌ [298, 311, 684] and یَتَجَلُّ [333, 674] being anomalous (SH): (a) we have mentioned that such as یَتَجَلُّ is regular, though weak [684, 701]: (b) similarly some of the Hijazis regularly convert the quiescent یَ and یَ in the aor. of such as یُتَعَدَّ and یُتَسَرَّرُ into یَتَعَدَّ [701]: (c) some of the Banū Tamīm regularly convert the [quiescent] یَ in such as أَوْلَادُ children, i.e. the pl. of that [n.] whose یَ is a وُ, into یَ: (d) when یَ is mobilized with an uninflectional Fatha, and is final, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, یَ [regularly] pronounce the letter before the یَ with Fath, in order that the یَ may be converted into یَ, [as بَقِى and بِقِى for یَ]
and (349, 482, 724) (T, MAR),] 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 [above]: (b) a poet [of the Banu Baulan, of Tayyi (T),] says

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 ی war [in the preceding verse] was doing that (T):

(c) if the ی be intermediate, because of the inseparable ی [266], as in [349, 482] for ناصأة [and ی for بادیة desert (T),] such conversion is rare, not regular (R): conversed

(R) ۱۴۴۹
together and trafficked, one with another, established [730. A] and explained, was established and was plain (SH), i.e., the augmented tril. [v.] (R), where the letter before the [mobile] and is quiescent (R, Jrb), but that quiescent is not a letter pronounced with Fath in the [unaugmented] tril. (R): (a) and قِفٔرُلٔ and اِسْتَبْعَدَيْنَ and أَبْيَنَ and اِسْتَبْعَدَيْنِ and أَبْيَنَ, because we stipulated [above] that the quiescent before the mobile or اس is quiescent (R, Jrb), but that quiescent is not a letter pronounced with Fath in the tril. pret. : (b) if you say "Do you not transform the act. part. in بَيِّعُ and قِفٔرُلٔ by converting the or اس into ل [683, 708, 712], notwithstanding that it is precede by an ل, and is in the n., where transformation is contrary to the general rule, it being generally in the v.?", I say "The case is so, except that بَيِّعُ and قِفٔرُلٔ have the sense, and government, of the v., and belong to the conjug. of the [unaugmented] tril. [343], contrary to بَيِّعُ and قِفٔرُلٔ: (c) if you then say "But أَفْمَ and اِسْتَقْمَ and بَيِّعُ and قِفٔرُلٔ belong to other, [i.e.,] non-tril., conjug.*", I say "Yes, except that the letter before the unsound letter [here] is the one pronounced with Fath [before the unsound letter] in the tril.: (d) the [rule] intended is that, when the deriv. belongs to a conjug. other than that of the original, it needs, [as a qualification] for transformation, that the
quiescent before the unsound letter [in it] should be the letter pronounced with Fath before the unsound letter in the original; but that, if the deriv. belong to the conjug. of the original, it is transformed, even though the quiescent [before the unsound letter in it] be not that [letter] pronounced with Fath [before the unsound letter in the original], provided that the quiescent be an l, because of its excessive lightness: (e) as for transformation of مَتْقَولٍ, مَبَيِّنٍ, مَقُومٍ, مَبَيِّنٍ and مَتْقَولٍ, مَبَيِّنٍ, مَقُومٍ, مَبَيِّنٍ, it would be more strange than transformation of مَتْقَولٍ, مَبَيِّنٍ and مَتْقَولٍ, مَبَيِّنٍ, because incorporation of the م in the [first] two conjug. is necessary (R). Such as مَتْقَولٍ and مَتْقَولٍ [684], and [wept, waited, (R),] أَطْبَبَ, أَطْرَبَ, أَجُدَ (R),] أَغْيَبَتْ [It (the sky) became rainy (R)], [She suckled notwithstanding pregnancy (R)], are anomalous [711, 707] (SH); and similarly deemed right, استَرَوْحَ أَلْيَمَ, smelt the odour, and and استَكْرُوْحَ [707]. AZ allows the conjug. of and to be treated as sound unrestrictedly, regularly, when they have no tril. v., like استَنَوْقَ [became a she-camel (MAR)]: but, according to S, such as also is anomalous, analogy requiring it to be transformed, for uniformity of the conjug., as the rel. ns. سَأَفَ [312] and حَاتِمٌ [from سَيْف sword and حِيْلٍ horses.
(MAR) are transformed, although no transformed v. comes from them, for uniformity of the cat. of ْتاعَلَ [633, 708]; and, since ْئُعِدُ [699], ْنَعِدُ, and are made uniform [with ْيُعِدُ], this [opinion] is more probable. says that the whole of the anomalies mentioned have been heard transformed also, according to rule, except ْعِسَتَكْرَوَذُ, ْعِسَّتَرُحُ, 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 ٰ̄ and یَ are made quiescent, their vowels being transferred to the preceding letter, in such as ْيَفُتُـلُ says and ْيَبِعُ sells [697, 704, 721], because of their liability to confusion with the conj. of ْيَتْكَانِ [below] and ْيَهَابُ (SH), if they were made to accord with the pret. in conversion of their unsound letter into ٰ (MASH). When the ٰ and یَ 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 ā [through conversion of ٰ or یَ into ِ ], or in a n. conformable to such a v., then ā of that v. or n. is made quiescent in imitation of its:
and, after the quiescence, the vowel [of the $\v$] is transferred to that preceding quiescent, to notify the mode of formation [below], [i.e., the measure,] because the measures of the $v.$ vary only through the vowels of the $\v$ [482, 704]. This quiescence is principally in the $v.$, not the $n.$, because the $v.$ is heavier ($R$). When the $\v$ of the $v.$ [712] is a $\nu$ or $\imath$ preceded by a sound quiescent, the vowel of the $\v$, being deemed heavy on the unsound letter, must be transferred to the sound quiescent, as \textit{يَقُومُ} stands and \textit{يَبِينُ} is \textit{plain}, orig. \textit{يَقُومُ} and \textit{يَبِينُ} with Damm of the $\nu$, and Kasr of the $\imath$, the vowel of the $\nu$ and $\imath$ being transferred to the preceding quiescent, vid. the $\nu$ of $\imath$ and the $\imath$ of $\nu$; so that the $\nu$ and $\imath$ become quiescent (A). In the augmented conjugs. [also] of these $tril. \ vs. \ unsound \ [in \ the \ \v]$, when the letter before the unsound letter is \textit{orig.} quiescent, and is not an $\imath$, $\nu$, or $\imath$, you make the unsound [letter] quiescent, transferring its vowel to the quiescent; and that is regular in their speech, as $\text{أَبَانَ}$ [below] and $\text{أَسْتَعَادَ}$, $\text{أَتَحَافَ}$ $\text{deemed \ tardy \ and}$ $\text{sought}$ $\text{protection}$: but, when the letter before the unsound [letter] is mobile, it is not altered, as $\text{إِخْتَارَ}$ $\text{706, 707}$, $\text{إِنْقَادَهُ}$ $\text{became \ accustomed}$, and $\text{إِنَقَاسَ}$ $\text{was \ measureable}$ (S). And, when the vowels are transferred to the letter before the $\nu$ and $\imath$, then, (1) if the vowel be Fatha, the
and ی are converted into ی, as یهاب and یخصاف [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 ی follows only Fatha: s) that they remain unaltered, as یبیبع یقرم and [above]; except the ی pronounced with Kasr, which is converted into ی, as یيطبع [below] and یقيم [above], orig. یتبطح یقُرَم and یقطْطح, because it becomes quiescent [and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)] (R). The ِع [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 یقُرَم و یبیبع (Sn)]: (2) if not homogeneous with the vowel, is changed into a letter homogeneous with it, as (a) ُؤبان (Sn) [above], orig. ُؤبین and ُؤبین، where the ِع, when the Fatha is transferred to the quiescent, remains not homogeneous with it; and is therefore converted into ی, because orig. mobile, and [now (Sn)] preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684]: (b) [above], orig. یقُرَم، where the ِع, 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., َيُقَرُّ (A),
and َيَبَاعُ َيَقَامُ are not transformed in the same way as their pret., on the plea that the، and ى، being mobile, and preceded by a letter constructively pronounced with Fath from regard to the o. f., vid. the pret., should be converted into ٰ، as َيَقَامُ and َيَبَاعُ, because, if so treated, they would be confounded with the conj. of َيَكَيَافُ [above] (R). And َمَفْعَلُ َمَفْعَلَ and َمَبْيِتُ َمَبْيِتَ [333] (Jrb); and so is َمَفْعَلُ [697, 714], as َمَبْيِتُ َمَبْيِتَ [347, 709] (SH). The n. conformable to the v. in this transfer is of two sorts, (1) the augmented tril. commensurable with the v. in the manner above mentioned under conversion of the، and ى into ٰ، while differing from the v. in an aug. letter [either] not used as an aug. in the v., like the مَقَامُ [712]; or used as an aug. in the v., [but] mobilized with a vowel not used as its vowel in the v., like [the بَيْعَ of] ِتَبَيْعَ [712]: (a) مَفْعُولٌ [above] is orig. مَفْعَلُ [347, 712], which is commensurable with َيُقَرُّ [436]; and, but for that, it would not be transformed: (b) as for the rest of the pass. parts., they are commensurable with their pass. vs., while differing [from them] in the initial م [347]: (2) a regular inf. n. equal to its v. in keeping its augments in the same relative positions as those of the v., like
and 

ج١٢٣١٨٩٥ [above] (R). In [such] vs., and 

vs. [330], where the ٠ and ِ, when ع s, are mobile, and the preceding letter is quiescent, [but] mobile in the o. f., [vid. the tril. pret.,] the vowel of the ع, even if it be فاتح, 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 ٠ and ِ,] because, in such [words], regard for the mode of formation is possible in those pronounced with فاتح of the ع, as in those pronounced with دام or كسر; contrary to [those words which have] the [ع orig.] pronounced with فاتح and preceded by a letter pronounced with فاتح, as قالت and بَع [705]. For here the ف is quiescent; so that, when it is mobilized with فاتح, and the ع is made quiescent, that فاتح on the ف ] is known to be the vowel of the ع: and here the distinction between the cats. of ٠ 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 يَطَبَطُع [above], which, according to Khl, is orig. مَقْامٌ [704]? And you say مَقَامٌ and مُقَامٌ [above], مُقَامٌ and مُقَامٌ; and, in the cat. of ِ, يَبَعُ and يَبَعُ [above], يَبَعُ, يَبَعُ sleeps at midday and يَبَعُ,
and مَفَالِل sleeping at midday and مَتَّيل [333]. Thus you see how, when they are obliged to transform the ع, because the words mentioned are conformable to their o. fs., i. e., the tril. pret., they intend, in both sorts, [v. and n.,] to explain the mode of formation by transferring the Damma, Kasra, or Fatha to the preceding letter; and do not mind confusion of the cat. of ج, with that of ى (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 َتَأَّلَّ and َبَأَيَع [above], hindered and َبَيَنَ: (b) a Hamza, as in ُنَأَيْس aor. of ُنَيْس despaired, because it is liable to transformation by conversion into َت [for alleviation; so that it is, as it were, an'] while it does not receive a vowel (Sn]): (a) that is categorically declared in the Tashil 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 أَبْيَنَ أَلْشِي How plain the thing is! and مَا أَقْوَمَةَ أَقُومُهُ يَخُبَّ وَأَبْيَنَ يَخُبَّ How upright it is!, and أَقَمُهُ يَخُبَّ and يَخُبَّ أَبْيَنَ, because they make it conform to the n. corresponding to it in measure and indication of excellence, vid. the أَنْعَلُ 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 اَنْعَلَ مَا اَنْعَلَهَهُ of superiority is only اَنْعَلَ مَا اَنْعَلَهَهُ; but the latter is made to accord with اَنْعَلَ يَِّ: (b) Frd says "A.H transmits from Ks that transfer is allowable in [the v. of] wonder, such as اَنْعَلَ مَا اَنْعَلَهَهَهُ; but it is weak" (Sn): (b) reduplicated in the ح, as in اِبْيَضَ was white and اِسوْدَ was black [707], which sort they do not transform, lest one paradigm be mistaken for another, because, if اِبْيَضَ were subjected to the transformation mentioned, بَابْلَ would be said, which one might suppose to be اَنْعَلَ [with Fath of the ع (Sn)] from بَضَاضَةٌ delicacy of complexion: (c) unsound in the ح, as in اَهْرَى fell down, where transfer is not introduced, lest two transformations occur consecutively. And IM in the Tashıl adds another condition, vid. that the v. do not agree [in sense (Sn)] with اَنْعَلَ [by indicating con-sti-tution or color (Sn)], as in اَصْبَدَ and اَصْبَدْ, aor. of اَعْرَرْ صَبِيدَ [707]; and similarly their variations, as اَعْرَرْ صَبِيدَ للهُ 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 ع اَنْعَلَ and اَنْعَلَ, when possessed of اَنْعَلَ ..... 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 إِفْعَلْتُ (Sn). The ن, and اَل are elided (SH), (1) necessarily, in two positions, (a) where quiescence of the final happens to be necessitated by (α) attachment of the pron. (Jrb) in such as ُ قُلْتُ I said and ُ بِعْتُ I sold [403, 697], ُ قُلْنِ They [fem.] said and ُ بِعْنِ They [fem.] sold: (α) the initial is pronounced with Kasr, if the اَل be [either] a اَل, [as in ُ بِعْتُ (Jrb)]; or [اَل (Jrb)] pronounced with Kasr, [as in ُ حَفْنِ (Jrb):] and with Damm in other cases (SH), as in ُ قُلْنِ [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 ُ قَعُلْ with Kasr of the اَل (456, 707), does not have the اَل 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 اَل; so that لَسْتَ becomes like لَبْتُ [516, 533] (R): (γ) for the same reason they make the اَل quiescent [707] (SH), i. e., do not convert it into ل, because that is a variation, as is transfer of the vowel of the اَل to the preceding letter; so that, since the v. is aplastic, it is not varied by conversion or transfer, but the vowel is elided as forgotten (R): (β) apocopation, as
in did not say and لَمْ يَبْعِلَ did not sell [697]; or quasi-apocopeation, as (Jrb) in تُقُولُ say and بْعِلَ sell [663, 697], because they are [derivs. (Jrb)] from تُبِعِلَ and [428, 431] (SH), and therefore do not differ from them in Damma or Kasra [of the ف ] (Jrb): (b) in [such as (Jrb)] إِسْتِقَامَةٌ and أُقَامَةٌ [above] (SH), orig. إِقْوَامٌ and إِسْتِقَامَةٌ [697], where they convert the Ɂ into ل for conformity with أُقَامَةٌ and إِسْتِقَامَةٌ [above]; and, since two Ɂs, the ل that is [converted from] the Ɂ, and the aug. ل, then concur, the first is elided (Jrb): (a) what IH mentions as to elision of the ل converted from the Ɂ or Ɂ: is the opinion of Akh [338]; while, according to Khl and S, the elided is the aug., as they say on the Ɂ of مَفْعُولٌ [709]: but the saying of Akh is more suitable, by analogy to other cases where two quiescents concurr [663] (R): (b) some Commentators state that the mention of إِسْتِقَامَةٌ and أُقَامَةٌ is a repetition; but the answer is that they are mentioned above because of the conversion of the Ɂ into ل, and here because of the lision (Jrb): (2) allowably, in such as (a) سَيَدٌ and مَيْتٌ [251, 685 (case 7, a, a)] (SH), which then remain سَيَدٌ and مَيْتٌ, with a single Ɂ (MASH); the second Ɂ being elided from them for alleviation, because of the combination of two Ɂs and a Kasra (Jrb): the poet ‘Adî Ibî
ArRa‘lā alGhassāni (Jsh) says, [combining ميت and ميت in one verse (Jh),]


(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) قيلوئة [331] and كينونة sleeping at midday (SH), with Fath of the ع (MASH): (a) this requires consideration (R, Jrb), because elision is allowable in such as سيد، necessary in such as كينونة [below] (R); since ns. like قيلوئة 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 o.f., because there is no فعلوئة [331] in their language, except extraordinarily, like صفونة swerving, deflection, [an inf. n. of الصف السهم عن الهدف The arrow swerved, or deflect, from the butt, aor. الصف (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 [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): (c) according to S, such as َبَيْعَة وَسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ and are with Kasr of the [251, 373, 685, 716]; while and are َبَيْعَةٌ َكَبِنْوَةَ with Fath of the, on the measure of [old woman (KF)], except that the َل is repeated, and the َس inseparable: (d) since neither َبَيْعَة وَسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ with Kasr of the, nor the inf. n. َبَيْعَةٌ َكَبِنْوَةَ [331], is found in any formation other than the hollow, some judge َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ with Fath of the, like َسُيِّرَبَة with Fath of the, like َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ [373]; but pronounced with Kasr irregularly, like َبَيْعَةٌ َسُيِّرَبَة with Kasr of the, and َدُهْرِي َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ with Damm [311]: (α) S, however, says that, if they were [orig.] pronounced with Fath of the, they would not be altered; [but would be] like َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ and َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ [390]: and the use of َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ would be commonly allowable, whereas no َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ has been heard from the hollow, except َمَا ِبَالُ عَيْنَ َعَيْنَ as َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ [251]: (c) Fr, also endeavouring to avoid the formation َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ with Kasr of the, says that َبَيْعَةٌ َسَيْدَة َمَيْتَةٌ َنيَعُلْ [251] is
orig. ُئً، like ُئً [348]; but that, the ُئً [pronounced with Kasr] being transferred to the position of the ُئً, and the [quiescent] ُئً to the position of the ُئً, [as ُئً،] the ُئً is converted into ُئً, and [has the quiescent ُئً] incorporated [into it]: (α) he says that ُئً 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 ُعٌ be not an ep., like ُعٌ a wailing, it is not subjected to this transformation: (f) he says that ُئً and the like are orig. اد ُعٌ [above], like ُعٌ [252, 390] and ُعٌ chest, coffer: but that, since most of these inf. ns. are scions of ُئً, as ُئً became, inf. n. ُئً and ُئً journeyed, inf. n. ُئً, they pronounce the ُئً with Fath, so that the ُئً may be preserved, because the cat. belongs to ُئً [below]; and then make the scions of ُئً conform to those of ُئً, converting the [first] ُئً into ُئً, for conformity with ُئً: (α) this is as he says that ُئً [247] is orig. ُئً, like ُئً [247]; but that, deeming the double ُئً heavy, they make it single, and put the s 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 فيعَلُ with Kasr of the ع to the hollow, and of فيعَلُ with Fath of the ع to [the n.] other than the hollow; and since, according to Fr, putting the ى [of the ep. فيعَلُ] before the ع, and, according to those others, transfer of فيعَلُ with Fath to فيعَلُ with Kasr, may be peculiar to the hollow, there is nothing to prevent the formation فيعَلُ from being peculiar to it: and similarly there is nothing objectionable in peculiarity of فيعَلُة [331] to the inf. n. of the hollow, or فيعَلَة [247] with Damm of the ن to the pl. of the defective; while the saying of Fr that they make ى predominate over ع, because the cat. belongs to ى [above], is of no account, since inf. ns. of this measure are rare, and, in those which occur, the scions of ع, like 5عِیْنة leading, and 6حُمْلَة intervening, are near, or equal, in number to the scions of ى: (h) the reason why elision is necessary in such as 5عِیْنة and 6سِرُرَة، 5عِیْنة and 6سِرُرَة and 6مَيُحَت، is that the extreme number of letters reached by a n. through augmentation is seven [368], while these contain six, to which the ى of feminization is invariably attached; so that, since alleviation is allowable in what has fewer letters, like 6سِبَل، it is necessary in what has many, like 5عِیْنة: (3) rarely, in فيعَلُان، as 5سِبَلاً sweet basil for 5سِبَلاً, orig. 5بُهْكَان، 5بُهْكَان، 5بُهْكَان، 5بُهْكَان، 5بُهْكَان.
from *Ir (R). The ' and ُ are preserved in other cases, vid. where the causes of transformation and elision are (1) absent (M), as in ُ تُول and ُّ بِع [above], and what resembles them (IY): (2) present, except that something intervenes, which prevents the execution of their behest, as in صَرَّى [684 (condition 11, d), 711] and حَيْدَةِ [272, 684], حَيْلَانِ [331, 684 (condition 11, a), 698, 711] and حَيْكَانِ [inf. n. of حَكَّان walked, swaying his shoulders, aor. حَيْلَةِ, حُيْكَان] [278] (M).

Such as حَيْرَانِ [684 (condition 10, a, b), 698] and حَيْكَانِ [and حَيْكَانِ], are [treated as] sound, (1) to notify, by their mobility, the mobility of what they signify; while ُّ مَرْتَانِ is [conformable to حَيْرَانِ (Jrb)], because it is its opp. [698] (SH): (a) this is marvellous: for the mobility of the word is not akin to the mobility of what it signifies, except by lit. homonymy, since the meaning of mobility in the word is that you put after the consonant something of ُ or ُ or ! [697], as is the well-known [theory]; and, the mobility of the signified being leagues away from this, how can one of them notify the other? (R): or (2) because they are not conformable [331] (SH), like إِقَامَةٌ and ُّ إِقَامَةٌ [above] (R), to the v. (R, Jrb), which is obvious (Jrb); or agreeable (SH) with it in mobility and quiescence (Jrb), i. e., commensurable with it, like مَقَامٌ and مَقَامٌ...
Moreover جَوَّلَنَّ and غَلْيَانَ and حَيْكَانَ [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 أ fortiori be [treated as] sound. Similarly حَيْكَانَ and حَيْكَانَ are not transformed, because of their remoteness from the formations of the v., by reason of the two ج of femininization at their end; and, even if no ج of femininization occurred at their end, their formation would still necessitate their being treated as sound, like عَبِيْبة [711] and جَلْفَ سُؤْلَة an inquisitive man, because of its remoteness from the formations of the v. (IY).

§ 704. The tril. vs. unsound in the ع, (1) if the ع be ج, are of three kinds فَعَلَ, فَعَلَ, and فَعَلَ [482], like the sound: (2) if the ع be ع, are of two kinds, فَعَلَ and فَعَلَ; not فَعَلَ [705], as though they discarded this formation in this cat. [of the hollow], because of that conversion of the ع into ج [686 (case 1)] which would ensue in the aor. (IY). One word of this conjug., however, does occur in the ع cat. of the hollow, vid. جَيِّبُ الرَّجُل meaning The man became possessed of goodly appearance [705, 707], the ع 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 \( \ddot{a} \) to the letter before it and conversion of the \( \ddot{a} \) into \( \dddot{a} \), would be necessary, because the aor. follows the pret. in [undergoing] transformation; so that you would say \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), 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] \( \dddot{a} \), are on [the measure of] (a) \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) 697, 703 (M); not \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) with Kasr, as [sometimes] occurs in the sound [482], lest, the \( \dddot{a} \) becoming \( \dddot{a} \) [685 (case 5)], the scions of be confounded with those of \( \dddot{a} \) (IV): (b) \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), as \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) [below] (IV) : (c) \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), as \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) ; and \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \); i. e., became tall, and bountiful: (2) in the [cat. of] \( \dddot{a} \), are on [the measure of] (a) \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), as \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) 697, 703: (b) \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), as \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) 703. And \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) with Kasr does not occur in the [cat. of] \( \dddot{a} \), nor \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) in the [cat. of] \( \dddot{a} \) [below]. But Khl asserts that \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) perished, aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) 703, and \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) lost the way, aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), aor. \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) 482, 700; both being from \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \), because they say \( \dddot{a} \dddot{a} \) having 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 ُن ُب، their pret. is َنَعَلَ with Kasr of the ُع، (1) because you say ٌطَلْحَتُ I perished and ُثَبَتُ I lost the way, with Kasr of their ُن ُب،; whereas, if their pret. were ُنَعَلَ, then ُثَبَتُ would be said, with ُدَامَم; and, since that is not said, they are proved to be of the class of ُحَقَتُ [403, 484]: (2) because the aor. of ُنَعَلَ, in the cat. of ُن ُب،, is only ُيَفْعَلُ [above] with ُدَامَم; so that, since they say ُبَيِّنُهُ and ُبَيِّنَيْنِهَا, what we have said is proved. The o. f. of ُبَيِّنَهُ and ُبَيِّنَيْنِهَا is ُبَيِّنَى, 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 ُي [685 (case 5)] (IY).

But, according to him that says ُثَبَتُ ُطَلْحَتُ and ُثَبَتْنِهَا, they are [from ُي (below), being ُنَعَلَ, aor. ُيَفْعَلَ (IY),] like ُبَيِّنَى, aor. ُبَيِّنَعُ [above] (M). IH says that (R) ُطَلْحَتُ, aor. ُيَتَبِّيْعُ, and ُثَبَتُ, aor. ُثَبِّيْنِهَا, according to those who say ُثَبَتُ and ُثَبَتْنِهَا, ُثَبِّيْعُ ُثَبَتُ and ُثَبَتْنِهَا [above], are anomalous (SH), on the ground that the pret. is َنَعَلَ with
Fath of the \( \varepsilon \), the aor. of which, in the hollow belonging to the cat. of \( \iota \), is pronounced only with Damm of the \( \varepsilon \) (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 \( \text{طَلَح} \), aor. \( \text{يُطَرَح} \), is said, takes the pret. from \( \text{طَلَح} \), aor. \( \text{يُطَرَح} \), belonging to the cat. of \( \iota \), and the aor. from \( \text{طَلَح} \), aor. \( \text{يُطَرَح} \), belonging to the cat. of \( \iota \) [above].

But the \( \text{يُطَرَح} \) mentioned by Jh has not been heard: and, if it were authentic, \( \text{طَلَح} \), aor. \( \text{يُطَرَح} \), would not be compounded [of two dial. vars.]; but \( \text{طَلَح} \), aor. \( \text{يُطَرَح} \), would be like \( \text{قَالَ} \), aor. \( \text{يَقُولُ} \); and \( \text{طَلَح} \), aor. \( \text{يُطَرَح} \), like \( \\text{بَعَ} \), aor. \( \text{يَبِيعُ} \) [above]. Nor is what IH says about anomalousness of any account, since, if \( \text{طَلَح} \) were like \( \text{قَالَ} \), then \( \text{طَلَحَتُ} \) [above], like \( \text{قَلَتُ} \) [403, 703, 705], would be said, with Damm of the \( \nu \), 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 [\( \text{يَقُولُ} \) with] Damma on the [\( \varepsilon \) when a] \( \iota \) occurs in \( \text{يَهِيَرُ} \) aor. of \( \text{يَهِيَرُ} \) [above] (R on the Preterite)

§ 705. Upon attachment of the [mobile] pron. of the ag., [vid. the \( \nu \) of the 1st or 2nd pers., and the like
(IY),] they transmute ﴾noun﴿,[when it is] from [the cat. of (IY)] و , into ﴾noun﴿; and, [when it is] from [the cat. of (IY)] ي , into ﴾noun﴿: and then the ﴾Damma and Kasra are transferred to the ف , [after removal of the vowel orig. belonging to it (IY); ] so that بعس ﴾and and ﴾[403, 703] are said (M). If you say "Why do you not assert that the o. f. of ﴾aud is with ﴾Damm of the ﴾u, and dispense with the trouble of altering [the conjug.]?", one says [in reply] "That would not be correct, because ﴾occurs only intruns. [432, 484]; whereas you say ﴾I visited the sick:﴿ and ﴾I visited the friend, so that you find ﴾to be [sometimes] trans." (IY). IH's saying: about "the conjug. of ﴾[484] is an answer to the objection that ﴾I ruled him and ﴾I said it are orig. ﴾and ﴾, with ﴾Damm of the ﴾u, as is the opinion of Ks [below]; the ﴾Damma of the ﴾u being transferred to the ﴾ف , and the ﴾[then] elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that ﴾does occur trans.: and the answer is a denial that they are orig. pronounced with ﴾Damm of the ﴾u, because the unsound, when its case is dubious, is made to accord with the sound; while no ﴾with ﴾Damm occurs trans. in the sound, so that they are orig. with Fath of the ﴾u
The learned differ about the manner of the transition [from *فَعَلَتْ*] to that [form *فَعَلَُتْ*]. Some say that *سُدَتْ* and *بَعَتْ* are *أَرِغِ. with Fath of the *ع*; but that, since it is known that the *ع* would be elided, because of the concurrence of two quiescents [663], upon its conversion into ُل [684, 703], and the *قَا * of *و* would [then] not be distinguishable from that of *ي* [being, in either *قَا*, reduced to *فَعَلَُتْ*, ] they transmute the former into *فَعَلَُتْ* with *لَََََم*, and the latter into *فَعَلَُتْ* with *كَََََر*; and then the vowel of the unsound letter is transferred to the *ف*, and the *ع* elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that *سُدَتْ* and *بَعَتْ* 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 *كَََََس* [above]; and is adopted by [Z in the M, and] *Iَََََم* in the Tashil (A). But IH refutes this by his saying "not because of transfer" [484], meaning "not because of transfer from the *ع*, as some mention", since that would entail transfer from one *قَا * to another differing from it in form, as is obvious; and in sense, because of the difference in the meanings [484] of the *قَا *s. [ُل* , *فَعَلَُتْ*, and *فَعَلَُتْ*]: and he points out that the *لَََََم* and *كَََََر* are "for explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of the ," [484] and *ي*,
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respectively (Jrb). What is meant by “scions of [or ی (Jrb)]” is (Jrb, Sn) its derivs. (Sn), [i.e.,] the unsound [words] belonging to the cat. of ی or ی (Jrb), [here] meaning the words whose ی is ی [or ی ] (Sn). His argument is that the ی and ی, being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, are converted into ۱ [684, 703] and elided [663]; and afterwards the ی is pronounced with Damm in the cat. of ی, and Kasr in that of ی, as an indication of them, so that no breach [of formation] may occur. The reason why the earlier [authorities] venture upon the objectionable [theory of transmutation above] mentioned is that, seeing the Arabs make no distinction, in یبَتْ یَخْفَت and یبَتْ یَخْفَت [403, 703], between the ی and ی, they say that, if the vowel were for explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of ی, Damm would be necessary in یَخْفَت: but, in reply to that, IH says that they pronounce [the ی] with Kasr in یَخْفَت for “explanation of the mode of formation” [484]. His argument is that indication of the mode of formation is more important than explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of ی or ی, because the first pertains to the sense, and the second to the form: but that, since indication of the mode of formation is not possible for them in یبَتْ یَغْت and یبَتْ یَغْت, from fear of missing the object altogether, because, if they pronounced the ی here with Fath, this would not indicate
the vowel of the ا, and moreover they would also omit
the explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of ا or
ي; contrary to جفط and جفط, which the Kasra shows
to be orig. pronounced with Kasr of the ا, so that here
they observe the explanation of the mode of formation
(Jrb). And [what] we say [is this]:—The ا in قول
[403], طول, وحلف, and the ا in بيع, جذب, being
mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath,
is converted into ل [684, 703]; so that they become
طال, حاتب, and باع and جذب: and, while the
ل remains, it is impossible to notify the mode of forma-
tion in these conjugs., and that they are orig. [on the
measure of] تعل [704], نعل, and نعل; because the ل
must be preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath;
but, when the mobile nom. prons. are attached to them,
the ج must be made quiescent, for the reason known [20,
403, 607, 692]; and, the ل being then elided in all of
them, because of the two quiescents [663], what pre-
vented the notification of the measure, i. e., the ل,
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 vocal-
izing the ج with a vowel like what was on the ا in the
o. f., because the variation in the measures of the tril. v.
is only through the vowels of the ا [482, 704]: but,
this notification not being possible in َفَعَلَ with Fathā of the ِنِلَا and ُبَعَتْ تَوَلَّون, where the vowels of the ِنِلَا and ِنِلَا are alike, they omit it; and notify the mode of formation in َفَعَلَ and ُبَعَتْ َحَافَد َفَعَلَ only: so that in َفَعَلَ, as ُجِحَفْتَ ُهِبَتْ [721], equalizing the cats. of ِنِلَا and ُيِدَا [in Kasr of the ِنِلَا], because the important [object] is to notify the mode of formation; and in َفَعَلَ, as ُطَقَتْ [721], the Damma being for explanation of the mode of formation, not for explanation of the [v. as a scion of] ِنِلَا, because of what we have [just] mentioned, and [because] in this conjug. no hollow [v.] belonging to the cat. of ُيِدَا occurs, which they might equalize with the cat. of ِنِلَا in Damm [of the ِنِلَا], as they equalize the two [cats. in Kasr] in [the conjug. of] َفَعَلَ, as ُجِحَفْتَ ُهِبَتْ [above], except ُعِبَيْوُ [704], the ُيِدَا of which is not converted into ُو, as we mentioned: and, since they have finished notifying the mode of formation in the conjugs. of َفَعَلَ and َفَعَلَ, while the like of that [notification] is not possible in َفَعَلَ, they intend in its case to notify the cats. of ِنِلَا and ُيِدَا, and the distinction between them, as the saying goes ِإِن لَمْ يَكُنْ خَلْلُ فََْكُحْرَ َIf there be not any vinegar, then wine; so that, after elision of the ُو because of the two quiescents, they import Damma into َقَالَ, putting it in place of the Fathā [on the ِنِلَا], and similarly Kasra
into بَعْ, in order that the first may indicate the, and the second the ي (R on the Preterite). Mz asserts that they transmute بَعْ and قَبَلَتُ to بَعْ and قَبَلَتُ فَعَلُ, as they transmute in بَعْ and قَبَلَتُ فَعَلُ and بَعْ and قَبَلَتُ (above) (IY). And Akh told us that some of the Arabs say كِبَيَدْ زَيْدٌ يَفْعَلُ Zaid was near doing and ما زَيْدٌ يَفْعَلُ ذَاكَ Zaid has not ceased doing that, meaning زَالَ and كَانَ (S). But [Z says that] they do not transmute without the [mobile] pron. [of the ag.] (M), because قُولْ بَعْ and قُولْ البَعْ would be mistaken for the pass. in بَعْ زَيْدٌ Zaid was sold and قُولُ الْقُولِ The saying was said, in the dial. of those who say that [436, 706] (IY); except in the sayings ما زَيْدٌ يَفْعَلُ ذَاكَ and كِبَيَدْ يَفْعَلُ كَذَا [above] transmitted from some of the Arabs (M), whence رَكِيدٌ قَبَعَ الْقُلُفِ يَأْكُلُنَّ جَثْتَى # وَرَكِيدٌ خَرَشَ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ يَبْتَمُ And the hyenas of the high ground, or of AlKuff [a valley of AlMadīna (Bk)], were near devouring my body, and Khirūs was near being fatherless after that, which As says that he heard some one recite. For كَانَ is فَعَلَ [463, 626], and so is زَالٌ, that being proved by the aor. يَكْفَانِ [482] and يَبْرَأَلْ [447]: but they transfer the Kasra from the ع to the ن, after eliding the vowel of the ن, so that the word becomes كِبَدَ and زَيْدٌ; and
they do not fear its being mistaken for فعل, because both [vs.] are intrans. (IY).

§. 706. When the ɤ of the pret., [either] tril., like قال [in the cat. of (Tsr)] and باع [in that of (Tsr)], or on [the measure of (Tsr)] اختيار or انتفع, like انتفع [in that of (Tsr)] and انتقد, submitted [in that of (Tsr)], is unsound, then [in the pass.] you may pronounce the preceding letter with (1) Kasr, (a) pure, [which is the dial. of Kuraish and their neighbours (Tsr)]; (b) smacking of Dammm, [which is the dial. of many of Kais and most of the Banu Asad (Tsr) : (a) the I is then, in either case, converted into Ꝟ: (2) pure Dammm, the I being then converted into Ꝟ, as حركت على نبرين "Alam and على "Alam [436], which [dial. (Tsr)] is rare; but [is found in the speech of Hudhail; and (Tsr)] is attributed to [all of (Tsr)] Faq'as and Dubair (Aud on the Pro-agent), who are among the chaste speakers of the Banu Asad; and is said by IUK in his commentary on the Tashil, and by RSht, to be transmitted from the Banu Dabba; and by IHsh to be transmitted from some of Tamim [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 انتفع and انتقد and اختر, which exceed
three [letters]; so that اَنْقُرُودَ and اَخْتُمُورَ are not said (Tsr): but [the well-known saying is (Tsr)] the first, [which (Tsr)] is the saying of IУ, AlUbbadî, and IM (Aud). The cat. of قِيلَ and بِعَ, [i.e., the tril. pret. pass. (Jrb),] has three dial. vars., (1) [pure (MASH)] Ci (SH), which is the chastest of them (MASH): (a) بِعَ is orig. بِعَ: then they make the Ci quiescent, from dislike to Kasra upon it after Đamma; so that, a quiescent Ci preceded by Đamma being produced, the ف is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the Ci may be sounded true: (b) then قِيلَ is made to conform to بِعَ: (c) by this the saying of S is strengthened against that of Akh [710], since they alter the vowel, not the consonant [below] (Jrb): (2) Ishmām (SH), i.e., making the ف smack of Đamm, for notification of the o.f.: (a) this dial. var. is chaste (Jrb): (3) [pure] تُرُولَ (SH): (a) تُرُولَ is orig. تُرُولَ: but, disliking Kasra upon the , after Đamma, they elide it, so that تُرُولَ becomes تُرُولَ: (b) then they make كُوَّدَعَ 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. تُرُولَ and
[436, 721, 724]: 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, قُرُول and بِيعَ remaining, (a) some convert the quiescent ي into ّ, because of the Damma of the preceding letter, saying بوع and بوع [436], which is the rarest of the dial. vars.: (b) the better [course] is to convert the Damma into Kasra in the cat. of ي, so that بيع remains, because alteration of a vowel is less [disturbing] than alteration of a consonant [above], and also because بيع is lighter than بوع; and then to make قُرُول conform to بيع , because, like the latter, unsound in the ع; so that, its ف being pronounced with Kasr, the quiescent ي is converted into ي: (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, بيع and قرول remaining, the quiescent ي is converted into ي, because of the Kasra of the preceding letter, as in مِرى‌ان [685 (case 5)]: (b)
some of them, says he, make the 出して quiescent, but do not transfer the Kasra to the preceding letter: so that the OrCreate remains in its [original] state; while the OrCreate is converted into OrCreate, because of [its quiescence and] the OrCreate of the preceding letter [636 (case 1)]: but this is the rarest of the OrCreate. vars., because OrCreate and OrCreate are heavy; and the first is better, because Kasra and OrCreate are light. The saying of OrCreate 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 OrCreate 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 OrCreate 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, vid. compressing the lips (a) while pronouncing the OrCreate, so that its vowel is between the vowels of OrCreate and Kasr, which is the well-known, notorious [way], used in reading [the Kur]; (b) while making the Kasra of the OrCreate pure; (c) a little before pronouncing the Kasra of the OrCreate, 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 ٢ of the word with a complete vowel compounded of two vowels, separately, not indivisibly, a preceding portion of Ḍamma, which is the smaller, followed immediately by a portion of Kasra, which is the larger, whence the ی becomes clear" [436] (Tsr). The essence of this Ishmām [436, 668, 697] is your directing the Kasra of the ٢ of the v. towards Ḍamma, so that the subsequent quiescent ی may incline a little towards ٢, 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 ٢; 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 Ḍamma 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] (IY). IH says "The object of Ishmām is to announce that the initials of these words are
orig. pronounced with Ḍamm" (R on IH). But, if that [mobile nom. pron. (Jrb)] which makes the ] quiescent [403] be attached to the cat. of ٛتٛ and ٛبٛعٛ Thou wast sold, O slave and ٛبٛعٛ Thou wast said, O saying [below], then [also three dial. vars. are allowable (Jrb),] Kasr [of the ف (Jrb)], Ishmān, and Ḍamm (SH). The َ 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 Ḍamm; (3) pure Ḍamm (R). IM asserts that what is ambiguous, whether Kasr, as in ٛعَقَتْ جَفْت and ٛبَعَتْ, or Ḍamm, as in ٛعَقَتْ جَفْت, [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 َخَافَى فَرْتُ زَيْنِ Zaid feared me and َبَاعَى لِعَالْرِهْ باَعٌى sold me to ‘Amr and َعَتَى عَن كِدَا hindered me from doing such a thing: then you [suppress the ag., and (Tsr)] put the vs. into the pass., [substituting a ُل for the ِ of the 1st pers. (Tsr)]; so that, if you said ٛعَقَتْ جَفْت I was feared and ٛعَقَتْ جَفْت I was sold with Kasr [of the خ and ب (Tsr)], and ٛعَقَتْ جَفْت I was hindered with Ḍamm [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 (Ts'r)] meaning would be reversed: and therefore only Ishmām or Dāmm must be allowed in the two first, [i.e., بعثُ (Ts'r);] and Ishmām or Kasr in the third, [i.e., عفتُ (Ts'r);] while the ambiguous mode [of vocalization], [vid. Kasr in the two first, and Dāmm in the third (Ts'r),] 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 في when pronounced with Dāmm in the *act.,* and Dāmm of the في when pronounced with Kasr in the *act.,* for distinction between the two [voices], which is obvious (Ts'r). 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 (Ts'r)], because [ambiguity is no preventive, since (Ts'r)] it exists in [n. and *v.* (Ts'r, Sn),] such as مُخَفَّأ choosing, or chosen, [an *act.* or *pass. part,* its *being converted from* a ي pronounced with Kasr or Fathā, respectively (Ts'r, Sn),] and تُضْاءُ (K, B), *act. or pass.,* the first *being pronounced [before the incorporation (Sn)]* with Kasr or Fathā, respectively
(TsSr, 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 [above]

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 ē𝐱𝐭𝐢ër and ān🇫阊, [i. e., of ān阊 from the hollow (R),] is like that of assertInstanceOf and بيب [in allowability of the three modes (R)] in both (SH) cases mentioned under ฎีൽ, i. e., absence, and attachment, of "that which makes the J quiescent" [above], the sense being that, in both cases, ē𝐱𝐭𝐢ër, like ฎีльц and بيب, ē IndexPath and ē IndexPath, have three states, [vid. in the first case] pure ฎ, which is the chastest; and Ishmām; and [pure] ฎ, like ฎхтвор and ฎنقوة [436]: and similarly [in the second case] pure
Kasr, which is the best known, like حَضِرَ (SH) and إِخْتَرْنَ and حَضِرَ (SH); and Ishmām; and [pure] ُدمَّ, like حَضِرَ and إِخْتَرْنَ (MASH): contrary to the cat. of حَضِرَ and إِخْتَرْنَ (SH), because ُدمَّ and Ishmām are allowable only in consequence of the ُدمَّ of the letter before the ُ (SH), whereas in حَضِرَ and حَضِرَ, ُدمَّ and إِخْتَرْنَ, the letter before the unsound letter is not pronounced with ُدمَّ; so that only pure Kasr is allowable (R). And [in the three states (MASH)] the [conj. (MASH)] حَمْزَة is pronounced (A, Tsr, MASH) like the third letter (Tsr), [i.e.,] with a vowel (A), vid. ُدمَّ, Kasr, or Ishmām (Sn), like [that of (A)] the ُ and ُ [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 ُدمَّ, absolutely, because he first lays down, unrestrictedly, that the initial of the [pass.] ُ is pronounced with ُدمَّ [436], and here confines himself to the currency of the three modes [of vocalization] in the letter before the ُ: so says RSht (Sn).

§. 707. The following cats. are [treated as] sound:—ما أَقُولُْ (1) حَمْزَة, [i.e., the ُ of wonder (MASH), as أَقُولُ ُ (R, Jrb), وَ لَوْ زَيدًا How well Zaid speaks! and أَقُولُ ُ (R, Jrb), ما أَبَيعَ ُ (Jrb),] because
(1485)

[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 & of superiority [351, 703] and the ep. & [348] (R) : (2) & (SH), i. e., the & of superiority (R, Jrb), as Zaid is a better speaker than 'Amr and & 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 & imputing a saying and of the & of superiority from & 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 & [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 & , when a n., complete, in order to
distinguish it from the plastic \textit{v. \ddash\ddash\ddash}, as \textit{اقام أفعال} and \textit{أفعال} [703] (S): but he makes the \textit{v. of wonder} conform to it (Jrb), [saying that] the \textit{ما أتباعه} \textit{أفعال} and \textit{أفعال} [above] is complete, because its sense is that of \textit{أفعال} \textit{الناس} the greatest doer of mankind; and similarly \textit{أفعال} because i. q. \textit{ما أفعاله} (S): whereas IH first does the reverse, by making the \textit{n. of superiority} conform to the \textit{v. of wonder}; and then mentions for the \textit{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 \textit{أفعال} of superiority is a \textit{n.}; while the \textit{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 \textit{ns.} [there] described are [so] transformed, as already explained, still the condition of the augmented kind commensurable with the \textit{v.}, when we intend its \textit{ع} to be transformable, is that it should be different from the \textit{v. in some respect} [703, 712]; whereas this [\textit{n.}] does not differ from the \textit{v. in anything} : (c) [if any excuse for the omission to transform were required,] his [second] saying “because it might be mistaken” would suffice (R); (3) \textit{إجتبوتروا} \textit{إيروجوا} [492, 684 (condition 9, a)], because i. q. \textit{تفاعَلموا} [703] (SH), i. e., 
\textit{تَبَارَجا} and \textit{تَيَبَارَجا} (Jrb): (a) if the sense of \textit{تَبَارَجا} be
not intended in [sought out (MAR)] and [703, 706]: (4) [the conjug. of] [684 (conditions 7, 8, b)], [703], and had the disease termed [below], because the transformation of such as [703] besides being contrary to the general rule, [since the ] is not preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is only for conformity with the transformed tril. [ ); whereas there is no transformed tril. here (R): (5) the conjug. of became blind of one eye and became black [714], because of ambiguity [below] (SH), since, if the , were converted into !, its vowel being transferred to the preceding letter, the conj. Hamza and one of the two !s would be elided; so that and would remain, which might be mistaken for the act. part. of the reduplicated: (a) there is no reason for his saying “because of ambiguity” [above], since non-transformation requires to be excused only where a cause [of transformation] exists, but no transformation takes place; while the cause of transformation, in the v. whose , or is preceded by a quiescent, is its being a deriv. of a v. whose transformation is authorized, as in [703]; whereas and are not transformed, so that and might be made conformable to.
them; nay, the case is reversed [below]: (b) if indeed it be asked "How is it that إسْوَانٌ اْعْوَارَ are not transformed, when they appear to be like أَتْوَمُ [703]?", the answer is that there is a distinction between them, vid. that the cause [of transformation] exists in أَتْوَمُ, not in إسْوَانٌ [or or إسْوَانٌ] (R): (6) the conjug. of (MASH) عَوْرُ became blind of one eye and سُوُنٌ became black [and صِيَّدُ (S, Jh, M)], because i. q. إعْوَارُ and إسْوَانٌ (SH) and إصْبِدُ [above] (Jh), since the original conjugs. for colors and external defects are أَتْوَمُ and إفَعَالَ [493A]; so that, though the tril. is the original of the augmented in form, still, since these two conjugs. are original in sense the case is reversed [above], the tril.-being treated like the augmented in respect of soundness, to notify the originality of the augmented in the sense mentioned [684 (conditions 7, 8, b)] (R): (a) لْيِسُ [447] is made quiescent [in the ع] from لْيِسُ، like صِيَّدُ [456, 703], as they say عُلْمُ knew for عَلْمُ [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) صِيَّدُ، where the ع is sounded true (IY),] or قَابُ، [where the ع is transformed (IY);] but into the form of what is [a pure p. (IY),] not a v., as لْيِبُتُ: (b) for the same reason they do not transfer the vowel of the ع to
the في لستُ [703] (M), لستُ (IY) : (c) the proof that the ع [of ليست] is [orig.] pronounced with Kasr is that Fatha of the ع is not elided, ضَرَبُ not being said [for علَمُ علَمَ], as is said for علَمُ [Note on p. 246, l. 2]; and that the conjug. of فعلُ with دامم [of the ] does not occur in the الس cat. of the hollow, except [704], which is anomalous (R) : (7) the variations of those [vs. (Jrb)] whose ع is sounded true, like (a) أعَزَّتْهُ إِسْتَعْرَتْهُ (SH), if you were to form عُورُ (M), and إِسْتَنْعَلْتُ إِسْتَعْرَتْهُ (S, M), because their o. f. عُرْر or صَيدَ is not transformed, so that they might be conformable to it in transformation (R); and [similarly (R)] (b) مُتَقَالُ and مُبَابِعُ (SH), act. parts. of قَارَلٌ and بَيَّعٌ [683 (case 1, a), 703] (Jrb), and عَلْر [683 (case 2), 708] (SH), because the transformation of such as قَارَلٌ and بَيَّعٌ is for conformity to its transformed v. [684, 703], whereas the vs. of these things are not transformed (R); and (c) أسْوَنَ [348, 712] (SH), the ep. آَفُعلُ [above] from سَوْدَ (MASH). But sometimes the conjug. of فعلُ from [inf. ns. denoting] defects is transformed, as

ضَمَسْتُنِى بَلاً - أَحَمَّرْ مِنْ رَآئَدِي أُعَلَّتُ عَيْنِيَّةَ أَمْ لَمْ تَعَارَ
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 لم تَعَرَّن, with the single corrob. ن for which the poet substitutes the 1 of pause [614, 649, 684] (IY). And he that says عَار says and استعار and عِئَر (SH), its derivs. also being then transformed (R). Such [formations], however, as 338 صدَّرت I made good (M), whence I أطبعت [338], whereas أطبعت 338, 685 إستَصْوَد, [565] إستَصْوَد [703] إستَصْوَد (IY), (case 6, c), 699 (M), as إستَصْوَد عليهم أَلْشِيْطَانُ LVIII. 20. The devil hath gotten the mastery over them (IV), and أطيببت (IV), I found [and إستفوق (IV),] and I made good (M), whence أطبت in HB's reading حَتَّى إِذَا أَخَذَ الْأَرْضُ زَخْرَفَهَا وَأَزِينَت X. 25. [Until when the earth taketh its garniture, and becometh possessed of adornment (K, B)] on the measure of أَفْعَلَت (IY), and وأَفْعَلَت became like an elephant, deviate from 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 ه and ى, when near the end [of the word], and preceded by an aug., are converted into 1, provided that, to the cause requiring conversion [684,
703], another requirer be adjoined, because the cause is then weak through the separation of the ۰ and ی from the Fatha by the ۱, and their not being at the end. That [other] requirer is (1) either resemblance to the transformed v. [703], or conveyance of its sense, and exercise of its government [703], as in ۰ قَاتِمٌ [343] and ۰ بَئِعٌ [below]: (2) enclosure of the ۱ 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 ۰ُو أَنْتَلُ [703, 715], and ۰ُو وَأَنْتَلُ, عِكَّاتِلُّ, بَائِعَةٌ, pls. of ۰ُو أَنْتَلُ, and یُّو أَنْتَلُ, عِكَّاتِلُّ, بَائِعَةٌ: (3) the ۰ and ی's being in the ultimate pl. in whose sing. they are aug. letters of prolongation, as in ۰ُبَائِعَةٌ [717] and ۰ُجَدْوَلُ عِكَّاتِرُ [661], because of the intention to distinguish the two aug. letters of prolongation from the ۰ and ی that have a vowel in the sing., whether they be rad., as in مَقَائِمُ and مَعَايِشُ, pls. of مَقَائِمَةٌ and مَعَايِشَةٌ [717]; or aug., as in ۰ُعِثَرَ وَجَدَوْلُ [253], pls. of ۰ُعِثَرَةٌ and ۰ُجَدْوَلُ [374]: since that ۰ or ی which has an original vowel, being hardier and stronger, is not converted. But, when the ۰ and ی are far from the end, as in طَوْارِيسُ [pl. of طَوْارِيِّس] peacock (KF)], they are not converted into ۱ [715]. According to this, it is plain to you that the Hamza in such as ۰ْدَآءٍ and ۰ْسَآءٍ [683 (case 1), 723], ۰ْتَلُّ and ۰ْبَئِعٌ
[683 (case 2)], \( \text{وآئل} \) and \( \text{وبتغ} \) [683 (case 4), 715], and \( \text{kبئر} \) and \( \text{عجكئر} \) [683 (case 3), 717], is orig. \( \text{I} \) converted from \( \text{و} \) and \( \text{ق} \). For, since mobilization of the \( \text{I} \) is needed, [in order to avoid a concurrence of two quiescents,] while its conversion into \( \text{و} \) or \( \text{ق} \) is disallowed, because we have only just escaped from them, it is converted into a letter that, after \( \text{و} \) and \( \text{ق} \), is most akin to it, vid. Hamza, because both are guttural [732]. The first \( \text{I} \) is not elided [723], for avoidance of] the two quiescents, as is necessary in the like [663], because the \( \text{I} \) of such as \( \text{قئل} \) is the sign of the act. part., and the \( \text{I} \) of such as \( \text{أوئل} \) and \( \text{عجكئر} \) is the sign of the pl.; while such as \( \text{دآ} \), if the \( \text{I} \) were elided, would be confounded with the abbreviated. But, as for the Hamza in such as \( \text{رسئل} \) [246, 683 (case 3, a), 717], it is a subst. for the \( \text{I} \) in the sing., not for the \( \text{I} \) converted from \( \text{و} \) or \( \text{ق} \) (R). The \( \text{و} \) and \( \text{ق} \) are converted into Hamza [below] in [the act. part. of the unaugmented tril. (Jrb),] such as \( \text{تئل} \) and \( \text{بئع} \) [683 (case 2), 703, 712], whose v. is transformed; contrary to \( \text{صاید} \) and \( \text{عالر} \) [below] (SH). The saying of the GG, in this cat., "The \( \text{و} \) and \( \text{ق} \) are converted into Hamza" [above] is not in accordance with reality, because the \( \text{ع} \) is converted into \( \text{I} \) [683 (case 2, c)], which is then converted into Hamza; so that the \( \text{و} \) and
 seem to be converted into Hamza (R). The o. fs. of بَأَيْعٍ and تَأَوَّلُ، vid. بَأَيْعٍ تَأَوَّلُ and تَأَوَّلُ، 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 َ 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 Fatha, is converted into ِ, as being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 703]: or because they consider the ِ equivalent to Fatha [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 َ representing] the Hamza, as H dots it, in the “Speckled Epistle”, in such as نَأَيْلُ يُكَذِّبُ فَضَّلَ، where he says And the gift of his hands has been abundant, is a mistake (Jrb). As for َعارِر [683 (case 2), 707], صَبَّيدُ.
[above], and the like, the َع (in them) is sounded true, not converted into Hamza, because sounded true in the 
َع, as َثَكُف َعَرْز and ُصَيْد َعَز (707), since the act. part. is conform-
able to its v. in respect of sounding true and transforma-
tion [683 (case 2, b)] ; and, for the same reason, the َع is 
sounded true in َمُبَابِن َمَقاَمَ, and the like [707], because 
sounded true in َبَاَيِن َقَاَمَ (703) (IY). Some of the 
Arabs transpose the َع and َد in some act. parts. of the 
hollow, and then subject the act. part. to the same 
transformation as َقَاَضَ (16, 719), as

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

(1494)
(...)

(R), by Tarif Ibn Tamim alAmbari (S, IAth) atTamimi 
(IAth), Then seek to know me : verily I, or that I, this 
one, am such that sharpen is my weapon in mishaps, am 
a bearer of the cognizance, or badge, or device, of the 
valiant (MAR). This is what has beguiled Khl 
[below] into venturing upon transposition in the whole 
act. part. of the hollow whose َد is a Hamza. For he 
says that, since they transpose the [َع and َد of the 
hollow] sound in the َد, 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 شَوَاعٍ, by transposition, for شَأَعْ [pl. dispersed], he says that in such as خطابًا and [661, 726], and جَوَا and شَوَعْ [248, 726], transposition is more appropriate. But the answer is that they resort to transposition in شَأَعٍ and only from fear of Hamza after the I; whereas, in such as جاء [below], one Hamza after the I is inseparable, whether the ج and ع be transposed, or not (R). And [S says that (R)] most of the Arabs say لَاتٌ and شَأَعٍ (S, R), by elision of the ع (R). But such as شَأَعٍ and شَأَعٍ are anomalous (SH). شَأَعٍ is from شَوَعْ, i. e., vehemence of prowess or valour (IY, Jrb), and point or edge, and weapon (IY); or [from] يَشَأَعْ (Jh, KF), inf. n. شَوَعُ, 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) شَأَعَتِكَ [276], with Hamza, according to rule (IY, Jrb), like بَعَشُ [above] (IY); (2) شَأَعَ [276, 278], by relegation of the ع to the position of the ج, [its measure being فَعَلْ (Jrb), of the class of the defective (IY),] like نَعَضُ [16] (IY, Jrb) and غَعْ [685] (IY):
(a) similarly لَاتُ الْعَبَّامَةَ عَلَيْ رَاسِهِ [278], from He wound the turban upon his head, aor. يَلْوَثُ (IY, Jrb), inf. n. لُوْتُ (Jrb); and as IX. 110. [276], i. e., حَاكَرُ [IY]: (3) لَاتُ شَالُ [276, 278], by elision of the [above] (IY, Jrb). Z says in the K [on IX. 110.] (Jrb), حَاكَرُ is [i. q.] حَاكَرُ, i. e., cracked, on the point of being demolished and falling: but its measure is فَعَلُ, abbreviated from حَلَفُ فَعَلُ, like حَلَفُ [pregnant she-camels (Jh, KF)] from حَلَفُ; while its counterparts are شَالُ [711] and صَائِنُ صَائِنُ and شَائِكُ: and its لَاتُ is not the لَاتُ of فَعَلُ; but only its عُ, the o. f. being حِرْزٌ, شَوَكٌ, and صَوْتٌ (K, Jrb). And [R says that] لَاتُ and لَاتُ may be orig. لُوْتُ and شَوَّلُ, intensive forms of لَاتُ and شَائِكُ [343], like عَمِيلٌ and لَيسُ عَمِيلٌ for عَمِيلٌ and لَيسُ [312], in which case they are like كَبَشُ صَافٍ [703] and يَومٍ رَاحٍ "windy day" (R). But this is contrary to what Z mentions in the M, about what has a rad. letter elided from it, and not restored in the dim. [276], which is confirmed by what IH mentions in the CM on this passage of the M, vid. that حَاكَرُ 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] قَالَ
[above], where the \( \text{i} \) is quasi-expressed, its elision being accidental, as [you see in] \( \text{I saw a little judge} \); so that it must be \( \text{f} \), its \( \text{u} \) being elided: while this [conclusion] is corroborated by what is mentioned in some of the Glosses (Jrb). The o. f. of \( \text{H\text{a}r} \) and \( \text{S\text{a}r\text{\text{a}r}} \) is \( \text{S\text{\text{a}r\text{\text{a}r}}\text{\text{a}r} \text{\text{a}r}} \) and \( \text{S\text{\text{a}r\text{\text{a}r}}\text{\text{a}r} \text{\text{a}r}} \): so that the \( \text{u} \) is irregularly elided; the rule being to convert it into Hamza [above], as \( \text{S\text{\text{a}r\text{\text{a}r}}\text{\text{a}r} \text{\text{a}r}} \) and \( \text{S\text{\text{a}r\text{\text{a}r}}\text{\text{a}r} \text{\text{a}r}} \), which also occur, on the measure of \( \text{\text{\text{a}l} \text{\text{a}l}} \) (Sn on the Diminutive): [or] it seems that they convert the \( \text{u} \) into \( \text{I} \), and then elide the \( \text{I} \) because of the two quiescent; and do not mobilize [it], in order to escape from Hamza: the elided [\( \text{I} \)] 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, \( \text{\text{\text{a}l} \text{\text{a}l}} \) [by elision of the \( \text{u} \), considered as \( \text{\text{\text{a}l} \text{\text{a}l}} \) or \( \text{\text{\text{a}l} \text{\text{a}l}} \) Hamza, from \( \text{\text{\text{a}l} \text{\text{a}l}} \). Some say that the \( \text{aug.} \) \( \text{I} \) is elided, and the \( \text{u} \) converted into \( \text{I} \), because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath. Their measure is then \( \text{\text{\text{a}l} \text{\text{a}l}} \) with quiescence of the \( \text{u} \) from regard to its state after conversion, and with Kasr of the \( \text{u} \) from regard to its state before conversion. But A proceeds on [the assumption] that the elided is the \( \text{u} \), since he says “And \( \text{\text{\text{a}l} \text{\text{a}l}} \) 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 جاهم [661] there are two sayings:—(1) Khl [above] says that it is transposed, like شالك: (2) it is said [by others] to be [formed] according to rule (SH). But َّاقَال [247, 373] is treated as sound, like what is not a n. [on the measure] of a v. [703, 712]: you say َّقَال and بَياَع (S).

§ 709. When [the pass. part. (MKh)] مَفْعُولٌ is formed from the tril. (MKh) v. whose ع is unsound, ى or و, the same transfer and elision are necessary as in استفعال [338, 697, 703, 714]; so that from َّقَال you say مَفْعُولٌ مَبِيع and مَفْعُولٌ مَبِيع [347, 703]. The o. f. is مَفْعُولٌ مَبِيع: but the vowel of the ع is transferred to the preceding quiescent; and, since two quiescents, the ع and the مَفْعُولٌ مَبِيع, then concur, the مَفْعُولٌ مَبِيع is elided (IA), according to S (MKh) مَبِيع ought to be said for مَبِيع (IA), like مَيْتِين for مُيْتِين [686] (MKh); but they convert the دamma into Kasra, in order that the ى may be sounded true (IA). The elided, (1) according to S, is the مَفْعُولٌ [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 $\mathbf{i}$ in the *pass. part.* [of the hollow] belonging to the *cat.* of $\mathbf{i}$ remains extant, as $\mathbf{مَبِيع}$, he opines that in it the $\mathbf{مَفْعُول}$ is the [quiescent] elided, and then extends this decision to the hollow belonging to the *cat.* of $\mathbf{j}$ : (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 $\mathbf{j}$ and $\mathbf{i}$ respectively, which, if the first [quiescent] were elided, would be liable to confusion, one with another: (d) when the $\mathbf{j}$ of $\mathbf{مَبِيع}$ is elided, the $\mathbf{ضَامِم}$ is pronounced as Kasra, in order that the $\mathbf{i}$ may be preserved, by analogy to the saying of S on such as $\mathbf{تَيْبِيع}$ from $\mathbf{بَايُبِيع}$ [710] (R): (2) according to Akh, is the $\mathbf{ع}$: [that is plain in the *cat* of $\mathbf{j}$ (MASH)]; while [in the *cat.* of $\mathbf{i}$ (MASH)] the $\mathbf{مَفْعُول}$ is, according to him, converted into $\mathbf{i}$ 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 $\mathbf{j}$ and $\mathbf{i}$, as is the rule in a concurrence of two quiescents: (b) it being said to him "Then, according to thee, $\mathbf{مَبِيع}$ ought to remain: so what is this $\mathbf{i}$ in $\mathbf{مَبِيع}$?"; he said "When the $\mathbf{ضَامِم}$ 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 Damma of the preceding letter converted into Kasra, not when it is going to be elided: so that, according to his opinion, one should rather say "First the ی is elided; and then the Damma is converted into Kasra, and the , 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 , on account of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Damm [710], though the ی [so converted] is going to remain; whereas here he converts the Damma of the letter before the ی into Kasra, notwithstanding that the ی is going to be elided (R). The sound [opinion] is that the elided is the second [quiescent], because it is aug. [338], and near the end (Aud); but Akh holds that the elided is the ی of the word, because the ی is often exposed to elision in other positions than this [703] (Tsr). The [effect of the dispute appears in the (Tsr)] measure [of preserved
(A), which (Tsr], according to S, is مَفْعُولٍ [with Damm of the ب , and quiescence of the ع (Sn)]; and, according to Akh, is مَفْعُولٌ (A, Tsr). And the utility of the dispute is displayed in such as مَسْوَرَتُ 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 ع , and then eliding it, according to the opinion of S [below] (Sn). IJ says, F having asked me about the alleviation of مَسْوَرَتُ , I said " According to the saying of Akh, I say رَأَيت مَسْوَرَتُ I saw a vexed, as you say مَقْرِرٌ for مَفْعُولٌ [658], because, according to him, the of مَسْوَرَتُ ] is the of مَفْعُولٌ ; but, according to the opinion of S [above], I say حَبَّ رَأَيت مَسْوَرَتُ , as you say حَبَّ [by elision of the Hamza after transfer of its vowel to the ب (Sn)] for حَبَّ [658], the ب being mobile, because, in his opinion, it is the ع " : and F then said " So it is " (A), i. e., the alleviation of مَسْوَرَتُ , because the mobile Hamza, when the [quiescent] ب , before it is a non-co-ordinative aug., is converted into ب , and has the [preceding] ب incorporated into it ; but, when the [quiescent] ب , before it is a rad., has its vowel transferred to the ب , and is elided [658] (Sn). But مَشُوبٌ for مَشِيِّب مَشُوب mixed, [as
(Jh, IY), by AlMukhabbal or AsSulaik, Flesh laid out in the court to dry, and water of cooking-pots in the bowls, mixed with seeds for seasoning and with sauces, will suffice thee for the sour milk of the people (MAJh),] from شاب aor. يُشْوَب, [inf. n. شرب mixing (MAR),] and for منول given, from نال gave, aor. ينول, and لمْبِثْي blamed, as though formed according to [the pass. (Jh)] شيب was mixed [436, 706], نيل was given, and ليم was blamed, are anomalous; as likewise is مهوب [for مهيب dreaded (Jh), as

وَتَأْوِى إِلَى زِمْب مَسَاكِينَ دُمِهُمُ * فَلاً لَا نَحْطَاةُ الْرَّذَالِ مَهُوُبُ (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 مُهِيبَة dread, as though formed according to [the dial. of those who say in (IY) the pass. (Jh, IY)] هُوَب [436, 706] (R). The Banu Tamim treat the cat. of ي as sound; [but not the cat. of , because ي is lighter to them than , (Tsr):] so that they say مَبْيَعٌ sold and مَخْيِطُ sewn (Aud), as they say مَصْرُوبٌ [347]; and that is regular,
according to them (Tsr). A [Tamimi (MN, Tsr)] poet says, [describing wine (Tsr),]

(1503)

...according to them (Tsr). A [Tamimi (MN, Tsr)] poet says, [describing wine (Tsr),]
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 هيل, inf. n. رجل مدين and مهيب and مهيب and مهيب or a man indebted and معين or معين overlooked, i. e., that the evil eye has smitten, are anomalous; and hence

نيشت قومك يرعونك سيدا * واحال انذا سيد معين

[below] I have been told that thy people assert thee to be a chief; but I fancy etc. [above] (D). But the case is not as H says: for معين and معين have been heard from the Arabs, contrary to rule; while theKF has وهو معين or معين He is upbraided, and also هو معين or معين It is sold; and all of this is according to the o. f., so that what H mentions is only from crabbedness. And معين or معين is said, as نيشت قومك دوم معين [above] (CD). And they say مزيوت or مزيوت طعام مزييت or food dressed with olive-oil, [the like of] which is frequent (IY). Mb says that the pass. part. in the cat. of ي may be complete in poetry, citing the saying of 'Alkama...
[above] as an instance of that (CD). But this is a Tāmi-mi dial. (A). ISh says "The Arabs differ about the pass. part. in the cat. of ی: for the Banū Tāmīm make it complete, saying مَثَبَّت, مَفْعُول, مَدْرَوْف, مَقْتُول, and مَثِيب, مُكِيل, مَكْيِل, and مَيْت [above]. But both parties agree upon making it defective in the cat. of ی, except what occurs anomalously, vid. تَلْفَظَ مَقْتُول, فَمَمْتُ مَقْتُول, بَسَك مَدْرَوْف, and a word said; where the better-known [form] is مَقْتُول, مَدْرَوْف, مَصْوُون, and مَفْعُول" (CD). Some of the Arabs treat a few pass. parts. in the cat. of ی as sound, whence تَلْفَظَ مَصْوُون a garment preserved, [from صَان, aor. يُصَن (Tsr); and مَسْك مَدْرَوْف (A, Tsr), i.e., moistened musk (Tsr, Sn);] and بَسَك مَمْتُ مَقْتُول a led horse (Aud, A), from قَال, aor. يُقْوُد; and بَسَك مَمْتُ مَقْتُول a saying said, from قَال (Tsr); which have been heard (Aud). And Mb allows completion of مَفْعُول from [the cat. of ی, as مَدْرَوْف مَعْوُد a sick man visited; that, says he, not being heavier than inf. n. of سَرَت I leaped and غَوْر inf. n. of غَار 683], because سَوْر and مَصْوُون [above] contain two s and two ַDammas; whereas مَصْوُون contains, with two s, only one ַDamma (IY). But that is not regular, contrary to the opinion of Mb (A).
The opinion of [S (IY),] the author of the Book [11], in the case of every \( \text{ي} \) being a quiescent \( \text{غ} \) preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, is that the Damma is converted into Kasra, in order that the \( \text{ي} \) may be preserved (M). But Akh differs from him in this rule, and substitutes \( \text{ر} \) for the \( \text{ي} \) (IY). S converts the Damma into Kasra, in order that the \( \text{ي} \) may be preserved; and does not convert the \( \text{ي} \) into \( \text{ر} \), because the first [method] involves less alteration [706]. But Akh reverses the matter, adducing as evidence their agreement upon conversion of the \( \text{ي} \), when \( \text{ف} \), into \( \text{s} \) because of Damma on the preceding letter, as in [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 \( \text{ي} \) is near the end, as in what we are discussing (R). Therefore, when such [a َفُلُ (IY)] as [the sing.] ُبِرَد a kind of striped garment is formed from [ٌبَيْض sale and (IY)] ُثَنَبَّ whiteness, S says [ٌبِعْ and (IY)] َبُطْرَض; but Akh says [ٌبَعْ and] َبُطْرَض; and restricts conversion [of the Damma] to the pl., such as َبُطْرَض pl. of َأَبْيَض [686 (case 1, a, \( \gamma \)), 718 (M), where, the pl. being heavier than the sing. [below], he substitutes Kasra for Damma, in order that the word may not increase in heaviness (IY). Similarly such [sings.] as ُنَعْلَم saying and ُدِيكَ cock, according to S, may be َفُلُ or
but Akh differs from him in that, holding that their measure must be [أَعْلَل] according to the apparent [form] (BS). And مَعْيَشَة [333, 686], (1) according to S, may be (a) مَفْعُولاً (M), in which case it contains transfer and conversion, transfer of the دَامَّم to the ف, and its conversion into كَسْر, in order that the ى may be sounded true (IY); (b) مَفْعُولاً (M), in which case the vowel of the ع is transferred to the ف, nothing else [being done] (IY): (2) according to Akh, is [only (IY)] مَفْعُولا'; while, if it were مَعْيَشَة مَفْعُولا, you would say مَعْيَشَة (M). But Akh contravenes this rule in such [pass. parts.] as مُسِيب [709], where the elided, according to him, is the ع of the word, because it is the first of the two quiescents [663]: so that [first] the دَامَّم [of the ى in مُسِيب] is transferred to the ع and مُسِيب [respectively], for transformation [697, 703]; then كَسْر is substituted for it, in order that the ى may be preserved; and then the ى is elided, because of the two quiescents; so that the [quiescent] and, coming immediately after كَسْر, is converted into ى [685 (case 5)]. Therefore the measure of the word, according to him, becomes مَفْيِل; and this demolishes what he sets up [above] as a rule (IY). And, when a [n.~] like تَرْبَة [274, 678] is formed from بَعْع , S says تَرْبَة [709, 712];
but Akh says $\overline{\text{تَبَنِّع}}^\text{[712]}$, changing the $\overline{\text{ي}}$ into $\overline{\text{و}}$, because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with Dainm, as in $\text{مُوسِر}$ [above] and $\text{مَرْتُن}$ [686], because Kasra is not substituted [by him] for Damma in what is a sing. [above]. And, but for the saying of the Arabs $\text{مَيِّع}$ [above], Akh's rule would be sound, strong; but hearsay furnishes cause for dissatisfaction with his rule (IY). And $\text{مُضَوْفَة}$ in the saying [of Abū Jundab alHudhallī (DH, Jh, MN)]

[And I was wont, when my neighbour called me for a matter that was feared, to tuck up my waist-wrappnor 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 $\overline{\text{تَوُّد}}$ [684, 703, 711] and $\text{الْقَصَرِي}$ [685 (case 6, c), 725] (M), by rule $\text{مَضَيْفَة}$ (IY); but, according to Akh, regular (M). $\text{ضَعَتْ الْجُلُر}$ is from $\text{مُفْعَلَة}$ $\text{مُضَوْفَة}$ [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 $\text{أَصَفَتْ مِنْ آَلَمِر}$, 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 ꞌDamma into Kasra, but the ى into ی (Jrb). This verse, however, is [said by Skr to be (Jh)] related in three ways, with ُمضَرَّةٌ [above], مَضْبِيَّةٌ, and ُمضَافَةٌ (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 ُبابُ door and ُدارُ house [684, 703], شَكْرَّةٌ شَابَّةٌ thorny tree and ُيِجْدُ مَالٌ [703], [and the like, which, being of the same formation as the v. (IY),] because on [the measure of] فَعَلُ and ُفَعَلَ (M), ُدَارُ and ُبَابُ on [the measure of] فَعَلُ [with Fath of the ع], and ُشَّاكِّةٌ ُمَالٌ [708] and ُمَالٌ on [that of] فَعَلُ with Kasr of the ع, have their ع converted [into َ], because mobile and preceded by a Fatha; so that they become among ns. like ُتَأَلَّ and ُبَأَعُ 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 ُقَالَ and ُبَابُ, and ُبَابُ and...
, into a letter, vid. 1, with which one is absolutely safe from a vowel [703]; for which reason 1, according to them, is equivalent to a mobile letter, because it is incapable of receiving a vowel, as the mobile letter is incapable of receiving another vowel (IY). Such [trills.], however, sometimes remain sound, [as though serving to notify the o. f. (IY),] like (1) خونه and لومة and جومة [pl. of جاثر acting wrongfully (KF), which belong to the cat. of للباب and دار (IY))];

(2) رجل رَع [below] (M), which belong to the cat. of شاكه and سمال (IY). Their sayings روَح خَاليل [684], غَيب [257, 684], خول [dependents, sing. خاليل (MAR),] and تَرَد [above] are anomalous; and so are رجل خول an artful man and روَح [above]. But فُعل with دام of the ح does not occur in the hollow n., from the heaviness of دامم [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) لومة blaming much (IY), نومة [sleeping much (IY)], and عيبة [703] (M) one that upbraids people much, where the formation becomes [a preventive of transformation,] like the augment in صررى جولان and [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], \( عَمَّس \) [685, 713] (M), \( حَوْل \) [below], and \( وَلْت \) \( teth \), all of which are [treated as] sound because their formation differs from that of vs.:

(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, in such as \( لُوْمَة \) and \( عَبْبَة \), since the preceding letter is pronounced with Damm; and at \( ی \) in such as \( جَوْل \) and \( پْرْوَل \), since the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr; contrary to such as \( بَبْن \) and \( دَار \), where we arrive at \( ی \), a letter with which one is safe from a vowel (IY). They transform \( ۪یَمَم \) [685, 713] only because it is an inf. \( n. \), i. q. \( ۪یَمُ \); [though] used as an ep. in [the reading (IY)] VI. 162. [368, 713] (M): and, but for that [quality of inf. \( n. \)], it would be [treated as] sound, like \( حَوْل \) [removal from one place to another, which is a simple substantive (Jh, KF)] in \( لا یَبْغِرَ عَنْهَا حُوْلَ \) 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. \( حَال \), aor. \( یَحْوُل \), you would say \( جِیَل \), 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 "لقاء" inf. n. of لَتَّ (713), and "لِوان" inf. n. of لَوْن (685 (case 2, b), 699, 711), because of the connection between them (IY): while "حَوُل inf. n. of حَال [685 (case 2, d), 713] is [explained] by Z as anomalous (IY),] like "كُون [above] (M); though the [better] account is what we have premised, [vid. that "حَوُل is a simple substantive, not an inf. n.,] because it is [then] regular (IY). And "فعل, (1) if from [the cat. of]و, has its ع made quiescent, because of the combination of two Dammas and the و, as "نور [712, 721] and "عور, pls. of "نوار and "عور [246]; but in poetry is uncontracted, [according to the o. f. (IY),] as "ئَيأَرَتْ التَّنُّبَايَا آلُح [246, 712] (M) and آلْبَلَكْ آلَلامَعِّياء آلْح [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 ، [683], that [substitution] is allowable, because the ، is pronounced with Damm (IY): (2) if from [the cat. of]ى، is like the sound: he that says "بِيَنَّكُتِبَ and رَسُلُ says غيِّر and بَيِّنُ in the pl. of غيِّر [246, 348] and بَيِّنَوُس [246]; while he that says كُتِبَ and رَسُلُ says غيِّر and بَيِّنُ [246] (M), because, being
it is subject to the same [transformation] as the pl. of ُبِضْن [686 (case 1, α, γ), 718] (IY).

§. 712. The condition of transformation of the ع in the n. [of more than three letters, like ُتَفَعَّلَ and ُمَفَعَّلَ (Jrb),] not tril., [like ُبَاب and ُتَأَب (MASH),] nor conformable [below] to the v. [like the inf. n. and act. and pass. parts (MASH),] but such as has not been [hitherto] mentioned [below], is agreement with the v. in vowel and quiescence, together with difference from it in an augment, [like the م of ُمَفَعَّلَ (MASH),] or a mode of formation, [like ُتَفَعَّلَ (MASH),] peculiar to the n. (SH). In the tril. [n.], together with commensurability with the v. [703, 711], no difference is prescribed. The reason why difference is not prescribed in the tril., but is prescribed in the augmented, is that [without difference] the augmented, if transformed, would, when used as a [proper] name [18], be confounded with the v., because of the omission of Kasra and Tanwin [17]; whereas the tril., even if a proper name, is distinguished from the v. by its Kasra and Tanwin. By “conformable” [248, 252, 331, 343, 349] IH means (1) the inf. n., such as ُقَصَمَة] and ُأَقَامَة [703]: (2) the act. and pass. parts. from the tril. and non-tril. [703, 708, 709, 714]: (a) they may be said to contain commensurability, ُقَاعِلٌ
being on the measure of [343, 703, 714] in respect of vowels and quiescences; and the, in [مُفعَل], being contrary to the o. f., which is [مُفعَل], like [347, 703, 714]. IH's saying "such as has not been [hitherto] mentioned" is not needed, because, for conversion of the e into l [703], every 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 tril. [703, 711] and the augmented; together with the difference specified [above], in the case of the augmented: and similarly for transfer of the vowel from the e of the augmented to the preceding quiescent, except in such as [بُكْرَة] and [مُسَتَقَمَة] [697, 699, 703], which, notwithstanding [their] lack of the agreement specified, contain transfer and conversion, because of their perfect affinity to their v.; and except in the cat. of [بَوْأَنْعِ] [703, 708, 715], which also, notwithstanding [its] lack of agreement, contains conversion, because of [its] extreme heaviness. In the augmented tril., then, together with commensurability with the v., difference from it in some respect is prescribed, like the aug. letter (1) not used as an aug. in the v., like the م of [مَقَام] and مَأْمَل [703]; for in the o. f. [مَقَوم] they are like تَحْبَس Thou praisest, and تُحْبَس Thou art praised, but in the initials of the v. م is not used as an augment: (2) used as an augment in the
but mobilized with a vowel not used as its vowel in the \( v \), as تَفُ عُل on the measure of كَفُ عُل with كَسَر of the \( \text{ع} \) and فَاتِحَة of the \( ا \); for it is commensurable with \([ \text{the imp.} ]\) كُنْتَ حُكَمْ You know thou, but in the initial of the \( v \), there is no aug. 

\( \text{ت} \) pronounced with كَسَر, such \([ \text{a formation} ]\) as تَعْدُم being \([ \text{merely} ]\) a 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 \([404] \). Sometimes the augmented 

tril. is transformed because of a difference other than the two mentioned, as 

\( ^\circ \text{تَعْدُم} \) and 

\( ^\circ \text{تَفُ عُل} [683 \text{ (case 2), 703, 708} ]: \) for they are commensurable with تَفُ عُل \([ \text{above} ]\); but their aug. is not in the same place as, nor identical with, its aug. \([ \text{R} ]\). Therefore, if from تَعْدُم you formed \([ \text{an augmented tril. } n. \] , (1) like مَضْرِب [361] and تَحْلي* [372, 678], you would say 

تَيْبُع مَضْرِب and transformed \([ \text{SH} ]\), because of their agreement with the \( v \) in vowel and quiescence, together with \([ \text{their} ]\) difference \([ \text{from it} ]\) in مَضْرِب through the augment \( \text{م} \), which is not used as an augment in vs.; and in تَيْبُع \([ \text{below} ]\) through the كَسَر of the \( \text{ت} \), since \( \text{ت} \), though used as an augment in the \( v \), is not pronounced there with كَسَر together with كَسَر of the \( \text{ع} [404] \): so that no confusion \([ \text{of the } n. \text{ with the } v. \] results from transformation \([ \text{MASH} ]\): (2) like تَضْرِب [678], you
would say 

*AAJ*, 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.* 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 ْمُقَام standing-place [above]: for it agrees with the *v.* in its measure only, [because orig. ْيَفَعَلَ (Sn);] but contains an augment, vid. the م, announcing that it does not belong to the class of *vs.*; so that it is transformed: (a) similarly such as ْمِيِّنْ setting upright and ْميِّن separating: (b) if from ْيَبِعَ you formed *مَفَعَلة* with Fath [of the ع ], then you would say ْمِبَاعَة; if *مَفَعَلة* with Kasr, then ْمِبَاعَة; and if *مَفَعَلة* with Damm, then also ْمِبَاعَة according to the opinion of S, but ْمِبَاعَة according to the opinion of Akh [710] (A): (a) ْمَفَعَلة is transformed on account of its resemblance to the *aor.* in measure, but not in augment; because the ْس of femininization,
being virtually separate [266], does not prevent [agreement with] the measure (Sn): (c) such as (M) مَكْوَازَا (4, 716) (M, R), مَزِيدٌ Mazyad, and [below] (M), among (R) proper names (IY, R) of human beings (IY), and مَدِينَ [below] (M), a name of a place (IY), and مَقْضَرة consult, council, مَصْيدَة snare, trap, net, [with Fath of the (R), as مَقْضَرة الْفَكَّاهَةُ The game fell into our trap (IY),] and [McGraw, as مَقْضَرة الْفَكَّاهَةُ The jest is a means of leading to annoyance, [among ns. not proper names (IY),] are anomalous (M, R), by rule مَكْارَة Part I, Note on p. 8, l. 1]; مَقْمَال, and مَدِان, like مَقْمَال saying [366] and مَقْمَال [above]; and مَشَارِكة, [McGraw, and مَقْمَلَة,] like مَقْمَلَة saying and مَعَانِيث help (IY): and لَكْمَوْنِه II. 97. [591] is read (M), like مَشْوَرة [above] (K, IY, B), by Katada and Abu-sSimâk, by rule مَثَابَة; while AZ transmits هُدَا شَيء مُضْطَبِبٍ لِلَّنفَس This is a thing giving pleasure to the soul and هُدَا شَرابٍ مَبوَلُة This is a diuretic drink: (d) this in the n. is like لَعْجَةٍ ٍمَبُولَة and لَعْجَةٍ ٍمَبُولَة [703, 707] in the v., as though they produced some of the unsound [formations] according to their o. fs., for a notification thereof, and for preservation of the altered o. fs. (IY):
(e) as for مَرِيمُ and مَلْيَنَ [above] (R, A), if you make them كَفَّاءٌ, there is no anomaly, since the ي is co-ordinate [703]; whereas, if you make then كَفَّاءٌ, they are anomalous (R): [but] it has been already mentioned [674] that their measure is كَفَّاءٌ; not كَفَّاءٌ, otherwise transformation [by transfer and then conversion (Sn)] would be necessary; nor كَفَّاءٌ, 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 كَبَعْلَةٌ تَحْلِيمٌ and كَبَعْنَ تَحْلِيمٌ a n. on the model of كَبَعْنَ تَحْلِيمٌ with كَسْرُ of the ت, in which case you say كَبَعْنَ تَحْلِيمٌ and كَبَعْنَ [above] with two كَسْرُs followed by a quiescent ي [original in كَبَعْنَ تَحْلِيمٌ], and converted from كَبَعْنَ تَحْلِيمٌ, the transformation of كَبَعْنَ being by transfer only, and of كَبَعْنَ by transfer and conversion (Sn)): (a) when you form from كَبَعْنَ a n. on the paradigm of كُتْبَتْ, you say, according to the opinion of S, كَبَعْنَ with دَامِم and then كَسْرٌ; but, according to the opinion of Akh, كَبَعْنَ [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 كَفَّاءٌ with كَسْرِ, or دَامِم, of the ت [and كَسْرُ 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 مّدنيّ مَرّم [above] are not transformed; and, according to him, are not anomalous: nor are تقولُ تَبيِّعٌ and تَبيِّعٌ 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 أسودُ وأبيضُ [348, 707] (A), which are eps. on the measure of [249, 372, 671, 672], but resemble [the aor.] إِعْمَلُ 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 أسودُ وأبيضُ [above], أَدْوُرُ مَنْكَ lower than thou and إِبْيَعُ [707], إِبْيَعُ on the measure of إِصْبُعُ [372], and إِبْيَعُ on the measure of دُرْنَبُ [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)] أَدْوُرُ and أَعْمَيْنُ [242] (M, SH), p.pls. of دارُ and عَمَيْنُ (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 لَدَرْعُ writing to turn round and لَدَرْعَنَة reaching a spring in digging for water, if they were transformed by conversion of the ﺱ and ﻰ into ﻯ, 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 لَدَرْعُ turned round and لَدَرْعَنَة [683 (case 2)], if اذُرُ and اذِرين 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 لَدَرْعَنَة (M, R) and لَدَرْعَنَة (R), pls. of لَدَرْعَنَة table [713] and لَدَرْعَنَة [685, 713] (MAR), and لَدَرْعَنَة (M), pl. of جَرْعَنَة [246] (KF), where, though the ﮫ [at the end], like the ﮫ at the beginning, makes them different from the v., transfer is not employed, because the ﮫ, though necessary here [265], is constitutionally separable [266]; so that, being here like the ﮫ in لَدَرْعَنَة fem. of لَدَرْعَنَة serpent [685 (case 7, d)], it is [virtually] non-existent. Nor is transfer employed in such as لَدَرْعَنَة and لَدَرْعَنَة [251, 714], because the [prolonged] ل of femininization,
being inseparable and like part of the word, excludes them from commensurability with the v., as the [abbreviated] ٰ does in حَيْدَى صَرْرى and the ٰ in طَيْران. Flying and ٰ جَوْلَان [684 (condition 11, a, d), 703]. Some of the Arabs transfer the Kasra of the ٰ in أَبِّيْنَا، saying أَبِّيْنَا [714], not because of resemblance to the v., otherwise they would also transfer [the Kasra of the ] in أَهْوَنَا ؛ but because of dislike to Kasra on ٰ, they being similars [697]; as the [second] ّDamma is elided in ٰ [for ٰ نُوْر ] pl. of ٰ نُوْر [246, 711, 721], because ّDamma on , is deemed heavy: so that such as أَبِّيْنَا، exclusively, notwithstanding the lack of the commensurability mentioned, is transformed by transfer because of the extreme heaviness. But [even] in such as أَبِّيْنَا، non-transformation is more frequent: nay, transfer is anomalous, contrary to ٰ نُوْر [above], where quiescence is more frequent, because , pronounced with ّDamm is heavier than ٰ pronounced with Kasr; so that the , and ّDamma in نَّيْبِّيْنِ أَلْقَافُ أَلْمَعَايِبِ أَلْحَم [246, 711] are anomalous (R). As for such as ّيِزِيد Yazid [4, 18], when a proper name, [which resembles the aor. in measure and augment (Sn),] it was transformed when a v., and afterwards transferred to the cat. of proper name (A, MASH). And [similarly (MASH)] ٰ أَبَان Abān (R, MASH),
when a proper name, if said to be ُنَعَلُ (MASH), according to those who decline it as a diptote, is transferred from a transformed v. (R); whereas, if said to be ُنَعَلُ, [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 مَخْيَطٍ [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 مَخْيَطٍ 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 مَخْيَطٍ ought to be transformed, because its augment is peculiar to ns.; while it resembles مَلْعُمٍ [404], i. e., with Kasr of the aoristic letter in the dial. of some people [above]: but that it is made to accord with مَخْيَطٍ [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 مَلْعُمٍ [above] would not be transformed, because it resembles مَخْسِبٍ [with Kasr of the ت (Sn)] in its measure and augment (A); while the reply that Kasr of the ع in مَخْسِبٍ [482] is anomalous is effective only in مَخْسِبٍ exclusively, not
in other *aor. vs. regularly pronounced with Kasr of the 
\text{\textit{e}}, like \text{\textit{تُعَرَّف}}, \text{\textit{تَضَرَب}}, \text{\textit{تُتَجَلَّس}}, and with which, according 
to the \textit{dial.} of those who pronounce the aoristic letter 
with Kasr, \text{\textit{تَتَحْكُلِّي}} is commensurable without any anomaly 
in respect of Kasr of the \textit{ع} (Sn). And moreover, if it 
were admitted that transformation was obligatory because 
of what they mention [about the resemblance of 
\text{\textit{مَخْيَط}} to 
\text{\textit{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 \textit{aor.} in measure and 
augment, like \text{\textit{مَخْيَط}} (Sn),] by his saying "But \text{\textit{مَفَعَال}} is 
treated as sound, like \text{\textit{مَفَعَال \textit{مَفَعَال}}}”, meaning that \text{\textit{مَفَعَال}} being 
different from the \textit{v.}, i. e., not resembling it in measure 
or augment, is entitled to be treated as sound, like \text{\textit{مَسْوَال}} 
tooth-stick and \text{\textit{مَكْيَال}} corn-measure; and that \text{\textit{مَفَعَال}} is 
made to accord with it in being treated as sound, because 
resembling it in sense, like \text{\textit{مَقْوَل}} \text{\textit{[252]}} and \text{\textit{مَقْوَل}} \textit{loquacious, eloquent} \text{\textit{[714]}}. By 
\text{\textit{مَخْيَط}} and \text{\textit{مَخْيَط}} [above] (A). By 
analogy, such as \text{\textit{مَقْوَل}} and \text{\textit{مَقْوَل \textit{مَقْوَل}}} should be transformed, 
since they are on the measure of \text{\textit{ع}} \textit{[above]}: but \text{\textit{كَح}} 
says that they are not transformed, because contracted 
from \text{\textit{مَفَعَال}}, which is incommensurable with the \textit{v.}; the
proof that is the o. f. of being that they are often associated, as and \[366\], and adz (R). The obvious conclusion, however, is what I have mentioned before, vid. that the cause of 's being treated as sound is that it differs from the v. in measure and augment, because, being contracted from \[366\], it is [identical with] the latter; not that it is made to accord with: and many etymologists are of this opinion (A). And such as [369], [374], and [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 [272, 375, 673], does not spoil the measure; while elision of the final consonant, on account of Tanwin [643, 683], as in, is like no elision, because Tanwin is not inseparable from the word [609, 731 (condition 1, f, b, \(\alpha\))]: (a) [374], according to Akh, is co-ordinated with [392]:
and, according to S also, is due to co-ordination, like سُرٌدُ [331, 718]; although فَعَلَ [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 ی and ی preceded by a quiescent are converted into ی only on account of that quiescent's being pronounced with Fath in the o. f. of that word [703]; whereas, in what we are discussing, no vowel exists in the o. f. (R).

§. 713. The mobile ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr ought not to be converted into ی, except at the end of the word [301, 721], like رَآيُتُ الْعَارِي I saw the raider [16, 685 (case 1), 720, 724], as the mobile ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm is not converted into ی [even at the end], like الدَّارُامَي competition in shooting, [orig. الدَّارُامَي (MAR),] َعِيَامٍ [686 (case 1, α, α), 714, 724], and عَيَبَة [703, 711, 724], because Kasra's requirement of ی after it is like Damma's requirement of ی after it; while, the ی and ی 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 ٌٓإِجْلِوَةٌ [332, 685 (case 5, b), 716] and ٌُٓبِعٌ; while ٌٓإِجْلِبَرَةٌ [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 ٌُٓنَٰمٌ inf. n. of ُقَامٌ [below]. That does not occur in the non-final mobile ٖ preceded by a letter pronounced with َبِمَ، 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 ٌُٓنَٰمٌ [685 (case 2), 699, 724], ٌُٓقَٰمٌ عَٰكٌائٌ [inf. n. of عَٰكٌائٌ sought protection (R)], ٌُٓقَٰمٌ [685 (case 2, d, a), 711], [and ٌُٓقَٰمٌ إِفْتُمَادٌ inf. n. of إِفْتُمَادٌ 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 ٌٓعِيَّانٌ is converted into ٍ because عَٰكٌائٌ is transformed by conversion of the ٖ into ٍ: (b) if it be said "How is it that such [an inf. n.] as ٌٓعِيَّانٌ is, and such as ٌٓعِيَّانٌ [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 ٌٓعِيَّانٌ ,
it is so in "كَيْبَان؟". I say that Kasra's demand for conversion of ٍ, after it into ی is stronger than Fatha's demand for conversion of ٍ, and ی after it into ٍ, since such as بِيعٍ قُولٌ and بِيعٍ قَولٌ are frequent, while such as بِيعٍ is rare, and such as قِولٍ بِيعٍ with Kasra of َ f َand quiescence of the َ, 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 َ into ی, because of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Kasr, since the incentive to such conversion is strong (R): (c) چَوُلٌ inf. n. of حَالٌ [685 (case 2, d), 711] is [anomalous (R, Jrb)], like تَوَّدٌ [703, 711] (SH), the regular form being چَيَلٌ (Jrb); contrary to the inf. n. of such as لَدُرٌ [685 (case 2, b), 699] (SH) and قَاَمٌ [698], which have لَوَانٌ and قَوَامٌ (Jrb), because [the , in (Jrb)] the v. is [treated as (R)] sound (R, Jrb), whence ِاَلدِينِ يَتَسَلَّلونَ مَنْكِمْ لِوَادًا XXIV. 63. [Those of you who steal away from the congregation, covering themselves one by another K, B)]; whereas, if the v. were لَدًا took refuge, لِياَمًا would be said [711] (Jrb): (d) [the , of] such as عَوضٌ [684, 711] is not converted, because it is not an inf. n.; while it is in VI. 162. [368, 711] is orig. an inf. n. (R): (2) such [pls. (R, Jrb)] as چَيَانٌ and دِيَارٌ ٍبِيعٌ [685 (case 3, a, and b, d, 168a
\( \alpha \), 724] and \( \text{byāh} \) [below], \( \text{bimar} \) and \( \text{dim} \), because [the \( \text{r} \) of (R)] the sing. is transformed (SH) by its conversion into (a) \( \text{a} \) time, pl. \( \text{tīr} \) [238]; (b) \( \text{yi} \), as in \( \text{thār} \) [238, 278, 685 (case 3, a)], and \( \text{riyāh} \), pl. \( \text{diim} \) [237] (R): (a) the proof that the \( \text{yi} \) of \( \text{tīr} \) is [orig.] is their saying \( \text{thār} \) \( \text{al-nas} \) \( \text{yatawarun} \) \( \text{ali} \) \( \text{returned} \) \( \text{time} \) \( \text{after} \) \( \text{time} \); and [also] what AB mentions, vid. that the \( \text{yi} \) of \( \text{thār} \) is substituted for \( \text{w} \), its derivation being from \( \text{tīr} \), which is a messenger between people: but the [opinion] mentioned in the Jh is that it belongs to the [cat. of] \( \text{yi} \) [below] (b) similarly \( \text{dim} \) is orig. \( \text{darom} \), because it is from \( \text{dam} \) continued, aor. \( \text{yuddum} \), 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 \( \text{yi} \), because of their saying \( \text{diim} \) \( \text{al-ssa} \) \( \text{The sky} \) rained continually, inf. n. \( \text{taddim} \), so he mentions in the Jh; whereas the truth is that it belongs to the cat. of \( \text{w} \) (Jrb on the Plural): (c) \( \text{pl. of tībīn} \) [pl. of \( \text{tībīn} \) (R) in \( \text{tībīn} \) \( \text{li} \) \( \text{tībīn} \) \( \text{li} \) (Jrb)] is anomalous [246, 685 (case b, d, \( \alpha \))] (SH), by rule (Jrb), since [the \( \text{r} \) of (R)] its sing. is not transformed (R, Jrb); and by usage also, since
the most frequent [form] is طُوَّال (Jrb): (d) ٍٰٰٰ ٍٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٯ
transformed: (b) the condition mentioned is effective because between Kasra and  is like a combination of three unsound letters [697]; so that the heaviest of them, i. e., the , is converted into what is homogeneous with the preceding vowel, vid.  : (c) although this condition is not prescribed for the two first [things], as in [the inf. n.] [above], and [the pIs.] [below] and [above], still it strengthens them; and therefore [above], though an inf. n. of a transformed v., may be treated as sound: (d) , together with [above], is allowable, for conformity with  [685 (case 3, b, c, 8)] : (e) [712] and  [685 (case 5)] are [treated as] sound, because they are not pIs. (R). But [Jh says that] [238] is contracted from ; and is [so] altered only on account of the unsound letter, [which he holds to be  (above)]; while, but for that, it would not be altered, since they say , and not , as pl. of [238, 254] (Jh).

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

And verily I am wont to stand in places wherein Jarir is not, nor the patron of Jarir, one to stand and جعلتنا للكم فيهم معايش VII. 9. And have made for you therein means of subsistence [717] (IY); and ابنيتاء أهونآ and [251, 712]: (2) [the letter after the ع , like (IY)] سورق [242, 683], and طريدلا [239, 242]; [348, 683-685]; and [as حيبار , حيبار] رجل حيبار من قوم [686, 713]; and جيبار. A good man, come of good people (IY): (3) the letter before, and the letter after, the ع , like (IY) عواري [ophthalmia and بياع great seller (IY)]; مشاري [place where beasts are exhibited and متروال copious, excellent, in speech (IY)]; and [ت转发] (IY) متروال (M), ت转发 ت转发 from \[489\] and I said much, like تسمار [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 ٩, 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 ٓئِیُنَآ and ٓئِیُنِنآ أَهُوْنَآ, however, the ۵ 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], ۵أَصِّبَ أَهُوْنَ being like I should strike; while the ٩ of femininization 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 ٩, as حُمْرَآث and حُنْقَفْسَآ from حَمْرَآث and حُنْقَفْسَآ [274, 282, 283]: although they do say ٓعَیِبَآ and ٓعَیِبَآ for ٓعَیِبَآ [728] and ٓعَیِبَآ أَبِیْنَآ [712], the Kasra of the ۵ being thrown upon the preceding [quiescent] letter. As for ٓعَیِبَآ and ٓعَیِبَآ [699, 763], we transform them, as we transform their vs., because ٓعَیِبَآ and ٓعَیِبَآ are as inseparable from [the inf. ns. of] ٓعَیِبَآ and ٓعَیِبَآ [332] as یَفَعِلُ and یَفَعِلُ 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 خَوْرِ [above], is (IY). Such [ns.] as نَوْلَ gift and سَيَّال a species of mimosa or acacia, طَبِيلَ [above], [348, 684, 685] and وَلَ eloquent [730. A], and تَسْبَار [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 تَكْنُ and بَنَع [708]: but this is reputed by [the fact] that transformation is proper if its cause be existing, as in the exs. mentioned (R). تَقْوَالَ and تَسْبَار [though inf. ns. of transformed vs. (R, MASH), i. e., تَأْل said and سَرَ journeyed (MASH),] are [treated as] sound, because of ambiguity [above] (SH); and are not made to conform to their vs., as إِعَلَى and إِسْتَقَامَة are made to conform to أَتَامَ and اْتَسْتَقَامَة [703, 712], lest, after transformation, they be mistaken for تَقْوَال [below] (R). The generality of Commentators say that, if the ي here were converted into ل, after mobilization of the ب, two لs would be combined; and, after elision of one of them, تَسْبَار and تَقْوَال would remain, which might be mistaken for the pass. of تَقْوَل and تَسْبَر: but this is [unsatisfactory,] as you see, since the ب 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 فعال [above], the b being fancied to be rcd. (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 ا 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 إِسۡيَقَامَة and إِسۡيَقَامَة [699, 703]; whereas مقرَال and تحْيَاط are not so (R, MASH). And مقرَال [above] and مَرَضِيّط [366, 712], (1) because of ambiguity (SH), since, if they were transformed, مَخاطَت and مَخاطَت would be said; so that one would not know whether they were مَفْعُول or مَفْعُول (Jrb): (a) IH means that, being instrumental ns. [366] conformable to the v. [331], they would [naturally] be treated, as regards transformation, in the same way as the v. [703]; but that they are not transformed, because they might be mistaken for مَفْعُول or فعال: 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 ٤: (3) because the unsound letter here is enclosed by two quiescents [above]: while that necessitates sounding [it] true [even] in the v., as إِسْوَاد and a fortiori, therefore, in the n. (Jrb). And [707] and مَنْقُولٌ [252, 712] and مَخْضِطٌ [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 اَحْمَد Praise thou and اَذْهَب [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 مَفَعَالٍ, they are treated like their o. f.: or we may say that, though they are not deriv., but o. fs., مَفَعَالٍ is made to conform, in omission of transformation, to مَفَعَالٍ, because syn. with it; and this is more appropriate, since agreement of مَفَعَالٍ with مَفَعَالٍ in meaning does not prove it to be a deriv. thereof (R). But such [pass. parts. (Jrb)] as مَقْومٍ مَقْومٍ [constructively مَقْومٍ يَهُمneath (Jrb)] and مَبْيِعٍ are transformed by another [process] (SH), not by conversion of their ٤ into ٤ (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 مَبْيِعٍ and مَقَامٍ would be said, for conformity with بَعُلَم and بَعَلَم; but by quiescence
of their ē, and transfer of its vowel (Jrb), because of ambiguity (SH), since, if مَبَاغ and its مَعَال were said, no one would know whether they were مَعَال [697, 703, 709] or مَعَال [703, 712] (MASH). And such [formations] as غِيْر (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 I, two quiescents would be combined, the first of them an I: so that, if the second were mobilized, and طَلِيل, جَانَين and غُيْر were said (MASH), they might be mistaken for فَاعِل; or if the first were elided, and طَلِيل, جَانَين and غُيْر remained, they might be mistaken (MASH)] for فَعَل (SH), with the ē mobile in جَانَ, and quiescent in the two last: while, if the second quiescent were elided, then غَار, جَانَ and جَانَ would remain, which might be mistaken for فَعَل mobile in the ē; or for the pret. of جَانَ was liberal, aor. جَانَ was long, aor. جَانَ was jealous, aor. (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 ""ويَفَعَل"" and ""يَفَعَلَ"", respectively, [“of its v." (M on §§. 343, 347)]; and, in explanation of the assimilate ep., that it is “not [one of the eps. (M on §. 343)] conformable” to the v. (Jrb): and (b) do not agree with it (SH) in vowel and quiescence [712], which is obvious (Jrb). But the truth is that they are not transformed because they do not belong to the sorts of n. mentioned by us [703] as transformed (R).

§. 715. When the ل of [the pl. belonging to] the cat. of مَسَاجِد [18, 256] is enclosed by two unsound letters, the second is converted into ج, because of (1) its nearness to the end (R) of the word, for which reason it is assimilated to the ج of سَمَا [246, 683 (case 1, k, ب)], as they say صِم [below], treating it like عَنْي [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 ج, which is so faint that [for قَوْرِل] you seem to say قَوْرِل (S). And afterwards the second ج is converted into Hamza, as in نَمَتُرُ [683 (case 2), 708], whether each of the two [enclosing letters] be a ك, as in أَوَّلُ [357, 683 (case 4, ب), 708, 726] (R), orig. أَوْلَ (IY); or a ى, as in نَبِيَانَبُعُ pl. of نَبِيَانُ seller,
chafferer [730. A.]: or the first be a ٔ ، and the second a ۡى ، as in ٌبًآْغَلٌ pl. of ٌقًِّٓٓٓ pl. of َعلتٌ، [on the measure of] ٌبًآْغَلٌ; or the converse, as in ٌبًآْغَلٌ pl. of َعلتٌ [below], from ٌبًآْغَلٌ، because from ٌبًآْغَلٌ، [had many dependents to support (MAR)], aor. َعلتٌ (R), inf. n. َعلتٌ (MAR). And, as for ٌبًآْغَلٌ، [by rule ٌبًآْغَلٌ، with Hamza (R),] it is anomalous (R, A) in the pl., as ٌبًآْغَلٌ is] in the sing. [685 (case 7, c, b, α, and d, d)] (R): but, since the ٔ is sounded true in the sing., it is sounded true in the pl.; so that they say ٌبًآْغَلٌ، as they say ٌبًآْغَلٌ، by rule ٌبًآْغَلٌ [685, 716] (A). That [conformity of the pl. to the sing. in lack of alteration] is, however, not universal, since you say ٌبًآْغَلٌ، [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

تَأْنِي لَكَ ٫َاَذَ ٌبَاتٌ ٫َبِْٔٓٓٓٓٓ

My heart-strings forbid, or My tenderness forbids, that for him (Jh, MAR)]; and, in the pl. [256], ٌبًآْغَلٌ، incorporated (R): though it is stated in the Sahâh that (MAR), in the pl. and dim. of ٌبًآْغَلٌ، you say ٌبًآْغَلٌ and ٌبًآْغَلٌ، 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 ضاكرُن is not to be taken as a precedent (A) for sounding the ب true, whenever a pl. is found resembling it in soundness of [the ب 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 ب of the pl. is enclosed by two ب s; while S constructs the remaining three by analogy to it, because two ز s, or ب, and د, are deemed heavy like two ب s (R). What is mentioned [in §. 683 (case 4)] as to there being no difference, in the two soft letters, between two ب s, two د s, and ب, 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 ب s: and (Tsr)] that [by analogy (R)] there is no Hamza in the case of two ز s, or of ب and د [716] (R, Tsr), because their combination is not like that of two ب s [in degree of heaviness] (R); so that you say سياًد, صراًد, and دُيَابُف, [683], سياًد, and دُيَابُف, according to the o.f. (Tsr); while بُوأَنُع بَتَّع [247] is pronounced with Hamza only because it is pl. of what has its ب converted into Hamza [708], [an argument which applies equally to صراًد]. Therefore, when you form the act. part. from حَلَى [697, 728] and شَرَى roasted, saying حَلَى with ب [685 (case 10, b, a)], like تَفْيِض [16], you say,
in its *pl.* for irrational objects [247], (1) according to $S$, حَوَائِبٍ and شَروَايَى [726], because the $l$ of the *pl.* occurs between ، and ی in the *pl.* of حَوَايِ ، and between two ء in the *pl.* of شَارِ: (a) you do not make the *pl.* of شَارِ imitate its *sing.*, as you do in the *pl.* of ٰ إِدَّةٍ [281], since, if you did, you would say شَوَأْى [726], which would be a flight [back] to what has been fled from: (2) according to the opinion of Akh, حَوَائِبٍ with ی: (a) as for شَروَايَى, there is no dispute about it, because of the combination of two ء، ء (R). Akh’s doubt is that the substitution in the case of two ء، ء is only because of their heaviness; while there is a precedent for that, vid. [in] the combination of two ء، ء at the beginning of the word [683, 699]; whereas, when two ی ء ء، or ء، and ی، are combined at the beginning of the word, there is no [substitution of] Hamza, as یَيِّس and یَيِّسَ [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] ٰ آَلْبِل یَّوِّم [698] is only by conformity to [the final of] ٰ رَدَآَهُ كَسَّالِ and ٰ رَدَآَهُ [683 (case 1), 723], because of its resemblance to the latter in respect of its nearness to the end; while in كَسَّالِ and ٰ رَدَآَهُ there is no difference between ی and ء، and so therefore here: (2) hearsay, because AZ transmits سِيَتَنَ with Hamza, as *pl.* of
stalkling-animal, which is فِعْلَة from drove, aor. يُسْوَقُ and Jh transmits جَبَأَتْ (Jh) with Hamza, as pl. of جَيْدُ (Tsr) and سَيْدً (Jh). Mz says "I asked As how the Arabs form the broken pl. of عَيْلُ [below], and he said 'They pronounce with Hamza, as in the case of two s'"; and this is an authority in support of Khl and S (IY). When the unsound letter after the ٰ of the pl. is far from the end, you do not convert it into ٰ, whether the two enclosing letters be both s, as in طَوْرَبُس [708]; or both ی s, as in pl. قَیَامٌ [714, 730. A]; or different, as in قَیَامٌ pl. of بَیَارِم [384, 716], and pl. of بَیَارِم [685 (case 7), 716] on the measure of تُرَابِ [377], from بَعَاعٌ, if you give these [broken] pls. to the ns. mentioned [252]. As for عَوْارِ [252] pl. of عُوارُ [714] meaning mote, as

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

[237], is [pronounced] with Hamza because its o. f. is عَیِانِل, the Kasra being implemented (R), since it is pl. of
Jo (R, Aud, A), with Kasr of the ی (Aud), like عیال [708], meaning poor (R) [or dependent], sing. of عیال and عیانیل (Sn); [for] Sgh says "The sing. of عیال is جیاکن و جیباد and عیانیل, pl. عیانیل, like جیباد, pl. و عیانیل (A):
so that in both pl. [عیانیل and عیانیل] the o. f. is observed (R). And hence the transformation of صیم [above] and قیم [247], [by conversion of the ی into ی (IY)], because of [its (IY)] nearness to the end; [contrasted] with the treatment of صرام and قوم [384] as sound, [when the unsound letter is far from the end (IY)]; while فُلکِن مِنْ صِیّادِةٌ قُومٍ [Such a one is of the choice, or best, set of his people, transmitted by Fr (IY),] and نَمَا أَرْقَ أَلْقَيْمَ الْعَرَبِ [685 (case 10, b, b), 716, 722] are anomalous (M). All of this is in the pl.: but, if the like [enclosure of an antepenultimate ی by two unsound letters] occur in the non-pl., then also S converts the second into ی, and afterwards into Hamza; while Akh and Zj do not alter it [683 (case 4, b)] (R).

§. 716. The ی, whether [it be (MASH)] an ع, or a ل [722], or anything else, [i. e., an aug., like the ی of مَفْعُول and the ی of the pl. (MASH),] when it is combined with ی, and the first [of them, whichever it be (MASH),] is quiescent [below], is converted into ی; and
[the first ی (MASH)] is incorporated [into the second (MASH)]; while the preceding [vowel], if Damma, is converted into Kasra [below]: as, (1) [when the ی is an ی (R),] (a) 251, 747 (SH) and مَیْت (Jrb), orig. مَیْت (MASH) and مَیْت (Jh), on the measure of یبِعْل یبِعْل [685 (case 7, a, a), 703] (Jrb): (b) ۷۴۷ (SH), orig. ۷۴۷ (R, Jrb): (c) ۳۲۲, ۴۹۹ (SH), orig. ۳۲۲, ۴۹۹, being یبِعْل from یبِعْل I went round (Jrb); and ۳۸۴, ۷۱۵ (SH), orig. ۳۸۴, ۷۱۵ (R, Jrb) from یبِعْل, aor. یبِعْل (Jrb): whereas, if [۷۴۷ (SH), orig. ۷۴۷ (R, Jrb)] were [on the measure of (Jrb)] یبِعْل, then [۷۴۷ (SH), orig. ۷۴۷ (Jrb)] would be said (R, Jrb), because they are from [vs. whose ی is] یبِعْل (Jrb): (d) ۳۷۷ (SH), orig. ۳۷۷ (R, Jrb) from یبِعْل یبِعْل [713] (Jrb); whereas, if it were [on the measure of (Jrb)] یبِعْل, then یبِعْل would be said (R, Jrb): (e) ۲۷۸, ۳۰۲, ۶۸۵ (case 7, a, b)] (SH), orig. ۳۰۲, ۶۸۵, inf. n. of ۳۰۲, ۶۸۵ (SH), orig. ۶۸۵ (R, Jrb), because dim. of ۶۸۵ bucket [280], the ی being put because ۶۸۵ is masc. and fem. [282] (Jrb): (3) [when the ی is anything else (R),] (a) ۲۹۴, ۳۴۷ (SH), orig. ۲۹۴, ۳۴۷ (Jrb), the ی being the یبِعْل of (R), because it is مَیْت from مَیْت; (b) مَیْت (SH), orig. مَیْت (MASH)
(Jrb), the, being the, of the pl. (R): (a) IH says "when a nom." [above], because, and ی are not combined in مُسْلِیَيی when an acc. or gen. [129]: (b) مَرْمِيٌّ and مُسْلِیَيی, though not belonging to this chapter, [which treats of the unsound letters as rads.,] are mentioned here, because they happen to be included in the predicament (Jrb). Although ی and ٍ are not so approximate in outlet [732] that one should be incorporated into the other, as in إِنْعَنِرَ وَأَذْكَرَ "and یُقرَ "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 ی and ی 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 atTaghlabi (EM)]

تَرَكْنَا البَحْلَ مَعَكَةُ عَلِیہٍ ﻋَمْلِیة ﻣَقْلَدَة إِعْتِنَاهَا صَفُوفًا

after

وَسَبِّیل مَعْشِر تَدْ تَوْجُوهٍ ﺑَنْ تَجَا ﺑَنْ آلِدُ ﺑِحْیَی آلِبَحْرِیْنَا

(IX) 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 toec of the fourth! (EM). And
incorporative alleviation is encouraged in their case by the fact that their first is quiescent [above]; for the condition of incorporation is quiescence of the first [731]. Although the rule, in incorporating two approximates, is to convert the first into the second [735], the, whether it precede or follow, is converted into ی, in order that the intended alleviation may be realized, because ی and ی are not heavier than double ی [715]. You do not incorporate, however, in (1) سُؤِير (685 (case 7, b, b, ب), 730] and تُؤِيرج̪, (a) because, says Khl, the`; is not inseparable; but its predicament is that of the ی, for which it is a subst., since their o. f. is سَيْر [703]; and therefore, as ی, which is the o. f. of this ی, is not incorporated into anything [739], so likewise the ی, which is a subst. for it: (a) for the same reason you do not incorporate in such as تُؤِيرل [730, 731] and سُؤِيرل, (b) because, if you did incorporate in such as تُؤِيرج̪ and سُؤِيرج̪, they might be mistaken for فَعَلَ and تَفْعَلَ: (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 تَمْعَرُوا وَأَقِبِلُوا XII 71. They said (and came forward) and فِي بَيْوْمٍ XIV. 21. On a day [731]; not in a single word, as مَغْرِزٍ [301, 685 (case 8, b), 722], and مِرْيٍ ٢
[above]: (2) such as ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ [332, 685] and ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ [685, 713], because the conversion [of the first ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ into ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠] supervenes irregularly; and ceases in the pl. and dim. of ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠, as in ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ and ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ [685]; while for ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ you more often say ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ [332, 685 (case 5, b), 713]:

(a) if ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠, conversion of the ١١٤٩٣٠, and incorporation of the [first] ١١٤٩٣٠ into it] would be necessary, as in ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ [above]; but it is ١١٤٩٣٠٤٩٣٠ [384], the [first] ١١٤٩٣٠ being irregularly converted into ١١٤٩٣٠, as in ١١٤٩٣٠, ١١٤٩٣٠ ١١٤٩٣٠ [278, 332, 685]: ١١٤٩٣٠, ١١٤٩٣٠, ١١٤٩٣٠ [685 (case 7, b, b, ١١٤٩٣٠)], when you alleviate ١١٤٩٣٠, ١١٤٩٣٠, and ١١٤٩٣٠ by converting the Hamza into ١١٤٩٣٠ [658]. Some of the Arabs convert [this ١١٤٩٣٠, into ١١٤٩٣٠], and incorporate [it into the second ١١٤٩٣٠], saying ١١٤٩٣٠, ١١٤٩٣٠, and ١١٤٩٣٠ [685 (case 7, c, a), 702]. That is nowise allowable in ١١٤٩٣٠ and ١١٤٩٣٠ [above], because confusion with the conj. of ١١٤٩٣٠ would be produced, contrary to such as ١١٤٩٣٠ and ١١٤٩٣٠ [above]. But, by analogy to it, some of the GG say ١١٤٩٣٠ in lightening ١١٤٩٣٠ [685 (case 7, b, b, ١١٤٩٣٠)] (R). As for ١١٤٩٣٠ [685, 715], ١١٤٩٣٠ [below], and ١١٤٩٣٠ [686], they are anomalous (SH). The second ١١٤٩٣٠ of ١١٤٩٣٠ of (Part I, p. 7 A)] ١١٤٩٣٠ [4, 685, 689, 698] is converted into ١١٤٩٣٠ in the proper name.
exclusively, because proper names are often altered to a form different from that which the word must assume, like مَكْرَةٌ مَّرْحَبٌ [4, 712], for a notification of their exclusion from their original application; but, according to Mz, the حَبْرَةٌ is original, as we mentioned in the case of حِبْرَةٌ [698] (R). The Damma is changed into Kasra in مُسْلِمِي and مَرْمَي [above], lest a quiescent ی preceded by Damma should occur (Jrb). But ی with Kasr and Dam occurs in the pl. of أَلْوَى [728] (SH) violent in altercation; contrary to the inf. n. ی [278, 685 (case 7, a, b)], where Kasr and Damm are not allowable (Jrb). And, when you alleviate such as زِيَّةٌ [above] and نَرَى trench dug round a tent, to keep out rain-water [by converting the Hamza into ], and [then convert this into ی, and] incorporate [it into the second ی], Dam and Kasr are allowable [in زِيَّةٌ and نَرَى], as in ی [above]; and so, when you form نَعَلُ from عَيْنُ I promised [699], and alleviate the Hamza by conversion [into ], you say ی; and similarly ی for نَعَلُ from ی I roasted (R). But صَيَّمٌ قَيْمٌ and قَيْمٌ [صَيَّمٌ یُم] and قَيْمٌ IY on §. 715),] are anomalous [247, 685 (case 10), 715, 722] (SH), because they convert the , into ی notwithstanding the lack of motive (Jrb). IH means
that the property of ِ‏ا‏ is to be converted into ی‏ when it is combined with ی‏, and the first of them is quiescent [above]: whereas here two ِ‏ا‏s 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 مَرْيَمَى [722]; for double ِ‏ [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 ُ‏ and ُ‏ [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 ُ‏ نَمَّا أَرَى أَنْيَمَ آلِهُ [685, 715] is more anomalous (SH), because the [double (R)], is converted without any motive; and, by reason of the ِ‏ occurring here (Jrb), is [more (R)] remote from the end (R, Jrb), which is the seat of alteration (Jrb).

§: 717. If there be no ِ‏ or ی‏ before the ِ‏ [715], then the unsound letter (Jrb), [whether] ِ‏ or ی‏ (R), occurring after the ِ‏ (R, Jrb) of the [ultimate] pl. [18, 256] (R), (1) if rad., as in مَعَايَشُ وَ مَفَاطِم [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 , pl.  [above] and , or aug., as in [253, 374, 708], [pl. ] 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 ] [above] (R). But [sometimes (R)]  with Hamza [246, 683 (case 3, e, b, g)] occurs (SH), by assimilation to  (R); and Ibn 'Amir (K), [like] Nafi [683] (B), is reported to have pronounced it in VII. 9. [714] with Hamza, by assimilation to [the pl. where the  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 مُصابِبة to مَصْبَبَة, as
channel of a torrent, [pl. مَسَابِيل (Jh)], has [also (Jh)] for
its pl. [أَمْسَان, and (Jh) [irregularly (Jh)],
by assimilation to مَصْبَب (R), like رَغِيف, pl. رَغْفَة, رَغْف, and رَغِفَان [246] (Jh); or (2) by imagination (R). As
for [above], it is a blunder of theirs, because they
imagine that مَصْبَبَة is مَصْبَبَة, whereas it is only مَصْبَبَة; but they do say مَصْبَب [683] (S). Jh says that all the
Arabs pronounce it with Hamza, (1) because they imagine
that مَصْبَبَة is مَصْبَبَة; so that they pronounce it with
Hamza, when they pluralize it, as they pronounce the
pl. of سَفَاتٍ [246]: or (2) [because] they assimilate the [rad. (Jh)] ى in مَصْبَبَة to the [aug. (Jh)] ى of سَكِيفَة, since it is substituted for ى;
and is not original, as the ى of سَكِيفَة is not original. But the regular form is مَصْبَب, [which also is used (Jh)],
because the ى [of the sing.] is mobile in the o. f. [below]. And Zj used to hold the Hamza in مَصْبَب to be con-
verted from the ى, pronounced with كَسَر in مَصْبَب, as
in إِشَاح for رَشَاح [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 of the word, and there is no , or before the l [715]; for which reason the rule requires it to remain, as in مُقاومٌ [above]: but that they constantly pronounce this pl. with Hamza, irregularly, for a notification that it is not pl. of or مفعولة, like and مُعايِش; but of مفعولة, since the o. f. [above] is مُضوِبة, the vowel of the , being transferred to the س, and the , [then] converted into س 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 مُصيبَات, since, in such as مَنْبِمٍ [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 مفعولة, but of مفعولة or مفعولة, with Fath of the م, and Fath or Kasr of the س; and therefore the , is converted into Hamza, for a notification that it is pl. of مفعولة with Damm of the م, and Kasr of the س, contrary to the general rule that the pl. of the latter should be sound (Jrb). But مَتَأَكَبٌ, مَصَبَبٌ, and مَعَايِشُ with Hamza are anomalous (R).
§. 718. The ی [serving as the ع (IY)] of ُنُعَلَى، when a substantive, is converted into ُ(M, SH), because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm [686 (case 1)] (IY), as ُمُرَبَي and ُ(686 (case 4)] (IY, SH), orig. طَرَبَي and ُ(IY). is either an inf. n., like ُرُجَعَى [248, 272], as in XIII. 28. [686 (case 4, a, a)], i. e., ُتَفَنَّسَ لِهِمُ طَيِّبًا ُ(SH), XLVII. 9. [62]: or fem. of ُأَلْتُرْبَي, in which case it ought to be ُأَلْتُرْبَي with the art. [356]. But [even in the latter case] its predicament is that of substantives [686 (case 4, b, e, α), 725], as S says "This is the cat. of what has its ی converted into ُ, vid. ُنُعَلَى when it is a substantive” (R), as ُطَرَبَي and ُمُرَبَي (S, M) from ُطَيِّب happiness and ُكِيس shrewdness (M). The author of the CHd mentions that ُكِيسُ ُمُرَبَي and ُطَرَبَي are fems. of ُأَكَيْسُ ُأَطِيْب and ُمُرَبَي; but that, though orig. eps., they are treated as substantives, because without an art. they are not quals. (Jrb). The reason why ُنَعَلَى without the art. is not a qual. is that it is not used with ُمِنُ, as is known [356]: while, with prothesis, the post. explains the qualified, because the ُنَعَلَ of superiority is part of the post. [118]; so that you do not say ُعَنْدِي جَارِيَة ُحَسْنَى ُالْكُحَوارِي In my possession is a girl, the most beautiful of the girls [with the intention
of making an ep. of جارية] because [the ep. would then be pre. to its qualified (121), since] indicates the qualified. And, sincewithout 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 أنَّ القُلُب of superiority, this أنَّ القُلُب divested of مين is triptote, by common consent, when made indet. after being a proper name, contrary to the cat. of أَحْمُر [18], as to which there is a dispute (R). In the ep., however, the is not converted; [but the letter before, it is pronounced with Kasr, so that the is preserved (SH),] as قَسَّة ضَيْزَة و مِشْيَة حَيْكَي and قَسَّة ضَيْزَة and [686 (case 4, b, c)] (M, SH), which are [judged to be (Jrb)] نُعَلَى (R, Jrb), orig. ضيزي (IY, Jrb), with Damm, [not نُعَلَى (R, Jrb) with Kasr (Jrb)], because, [says S (R),] there is no نُعَلَى [with. Kasr (IY)] among eps. (IY, R, Jrb), except غَرْطَي [272] (Jrb), while غَرْطَي is with ٍ [272]; though some authorize رَجُل كِيْصَة [272], which may, however, be نُعَلَى with Damm, co-ordinated with جَتْقُ نَعْلَي [392], like سُوَدَن [331, 712] and عَرْطَط [said by Ks. to be (Jh) pl. of عَرْطَط (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 ُعَلَى with Ḍamm, like ُحَلَى (IY, Jrb) and ُضَلَى [272] (Jrb). They do not convert the ى into ُ, here (IY, Jrb), as they do in ُطَرَبَى كُوْسَى [above] (IY); but convert the Ḍamma into Kasra, in order that the ى 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 ى into ُ (Jrb).

And so in the cat. of ُبِيضُ [686 (case 1, a, ى), 710, 711, 728] (SH), i.e., the pl. ُعَلَى, from the heaviness of the pl. (R). ُبِيضُ is orig. ُبِيضُ with Ḍamm of the ُ, because pl. of ُبِيضُ ُحَرُّ pl. of ُأَحْرُ [249]. They convert the Ḍamma into Kasra, in order that the ى may be preserved, because the pl. is deemed heavy; so that, if they converted the ى into ُ, the heaviness would be excessive (Jrb). But sometimes the Ḍamma is left unaltered in the cat. of ُبِيضُ pl. of ُأَبْيَضُ, and the ى then converted into ُ, because of the lightness of the measure [ُعَلَى] (R).
THE 5 AND 5 AS J Ş.

§ 719. The 5 and 5, when 5 s, are more unsound, and weaker in state, than when 5 5 s, because (1) they are consonants of inflection, which become altered by the vowels of inflection [16, 404, 720]; (2) the 5 of prothesis [129], which causes the preceding letter to be pronounced with Kasr, is affixed to them; and (3) the 5 of relation [294] and the sign of the du. [228] are affixed to them: while all of that necessitates their alteration. Therefore, when 5 s, they are weaker than when 5 5 5 s [703]; and when 5 5 s, are weaker than when 5 5 5 s [699]: so that the further they are from the end, the stronger they are; and the nearer they are to the end, the more inseparable is transformation from them. Transformation contains a kind of alleviation [697], and is therefore lighter than the use of the o. f. (IY). Their predicament, [when they occur as finals, last (IY),] is to be (1) transformed (M), by (a) alteration of [their] vowels [into quiescences]; (b) conversion into another letter (IY): (2) elided (M), (a) because of a quiescent that meets them [663]; (b) for a kind of alleviation [697] (IY): (3) preserved (M), and sounded true (IY). Their transformation is [effected] by (1) conversion (a) of both into I [684]; (b) of one of them into its fellow [685, 686]: (2) quiescence (M). They are converted into I, 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 رَمَيَّةٌ يُقَرُّي is strong and lives [728, 730 A]; and رَحْمَى [16, 300, 328, 673]; contrary to (1) رَمْيَةٌ غَزْرَٰنَا, and رَمْيَةٌ غَزْرَٰنَا, and تَّحْفُصٌ (SH), where the, and ی are quiescent (R): (a) یَأْبِينَ and تَّحْفُصٌ are [2nd or 3rd pers.] pl. fem., their measure being تَّفَعَّلَنَّ or تَّحْفَصَنَّ [663] and تَّحْفُصٌ are 2nd pers. sing. fem., orig. تَّفَعَّلَنَّ and تَّحْفُصٌ, like تَّفَعَّلَنَّ [405], their ج being converted into ل, 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 تَفَعَّلَنَّ: while the ی [before the ن, whether this ی be the ج of the v... as in the two pls. fem., or the pron. of the agz, as in the sing. fem.,] is not converted into ل, because it is quiescent (Jrb): (2) غَزْرُ and رَمَيَّةٌ [634 (condition 5), 698] (SH), where the, and ی are preceded by a quiescent (R): (3) غَزْرُ and رَمَيَّةٌ [663, 684 (condition 6, b)]—with which يَفْرَقُّي (R); [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 ن., [respectively,] since the I converted [from the ، or ل] would inevitably be elided, on account of the concurrence of two I's: (a) the attached pron. and the I of the du. are, each of them, the "cause necessitating Fath" [of the J] (MASH): (b) these affixes, as [will be] mentioned, necessitate return of the I's [converted in the sing. from ، and ل] to their o.f's. [below], lest ambiguity be produced; and, after restoration to the o.f., the ، and ل are not converted into I, lest such conversion be a return to that [ambiguity] which has been escaped (R): (4) إِخْشَىَا (663), because it belongs to the cat. of لَنْ تَخْشَيْا Ye two shall not dread (SH), since the imp. is derived from the aor., and in [each of] them the J is followed by the I of the pron.; so that, since the J is not transformed in [the subj.,] such as لَنْ تَخْشَيَا, lest it be elided, and the du. be [then] mistaken for the sing., it is not transformed in [the imp.] إِخْشَيَا also, although ambiguity would not be produced [by its elision], because إِخْشَىَا with I would then be said, and in the sing. إِخْشَى without I [428, 431] (Jrb): إِخْشَيَا (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 I; so that إِخْشَيْنَ is
like [below] and [below] and [SH], orig. [610, 663, 664] and [610, 663] and [610, 663] and where the ħ is converted into l, and elided, because elision of the ħ does not produce ambiguity here, as it would in [663], where the l is therefore not elided; while [above] is made to accord with the latter, because it is a deriv. thereof, though ambiguity would not be produced; and [also], because the ħ in such [a position] resembles the l [of [below]]. But, [in the chapter on the Corroborative Īn ] at the end of the commentary on the IH, we have mentioned [in the following terms] the objection to this language (R):—IH says that the [double or single (MAIH)] Īn , when it is after the prominent pron., [as in Īn and Īn ,] becomes like a separate word, because the pron. is a separative; but, when there is no prominent pron. [before it, as in Īn ], is like an attached [nom.] pron.: this is the gist of his language, which is open to the objection that the attached [nom. pron.] is not only the l [in Īn and īrāsīa ]; but also the ī and ī in īrāsīa and īrāsīa [663], with which you do not retain
the \( \text{J} \), as you do with the \( \text{I} \); so that his saying "like an attached \([\text{nom.}] \text{pron.}\)\), unrestrictedly, is not true (\( \text{R} \) on IH). And the better \([\text{opinion}]\) is that the non-conversion, \((1)\) in \([\text{\like\ l\kh\sh\s\n}\text{\like\ r\p\s\n}\text{\like\ a\ t\r\p\s\n} \), \([\like\ a\ t\r\p\s\n}\) \( \text{R} \) on IH\), [like \( \text{\like\ l\kh\sh\s\n}\) and \( \text{\like\ r\p\s\n}\) below,] is because the \( \text{J} \) is restored [to its place], on account of what we mentioned there \((\text{R})\), \([\text{vid. that}]\) its elision \([\text{in \like\ l\kh\sh\s\n}\) and \( \text{\like\ a\ t\r\p\s\n}\)\] was \([\text{a substitute}]\) for apocopation \([404]\) or quiescence \([428, 431]\); whereas, when the \( \text{v.} \) is intended to be uninfl. upon Fath \([402, 406, 610, 663, 664]\), because compounded \([\text{with the corrob.} \text{\n}]\), there is no apocopation or quiescence \((\text{R} \) on IH\): and, if it were then converted, its elision would be necessary; so that its restoration would not be evident: \((2)\) in \( \text{\like\ a\ t\r\p\s\n} \), is because it is a deriv. of \( \text{\like\ x\s\y\a\r} \) \([663]\). And we do not maintain that \([\text{in these formations the non-conversion is because}]\) the vowel is accidental; since, if the vowel in such \([\text{a position}]\) were not taken into account, the \( \text{\n} \) would not be restored in \( \text{\like\ h\s\n} \) and \( \text{\like\ a\ n} \) \([663]\). We have mentioned the predicament of such as \( \text{\like\ x\s\y\a\r} \) and \( \text{\like\ x\s\y\a\r} \) \([\text{above}]\) in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents \([663]\). And in such as \( \text{\like\ x\s\y\a\r} \) and \( \text{\like\ x\s\y\a\r} \) \([\text{above}]\) the, \( \text{\like\ x\s\y\a\r} \) and \( \text{\like\ x\s\y\a\r} \) are not converted, \((1)\) because each of them is an entire word, which must not be totally altered; \((2)\) because their vowels are accidental \([684 \) (condition 2)]\),
arising from the [concurrence of] two quiescents; (3) because the vowel of the preceding letter belongs to another word [684 (condition 4)], as mentioned [below under اَرْضِيَنَّ and اَرْضُوُنَّ] (R). IH's saying "[when] they are mobile" [above] means "with a permanent vowel" [684 (condition 2)], to exclude such as غَرْرَا and اَرْضِيَنَّ [above], [رَحْيَانِ] and [عَصْوَانِ] [below]: while, in such as اَلْرَحْيِ, although the inflectional vowel is accidental, the ؤ and ى are converted, because, though its sort is accidental, [being regulated by the op.,] its genus is permanent, since every n. infl. with vowels, whether nom., acc., or gen., must have some [inflectional] vowel [16] (R on the ؤ and ى as ُس). The ؤ and ى, when ؤs, are converted into ُ, 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 ُ, as ُراَن gain and ُرَبِىَ [pl. of ُرَبِیة a kind of small beast or reptile (MAR)]; or in a n. commensurable with, but not differing from, the ُ, as ُحَرَى [black (MAR)] and ُشَقَرُ more wretched: for the conformability, or the affinity mentioned, is prescribed only in the ُع [703, 711, 712], not in the ؤ, because the ؤ is the seat of alteration; so that the weak cause, i. e., its being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [703], is effective in converting it
And the reason why such as جلوان [831] and عطية نَزْرَان [331] are not transformed is only that the ٰ and ٖ, being inseparable [from the word], exclude the ج from the end; so that the ٰ and َ become [medial,] as in جller and طَيْرَان [684 (condition 11, a), 703]. If it be said "Why does not the inseparable ٰ in such as جٌراة [247] and ُنْقَاة [689] prevent transformation of the ج [into ٰ], as the inseparable ٰ in such as جٌنْصْوًة and جٌعَّدَرْة [721] prevents conversion of the ج into َ؟", I say "Because ج preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm is not converted into َ in any position except when final, contrary to the conversion of ٰ and َ into ج, which is often found in the medial also, as in قال [684, 703] and مقال [712]; so that the ٰ, which is orig. not inseparable [266], is not taken into account; contrary to the ٰ and ٖ, which are constitutionally inseparable ". And, from the affinity of conversion to the end of the word, the ٰ and َ, when final, are subject to this transformation, even if they be preceded by ج, provided that the ج be aug., because then it is virtually non-existent, as خٰسْاَر [683 (case 1), 720, 723]; whereas, when it is rad., as in رٰاي and رّئى [723], they are not transformed, because the ج intervening as a separative [between the mobile ٰ or َ and the preceding Fatha] is strong by reason of [its] originality. But, from the
weakness of this cause—I mean mobility of the, or ی, and precedence of a letter pronounced with Fath [703]—in necessitating conversion, the I is restored to its o. f. [above] of ی or ی, and admits of being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, when omission of restoration would lead to ambiguity in the v. or n., vid. when the I is met by a subsequent quiescent letter, with which the I, if retained unaltered, would be elided, and so ambiguity would be produced. The v. is such as (1) یُرْضَیا and َرَمِیا [above], where the I of the pron. is attached to the transformed یُرْضَیا and َرَمِیا [above]: so that, if the I [converted from the ی or ی] were not restored to its o. f., it would be elided because of the two quiescents; and [then] the [v.] attributed to the pron. of the du. might be mistaken for the [v.] attributed to the pron. of the sing., or to the explicit n. [21]: (2) یُرْضَیا [and یُغَرِیا above], because the ی would be elided in the [subj. and] apoc. [405]: (3) یَحْشُیا [above] or تْرَضْیا [above], because it is a deriv. of تْرَضْیا [above]. And the n. is such as (1) صَلْوات prayers [726] and ُنَتیبَات damsels [234], where, if the I [converted from the ی and ی] were elided because of the two quiescents, the pl. might be mistaken for the sing.: (2) ُعْصَواب two staves [above] and ُنَتیبَان two youths [684 (condition 6, b)].
where, if it were not restored, the *du.* might, on pre-
fiction, be mistaken for the *sing.*; while [عَصْرَىٰٓٗ and] 
*ٓرَحْيٰٓٗٓ* and are *derivs. of [عَصْرَىٰٓٗ and* 
*ٓرَحْيٰٓٗٓ* [above]. And, with the *ى* of relation, the *ى* elided 
in [643, 683, 697], when pronounced with 
*تَُُوُُزِين* and *ٓرَحْيٰٓٗٓ* when pronounced with 
*تَُُوُُزِين* is restored [to its place], because the [concur-
rence of] two quiescents, the *ى* and *تَُُوُُزِين*, ceases to 
exist; and, after its restoration, you convert it into *ى* on 
account of the *ى* of relation [300], as you convert the *ى* in 
[the synarthrous (MAR)] *ىَلْيَلَٽَٔٓلْعَضَا* [above] 
when you form a *rel. n.* from them: but you do not say 
that the elided *ى* is restored to its *o.f.* of *ى* or *ى*; and, 
for the reason mentioned by us in the chapter on the 
*Relative Noun* [300], the [restored] *ى* is not elided, on 
account of the quiescent *ى* [of relation] affixed to it. 
And, after restoration and mobilization of all the letters 
mentioned, you do not convert them into *ى*, notwithstanding their mobility and their being preceded by a 
letter pronounced with *فِثُْ* (1) because their vowel is 
accidental [300, 684 (condition 2)]; (2) because, having 
fled from the *ى*, lest, after [its] elision, ambiguity be 
produced, one cannot revert to what one has fled from. 
But, as for the restoration of the *ى* to its *o.f.* in such as 
*ُٓرَمْيَٽَٔٓرَمْيَٽَٔ* and *ُٓرَمْيَٽَٔٓرَمْيَٽَٔ* and *ُٓرَمْيَٽَٔٓرَمْيَٽَٔ*, orig. *تَُُوُُزِين* and *تَُُوُُزِين* , it is not from 
fear of ambiguity, but for conformity to *ُٓرَمْيَٽَٔٓرَمْيَٽَٔ* and
The ج is restored [to its place] in such as لا تَرْمَيْنَ إِضْمَانٍ [above], and similarly أَهْرَنَّ [663] and لا تَرْمَيْنَ إِضْمَانٍ, and because with the the v. is not quiescent [in the final] nor apocopated, while elision of the ج is only [a substitute] for apocopeation [404] or quiescence [428, 431]. And, after restoration of the ج [to its place], the لا تَرْمَيْنَ إِضْمَانٍ [above] is not converted into ٰ, lest elision of the ٰ be entailed thereby, which would lead to what one has fled from, [vid. elision of the ج without apocopeation or quiescence] (R on the ٰ and ٰ as عٰs). But, in the dial. of Tayyi, according to what Fr transmit from them, the ٰ that is a ج 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 زَنْبٌ لِّيَرْحَمَ زَيْدًا By God, assuredly Zaid shall shoot and زَنْبٌ يَا زَيْدُ Do thou surely shoot, O Zaid, assuredly Zaid shall dread and زَنْبٌ يَا زَيْدُ Do thou surely dread, O Zaid: and hence إذا قَالَ قَطْنَيْ تَلَّتْ يَا بَلَغَهُ رَحْفَةٌ لِّتَغْفِنَّ عَنْهُ ذَٰلِكَ أَجَمَعًا [119] (R on IH), where there is another version meant to be with the single ﺗ, which, says IY, is suppressed by poetic license [614]; and
which also is an address to a male, And do thou weep, O 'Amr, for a life that has passed away after its newness, whose evenings were pleasant in that country; and the Prophet's saying in tradition 

Assuredly the rights shall indeed be rendered to their owners on the day of resurrection (AKB). And so in إِرَضَيْنِ يَا أَمْرَأَةٌ and إِرَضَيْنَ [above], the and ی are not converted, (1) because the vowel is accidental [684 (condition 2)], as we mentioned [under إِخْشَيْنِ and إِخْشَيْنَ] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents [663]; (2) because the and ی [here] are independent ns.; (3) because ی 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 ی [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 أَخْرَنْ [663, 664] and أَخْرَنَ (R on the and as ع s), where the indication of the elision is the Damm and Kasr, respectively [610] (MAR); [since إِرَضَيْنِ and إِرَضَيْنَ would both be reduced to إِرَضَيْنَ]. But IM says that elision of the ی of the pron. after Fatha, as إِرَضَيْنَ from إِرَضَيْنِ [663], is a تَلِ dialectic variation (R on IH). If, however, elision of the ی, on account of two quiescents, do not lead to ambiguity, the ی is not restored, as
They are pleased. They are raided, and Thou art pleased. They raided and They shot. They raided and They shot, 663, 234, 607, 663 (R on the, and as e s). The, and iy are made quiescent in the cat. of raid and shoots. The raider below and the shooter 720 in the nom. and gen. (SH). The iy -- and this termination is peculiar to the v., not being [found] in the n. 721 is made quiescent, because iy pronounced with Damm after Damma 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 iy], because the vowel is after the consonant 667, 697, is elided. Similarly iy pronounced with Damm after Kasra is made quiescent: but this combination is less heavy than the first; and iy, as found in n. and v., as He shoots and The shooter came. IH mentions 685 case 1, a), 724 and in order to explain that the iy whose o. f. is iy, is like the original. And similarly iy pronounced with Kasr after Kasra is made quiescent, because of the combination of likes, as iy pronounced with Damm after Damma [above], which is heavier:
and this [combination] is [found] in the n., as [in the gen.]; and in the v., as [663], orig. ُ(R).
The ُand ُare elided in such as (M, SH) 
Raid not and ُShoot not [404, 697], 
Raid and Shoot [428, 431, 697] (M): (1) They [masc.] 
raid and ُThey shoot (SH): (a) ُis orig. ُ
[above], to which the ُof the pl. is affixed; so that the first ُis elided, because of the two quiescents: (b) ُ
is orig. ُ, to which the ُof the pl. is affixed; so that the ُis elided, because of the two quiescents; and the ُmay be preserved, since it is a complete word, which must not be altered (R): (3) ُand ُ[above], 
ُ(SH): (a) ُis orig. ُ[663], to which the double ُis attached; so that the ُis elided, because of the two quiescents: and ُis similar [mutatis mutandis]: (b) ُand ُ[663, 664] are like ُand ُ, because orig. ُand ُ[663] 
(R): (4) ُand ُ(M). But such as ُand ُ[687, 
697, 698], ُand ُ[667], ُand ُ[260, 307, 
689], are not regular (SH), which means that the elision of the ُ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 \( \mathfrak{L} \)] in some of them, like \( \mathfrak{L} \) and \( \mathfrak{D} \) and \( \mathfrak{E} \), because the letter before the unsound letter is quiescent, as in \( \mathfrak{6} \) [643, 720] and \( \mathfrak{7} \) [667]; and change [of the \( \mathfrak{L} \) into \( \mathfrak{L} \)] in others, like \( \mathfrak{A} \) and \( \mathfrak{B} \), because the unsound letter is mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as in \( \mathfrak{O} \) [above]: but they are docked [of the \( \mathfrak{L} \)], contrary to analogy, because frequent in their speech (Jrb). As for \( \mathfrak{A} \), however, it is not docked of the \( \mathfrak{L} \); but the \( \mathfrak{B} \) is a subst. for its \( \mathfrak{L} \) [689] (R). The \( \mathfrak{O} \), and \( \mathfrak{Y} \) are preserved in such as (1) and \( \mathfrak{R} \) [above]; (2) \( \mathfrak{A} \) and \( \mathfrak{B} \) (M), where the \( \mathfrak{O} \) and \( \mathfrak{Y} \) are preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm and Kasr, respectively [684 (condition 3)] (IY); (3) and \( \mathfrak{R} \) [above] (M).

§. 720. As regards bearing the vowels of inflection, the \( \mathfrak{O} \), and \( \mathfrak{Y} \), (1) when preceded by a quiescent, proceed like sound letters, as in (a) \( \mathfrak{D} \) and \( \mathfrak{6} \) [16, 302, 643, 728] (M), because the origin of their unsoundness is their resemblance to \( \mathfrak{L} \), which they are like only when quiescent, and preceded, the \( \mathfrak{Y} \) by Kasra, and the \( \mathfrak{O} \) by Damma, in which case they become like \( \mathfrak{L} \), because quiescent and preceded by a vowel homogeneous with them, as likewise is \( \mathfrak{L} \), since it is quiescent and preceded by Fatha, which is homogeneous with it; so that, when
preceded by a quiescent, they are excluded from resemblance to ٌ, because ٌ is preceded only by a letter pronounced with Fath (IY): (b) ٌ [643, 780] and ٌ[299] (M), because the first ٌ and ی here are quiescent, like the ٌ of ٌ[above] and the ٌ of ٌ[85] (IY): (c) ٌ and ی [683 (case 1, c), 723], and ی [302, 683, 723, 728] (M), because ٌ and ی, when final, are transformed only after an aug. ا, as in ٌ [683, 719, 723], not after an ٌ converted from a rad. letter; lest two transformations, of the ُ and the ِ, occur consecutively in the word (IY): (2) when preceded by a mobile [below], bear only [Fatha (IY),] the sign of the subj. or acc., [because Fatha is light (IY),] as in (a) لَنْ يَنْبُرُ ارَبِيدُ أَنْ تُسْتَقَفُ I desire that thou shouldst draw water and shouldst summon; (b) رَأِيتُ الْمَرْأَةُ I saw the shooter and the blind (man) and the shouter (M): (a) by “mobile” [above] Z means “with the vowel permissible”, vid. (α) Damma before ّ, which [combination] is [found] only in vs., as يَغْزُرٌ [404, 719] and يَدْعُو calls [727]; not in ns. [721]: (β) Kasra before ی, which [combination] occurs in ns., as يَلْقَانِ这样才能 the judge [16, 294, 724] and الْمَرْأَةُ [719]; and vs., as يَسْقُي [404, 719] and يَسْقُي waters: (b) when preceded by
a letter pronounced with Fath,  و, and ی are converted into ٍ [684], as well as َعَصَّا and َرَحَى [719]; when preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, ی is converted into ى [686]; and, when preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, ی is converted into ى [685]: while only Damma occurs before ى, and only Kasra before ی (IY). But [some of the Arabs assimilate the ى and ی to ٍ, 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 'Āmir Ibn AtTufail (IY, MN) al-'Āmiri alJa'di, the chief of the Banū 'Āmir in heathenism (MN).]

فَمَا سُوْدَتْنِئِي عَامِرَةً عَنْ وَرَأْتَهُ * أَبِيْ أَلْلَهُ أَنْ أَسْمُوْ بَلَى وَلَا أَبُوَّْلَا َأَبٌّ [Yet clan 'Āmir 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 أَسْمُوْ (MN)]; and [hence (IY)] the saying of AlA'sha [Maimūn Ibn Kais, praising the Prophet (Jsh).]

نَعَلَيْتَ لَا أَرْتُ لَهَا مِنْ كَلَالَةٍ ۛ وَلَا مِنْ حَفْقِي حَتَّى شَلَّتُ مُمْكِنٌَْ (M) Then I swore that I would not be merciful to her for any weariness, nor for any soreness of foot, until she should meet Muḥammad, by rule ُتَلَافِي (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 āthā'īhā] is an acc., because an exc. from an aff. [88]; and hence َكُفَى ِبِالثَّنَّى إِلَى أَلْحَجَّام Give the bow to its maker (M), meaning Seek aid for thy work from the possessors of knowledge and skill therein (Md), where [properly َكُفَى ِبِالثَّنَّى إِلَى أَلْحَجَّام] is obj. of َكُفَى ِبِالثَّنَّى إِلَى أَلْحَجَّام: (a) ISh says "Mb says that this is one of the most beautiful poetic licenses [above], because they co-ordinate one case [of the n.] with [the other] two, meaning that they make the acc. like the gen. and nom.; while quiescence is lighter than vowels; for which [reasons] they determine upon making the quiescent in such comps. as َمُعْلِدٍ َكَرِبَ [below] and َكُفَى ِبِالثَّنَّى إِلَى أَلْحَجَّام [215]." (AKB on َكُفَى ِبِالثَّنَّى إِلَى أَلْحَجَّام below). Ka'b's saying [444] with quiescence [of the ] admits of two explanations, (1) that he makes the infinitival َكُفَى ِبِالثَّنَّى إِلَى أَلْحَجَّام inop., as in

إِذَا كَانَ أَمْرُ ٱلنَّاسِ ۡعَنَّى عُجُورِهِمَّ # ۡفَلاً بَدَأَ أَن يَلْقَوْنَ ۡكُلَّ ثُمَّرٍ

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 َبِيَمُ in
II. 233. [525, 572]: (a) so they say: though the latter may be explained on [the supposition] that ٖ is op. ; but that the o. f. is with the ، of the pl., by concord with the sense of ٖ , like X. 43. [182, 581]; and that the ٖ is afterwards elided [405] because of the subjunctival [410], and the ، because of the two quiescents [663]: (2) that he treats Fatha on ، like Damma, by poetic license, which, says Mb, is one of the most beautiful poetic licenses [above]: (a) that occurs even in the case of a [letter] lighter than ، , vid. ى , as in AlA'shâ's saying تُلَّاثِي هُمْ [above]: though تُلَّاثِي ْتَقَلِّبُ الْحَمْٰلُ thou shouldst meet may be orig. تُلَّاثِيْنَ , an enallage from the 3rd to the 2nd pers. [1], which is attested by [the fact] that he addresses her in the following verse مَتْيَ ما نَناخَي أَلَح [565]. Quiescence of ، occurs in prose, as in the reading of one of the ancients أَوْ يَعْفَوُ الَّذِي يَبْدِلْ عَقْدَةُ أَلْتُكَعَي V. 91. [543] (BS), according to the dial. of those who make it quiescent in the three cases, like
[below] (B), for lightness, as they say مَعْدِي كَرِبٍ [above], by assimilation of ي is ی (K); and also in the readings زَٰٰلِيَّةٌ حَفَتْ الْبَوْلِي مِنْ زَٰرَأَةٍ 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 نَأْذَكُرُوا آَسْمَ آَللَّهِ عَلَيْهَا صَرَائِي XXII. 37. Therefore mention the name of God over them, when pure, this being with a quiescent ی, pl. of صَائِيَةٍ, i. e., exclusively belonging to God (BS). In [the position of (IY)] the ind. or nom., the ی and ی are quiescent (M), because ظَامِنَة upon them is deemed heavy; so that you say [in the v.] هُوَ يَغَزُو He raids and يَزْرَى shoots [719], and in the n. هُدَا آَلِ الرَّأَمِي This is the shooter and the blind (man) and the shouter. But some of the Arabs treat this ی like the sound [letter], mobilizing it with the vowels of inflection, as هُدَا قَاضِيَ This is a judge, رَأَيْتُ قَاضِيَا I passed by a judge (IY). Mobilization [of the ی (SH)] is anomalous (M, SH) in the nom. and gen. [below] (SH), as قَدْ كَادَ يَذُهَبُ بِالدِّنيَا وَلَدَتْهَا مُرْأَيْتُ قَاضِيَةٍ Plump darlings, like the rams of the breed of sheep called ﴿ٱلْعُوسُ﴾, have wellnigh taken away (the life of) the world and its pleasure (Jsh), and ما إن رَأَيْتُ آَللَّهِ
[below] (IY, R, Jrb): like (1) quiescence [of the ʿ and ʿ (R, Jrb)] in the subj. or acc. (SH), as (a) ʿmā ṣāḥibnī (R, Jrb) [above] (R, Jrb): (b) [333]; the saying

(℅) ʿaydīyīs ʿpālīqā ʿalqir ʿaʿīdījūrā ḫawā ṭuttāṭīn ʿalqir (R), attributed by IR in the 'Umda to Ru'ba Ibn Al'Affājāj, though I have not seen it in his Diwān, As though their (the camels') forelegs in the level plain were arms of maidens taking silver dirhams, one from another (AKB); [above]; and the prov. ʿāʿūsh ʿalqir [above] (Jrb): (2) retention of both [ ʿ and ʿ (R, Jrb)], and of ʿ, in the apoc. (SH), as (a) ḫajjūt ʿalqir (Jrb): (b) ʿlūm yāʿtaʾṣīd ʿalqir (Jrb) [below] (R, Jrb), i. e., ʿlūm tāḥīj [below] (R): and, in some readings, (a) ʿrṣāla ṭaʿnā ʿaṣā ʿrṭībī ʿrṭībī X. 12. Send him with us to-morrow: he will feed, and play [from ʿrṭībī, aor. ʿrṭībī (K, B)], where ʿrṭībī being the correl. of the command, is governed in the apoc. [420] (Jrb); while Nāfī reads [ ʿrṭībī ] with Kasr, and ʿlūb (B); and Ya'lä Ibn Siyāba reads ʿrṭībī ʿlūb with Kasr of the ʿ, and ʿlūb And he will play in the ind. by inception [423] (K): and (b) ʿdā ʿmān ʿyinīʿyī ʿalqir XII. 90. [below] (Jrb): (α) Damma is then
supplied on the  and  in order that it may be elided [404] by the apocopative, because the apocopative must govern [419]; but more frequently and properly on the  because دامما on  is heavier than on  (R): (c) لا تَرَضَعَا أَلْحَمَى مَا أَنْسَى لَا أَنْسَاهُ أَلْحَمٍ [below] (Jrb), and [below]: (a) to supply دامما on the  is more strange, because  does not bear a vowel (R). In the gen. only  occurs, because [the gen. is only in decl. ns., while (IY)] among decl. ns. there is none whose final is  preceded by a vowel [721]. And the predicament of the  in the gen. is the same as in the nom. [above]. But 

by Jarir, [And one day they reward love with an ineffective (meeting), and another day thou seest in them a she-devil that destroys (man), orig. تَنَفَّذُ (MN)], is cited; and [Ubaid Allah (Dw)] Ibn [Kais (Dw)] ArRu’kayyat says  لا بَارَكَ الْآلهَةُ فِي الْغَزَّانِيَيْنِ أَلْحَمٍ [547]; and another says  مَا إِنْ رَأَيْتَ وَلَا أُرَى نَيْنِ مُدَّتِي كَجَعْرَةَ يُلْعَبُنَّ فِي الْصَّكْرَاءٍ [above] (M) I have not seen, إن  being red. [563], nor shall I see in my period of life, aught in beauty like maids that play in the meadow (Jsh). Some of them make that a poetic license; and, according to this, the poet [in the last verse] combines two licenses, Kasr of the  in the gen. [16], and triptote declension [17, 18] (IY). But [R says that] the  and  are treated like...
the sound [letter], in a case of choice, by some of the Arabs, who mobilize the of ُ[الر]ِمِي [719] in the nom. and gen., and of ُيِرْمِي [404, 719] in the ind.; and similarly the, of ُيَغْرُقُ [404, 719] in the ind. (R). In the apoc. they are elided [404, 697, 719] (M), because they are regarded as equivalent to ُدَمَّمَا, inasmuch as their quiescence is the sign of the ind. [above]; so that they are elided for apocopation (IY), as the vowel [ُدَمَّمَا (IY)] is elided [404]. But they are retained in the saying

[Thou didst satirize Zabbān; then thou camest, apologizing for satirizing Zabbān: thou didst not satirize (him), nor let (him) alone (MN, Jsh), by rule ُتَهَجَّ (Jsh)]; and in ُأَلَمْ يَأْتِيَ الْحَمْ (503) (M), properly ُيَأْتِيَ (Jsh); while one version reported from Ibn Kathīr is ُإِنْ ُمَنْ يَتَقَبَّلُ وَيَضَيِّرُ XII. 90. Verily the case is this, whoso feareth etc. [404]. As for the ِ[above], it is retained, always quiescent; except in the apoc. mood [404, 697], where it is elided, like the, and ُ[above], as ُلَمْ يَخُشَّ did not dread and ُلَمْ يُدْعَ was not called. But it is retained in the saying [of ُعِبْدِ يَأْجُحُ (IY, Jsh) Ibn Wā‘kās al‘Hārithi (Jsh)]
And an 'Abshami old dame laughs at me, as though she had not seen a Yamānī captive before me, by rule (Jsh); and [similarly (IY)] in 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 by (Jsh): and hence

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 , according to the more recognized form (MN).

§. 721. Among decl. ns. there is none whose final is preceded by a vowel [719, 720], because the vowel, if Fatha, makes the , as in [684, 719]; and, if Kasra, converts it into , as in [685, 719, 724] (IY on § 720); while there is no [decl. (Jrb)] n. whose final is preceded by Damma [686 (case 2, c, α)], that being [found] only in vs., as in [727] (IY, Jrb), and indecl. ns., as [below] and [176] (Jrb). The cause of that will [now] be explained (IY).
original Šamma occurs as a Ũ, final, as in ۸۹۳٠, or virtually final, as when followed by a separable letter, like the š of feminization, when separable [۹۶۶], as in [۳۳۶, ۶۸۶ (case 2, b)], or an l of dualization [۲۲۸], as in ۷۲۷, and that [combination] is in a decl. n., the, must be converted into ī, and the Šamma before it into Kasra, because, preceded by a letter pronounced with Šamm 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 ۸۹۳٠, ۶۸۵, ۷۲۷ and ۸۹۳٠, [by analogy ۸۹۳٠ and ۸۹۳٠ (IY),] for the pl. [of paucity (IY)] on [the measure of] ۸۹۳٠, from ۸۹۳٠ bucket and ۸۹۳٠ waist; and ۸۹۳٠ and ۸۹۳٠ for the pl. of ۸۹۳٠ [۲۴۸, ۷۲۳] and ۸۹۳٠ [۲۵۴, ۳۹۰, ۷۲۳], [by elision of the š (IY),] on the principle of ۸۹۳٠ and ۸۹۳٠ [۲۵۴], as

لا صبر حنی تلکفقی بصنع ۸۹۳٠ اهل الویمیت الریمیت و القدیس

[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 Šamma before the, in order that the, may be converted into ī, as in ۸۹۳٠ and ۸۹۳٠ [۶۸۵ (case 5), ۶۹۹] (M); so that the word becomes of the
class of the defective, like ٌقَصَن [16] (IY). [According to R, however, first] the َ is converted into ى; and afterwards the ؤamma into Kasra: and one does not begin by converting the ؤamma into Kasra, because alleviation of the final is more appropriate. The َ is not converted into ى, (1) when it is not a ل, whether it be pronounced with (a) Fath, as in ٌقَبَبَّت [273, 385]: (b) ؤamma, in which case, (a) if followed by a quiescent, as in حَوْلٌ [inf. n. of حَالَةُ عَلَيْهِ آللَّهُ The year passed over him (KF, MAR)], it may be retained, or be converted into Hamza [683] (R), [as] حَوْلٌ (KF); (b) if followed by a mobile, it must be made quiescent, as ُنَوْرِ [orig. نُورِ (MAR),] pl. of نَوْرٍ [711, 712]: or (c) Kasr, in which case it remains unaltered, as أَرْنُ on [the measure of] أَكْرَمُ from ُنَوْرِ affection: (a) as for قِبْلَ, orig. قِبْلَ [436], it is because of what has been mentioned in the Commentary on the IH [706]: (2) when it is a ل, but is followed by an inseparable letter, like the ى of feminization in عَنْصِرَة [385, 399, 719, 724], and the nondualistic ٌن in ُنَعْوَان and أَنْعَوَان [274, 390, 724]: except when the ؤamma before it is upon another َ, in which case it is converted into ى, because of the excessive heaviness, even if it be immediately followed by an inseparable letter, as in ُقَويّة and ُقَوْيَان [730. A] on [the
measure of] سُرَّة [254] and سَبْعَان [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 Damma [before it] is not permanent, as in (a) *اَخْوَان* فَّلُون* thy father, *أَبُو* فَّلُون* thy mouth and *أَخْوَات* فَّلُون* thy brother [16]: (b) *خَطْوَات* steps [238, 240]; for, though the ْل and ْل [234] are separable, like the ِل [336] of تَغَاوَرْتُ [above], still the Damma of the ْل is accidental in the pl., where the ْل may be made quiescent: (4) when the ْل is in a v., like سُرَّرُ was liberal [729], aor. يُسِّرُ [730], and [like] يُذْعَرُ [720], because, though the v. is heavier than the n., so that alleviation is more appropriate and suitable for it, still the word becomes a v. only through the measure, since the o.f. of the v. is the inf. n. [331], which is transferred to the cat. of the v. through the formation only, the inf. n. being like the material, and the v. like a compound of the material and the form; and, since the quality of v. comes into existence through the formation only [724], while the formations of the tril. v. vary, and are distinguishable, one from another, only through the vowel of the ع [482, 704, 730. A], the Arabs take care to preserve that vowel, which is therefore not elided, except when the formation is not distinguishable by transfer [of that vowel] to the preceding letter, as in ٤۹١٤٢٨١٦٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٢٨١٦٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٢٨١٦٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٣٠٤٢
and طَلَّتْ [705], and to يَخَافُ and يَبْيَعُ [697, 703], as before explained: (a) similarly they say رَمْوَرْ آَلَّرْجَلُ How well the man shoots! [476, 686 (case 2, a), 724], contrary to such as آَلَّتِرْاَمِي [713]: (b) thus it is established that the Damma of سَرُّ and يَدُعُو [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 حُمْ 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. [ ] if the were converted. And IH, notwithstanding that he is discussing the preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, mentions خَيْلاً [273] together with قُبْيَاء [above], to demonstrate the predication 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 تَرَأَمْ تَرَأَمْة [332] and تَرَأَمْة [336, 686 (case 2, b)], according to what we have mentioned [in connection with نَعْرَة and نَعْراً ]; and unnecessary where it is not necessary with the , [above]. Fr says that سَيْرَة [273, 385] is orig. فَعَلَةَ with Damm, being
pronounced with Kasr on account of the ى, as ّبوت and ّبوت [242], ّبوت and ّبوت [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] فَعَلَةَ، with Kasr of the ف, except the hollow whose ع is a ى: but Khl says that no فَعَلَةَ، with Kasr of the ف occurs in the language, except عِنْبَا [368], سِيرَآهٌ; and عِنْبَا حُرَالَا، i. q. حُرَالَا عِنْبَا. membrane enclosing the fetus in the womb of the she-camel (R), which have no fourth (KF, MAR). They say كُسْسَةٌ، and كُسْسَةٌ [above]; كُسْسَةٌ [above] and عْنَفُوْنَ [283, 389, 685 (case 1, b, b), 724], where the ج is not final. And the counterpart of that is the transformation in such as رُدَا، كُسْسَةٌ and [683, 723], and its omission in such as (1) نِهَالِةٌ and and ضَفْأَةٌ صَلاَيْةٌ and ضَفْأَةٌ عَطَالِيَةٌ [266, 683 (case 1, d), 723]; (2) أَبْرَةٌ paternity and أَخْرَةٌ fraternity [722] (M), inf. ns. on [the measure of] فَعَولَةٌ [331], from which the ى is inseparable in the first state of their formation in this shape [265 (case 10)] (IY); (3) مِدْرَازٌ وِنَلَاءٌ [228-230, 683 (case 1, f), 723, 727]. S asked Khl about their saying صَلَée [683 (case 1, e), 723], عَتَاؤَا عَبْأَا، and عَتَاؤَا عَبْأَا; and he said “They only pronounce the n. un. [254] conformably to صَلَée [723], عَبْأَا and عَتَاءٌ (M); as they
say مَرْضِيَة مَسْنَيَة, pronouncing them conformably to مَرْضِيَة مَسْنَيَة [685 (case 8), 722]" (S, IY); meaning that مَرْضِيَة صَلَائِه and عَبَآءَة are not treated like نَهَائِيّة [above] and إِدَارَة [281, 683 (case 1, d)], because the s is affixed to صَلَائِه and عَبَآءَة after the conversion [of their ] into Hamza has become necessary in them (IY): "but, as for those who say مَرْضِيَة and عَبَآءَة [266], they do not pronounce the n. un. conformably to صَلَائِه and عَبَآءَة; as those who say خَصْيَامٍ [228] do not form the du. conformably to the sing. used in speech (M), whereas, if they meant that, they would say خَصْيَامٍ" (S).

§. 722. They say عَتَبَّٰيِ and جَبَّٰيِ [act of] kneeling upright [728], and عَتَبَّٰيِ جَبَّٰيِ [with Kasr of the ا and ص, or with ذَامَمَم of the ف (IY)], doing to the final ج after ذَامَمَم فَعْل, notwithstanding that the letter of prolongation is a barrier between them, what they do to it in أَدَلُّ بَلْنِس [721], as they do in كَسَآء [683, 723] the like of what they do in عَصْمَا [684, 719] (M). The ج is converted into ا for alleviation, because of two matters, (1) that the word is a pl. [below], the pl. being deemed heavy: (2) that the first ج, being an aug. letter of prolongation, is not taken into account as a barrier; so that the ج, which is the ج of the word, comes, as it 175a
were, immediately after the Damma, \( \ddot{\text{عصر}} \), becoming \( \dddot{\text{عصر}} \); and is therefore converted into \( \dddot{\text{i}} \), as in \( \dddot{\text{أَدَل}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{أَحْقِي}} \) [721]. Then, this \( \dddot{\text{i}} \) being combined with [the preceding] \( \dddot{\text{و}} \), the \( \dddot{\text{ي}} \) is converted into \( \dddot{\text{ي}} \) [685 (case 7)]. And they pronounce the \( \dddot{\text{ع}} \) with Kasr in such as \( \dddot{\text{عُصِي}} \), as they do in \( \dddot{\text{أَدَل}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{أَحْقِي}} \) [721] (IY). This process is invariable in what is a pl. [above], except in such an anomaly as \( \dddot{\text{لَتَنَظَرُ فِي نَّتْحَرِكُ كَثِيرَةً}} \). 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 \( \dddot{\text{عَتَر}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{مَغْزَر}} \) (M), as XXV. 23. [685 (case 9, b)] (IY); but they do say \( \dddot{\text{عَتَرّي}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{مَغْزَرّي}} \), as

[685 (case 8, b, a, \( \gamma \))] : and they say \( \dddot{\text{أَرْضَ مَسْنَى}} \) \( \dddot{\text{i}} \) \( \dddot{\text{أَنْتُي}} \) \( \dddot{\text{أَنَّا}} \) \( \dddot{\text{أَلَّيْتُ مَغْدِيًا عَلِيَّةً وَعَادِيًا}} \) [685 (case 8, b, a, \( \gamma \)] : and they say \( \dddot{\text{i}} \) \( \dddot{\text{أَرْضَ مَسْنَى}} \) \( \dddot{\text{I}} \) \( \dddot{\text{wَatered the land}} \) (IY)], and \( \dddot{\text{I}} \) \( \dddot{\text{مَرْضِي}} \) [685 (case 8), 721]; or \( \dddot{\text{I}} \) \( \dddot{\text{مَرْضِي}} \) [below], according to rule. S says "The proper letter in this sort", [i. e., what is a sing. (IY),] "is \( \dddot{\text{و}} \); but the other is [good] Arabic, [and] frequent: while the proper letter in the pl. is \( \dddot{\text{ي}} \)" (M). The final \( \dddot{\text{و}} \) 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 غَزَّى on the measure of عِصْفُر [396] from غَزَّ [728, 730. A]; and hence pass. part. from قُنُول [685 (case 8), 730. A]: (b) a pl. on [the measure of] فَعُوْل [243, 685 (case 9)], like ُقُلُبَ pl. of جَانُثُ pl. of kneeling upright, and أَعْصَمُ pl. of أَعْصَمُ [above]; and hence after transposition [243]: (a) نَحُوُ pl. of نَحُوُ, as غَرَّ نَحْوَ etc. [above] is anomalous; and so are نَحُوُ pl. of مَنْجِرَ pl. of مَنْجِرَ chest, and أَبَ نَحُوُ pl. of أَبَ pl. of chest, and أَبَ pl. of أَبَ and أَخْرَ pl. of أَخْرَ: and أَخْرَ أَبَ [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 قُتِّرَ (IY, Jrb) and قُتِّرَةُ [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 conj. of with Kasr [of the ع], as مَرْضُ [685 (case 8)], which is more frequent than مَرْضُ [above], for imitation of the pret. v.: (3) properly omitted, in every inf. n. on [the measure of] فَعُوْل, like جَنْوُ [act of] kneeling upright and ثُنَوُ [685 (case 9, b)]; while those who convert [the س into د] do so because of the transformation of [the س into د] in the v. [ثُنَا and ثُنَا]. If not final, the س is not converted, as أَدْوَأُ أَخْرَة [721].
Conversion is extraordinary: in (1) فَعَلَ and جُعُولَةٌ, like أدْعِيَةٌ أدْعُو or أدْعَا, riddle occurs; and hence دَحُورٌ of I expanded (Jh), and hence أدْعَا, 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) and جُعُولَةٌ as أَلْيَةٌ oath, which may be فيَعُولَةٌ or فيعَيْلَةٌ while its ل is a م, because they say أَلْيَةٌ in the same sense: (3) the pass. part. in which the ظamma is not on [another] م, and which does not belong to the conjg. of جُعُولَةٌ with كَسْرٍ, like مَغْزِر [685 (case 8, b)]: but مَسْنَةٌ أَرضَ مَسْنَةٌ [above] is said; and the poet says

َاَنَّا اللَّيْتُ مَعْدُيًا عَلَيْهِ وَعَادِيًا

[above] (R). The saying أَنا اللَّيْتُ الْحَجَّ is recited in both ways [685 (case 8, b, a, ð)]. The cause of the transformation is disputed, being said to be (1) conformity to the pass. v. [عُمْدَيْ (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 أَذَلٍ أَجْرُ [243, 721], because the first مَعْدُ (Sn), being quiescent, aug, [and] fit for incorporation, is not taken into account as a barrier; so that
the, which is the ج of the word, is, as it were, immediately after the Damma; and is therefore converted into ی, as in لدٌ أَجُر [above] (A). The pass. part. whose ج is a Hamza is sometimes subjected to this transformation, like مَكْشُوبٍ, orig. مَكْشَبٍ, hidden [658].

And occurs anomalously as pl. of فَتْى youth, notwithstanding that its ج is a ی, as نَجْحُ / نَجَّحُ is anomalous, except that the anomaly in نَجْحُ is conversion of the ی into [243], and in نَجَّحُ is non-conversion of the ی into [above]. After conversion of the ی into ی [and of the Damma into Kasra], you may make the ف of فَتْى, whether a pl. or otherwise, imitate, or not imitate, the ع [in its vowel], as [684, 685 (case 9, b, a), 730. A] and دَلِّي [243, 685 (case 9)]. And in فَتْى, when a pl. of the hollow whose is ع, as فَتْيُ صَمُومُ fasters [247] and قَوْلُ sayers [730. A], you may convert the ی into ی, as صَمِيمُ and تَيِّبُل [685 (case 10), 715, 716], though it should rather be sounded true. That is allowable only because it is a pl. [above], and the ی is near the end; while حَيْلُ [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 نَمَا أَرَقُ أَنْلِيَمَ آلٍ , [685, 715, 716], it is anomalous, because of the remoteness from the end (R).
§ 723. The  and  are converted [into ] and afterwards (R)] into Hamza [683 (case 1, k, ء)], when they occur as a final [below] after an aug. 1 , [because, the 1 being then like the non-existent, the mobile  and  occur, as it were, after Fatha (R),] as  and  

[328, 683, 708, 719] (SH), which are  فعال from  كسأ and  فكان حسن اليدية such a one is good in the fashion of wearing the cloak (Jrb); contrary to  رأى and  تأى [719] (SH), where the 1 , being converted from a rad. letter, [  in the former ex., and  in the latter,] is taken into account (R). It is mentioned, in the commentary ascribed to IH, that  رأى and  تأى are pls. of  رأية and  تأية: but this requires consideration; and it should rather be said that  رأى and  رأية [301, 302, 305],  تأى and  تأية [305, 684], are [collective generic ns. and ns. un., respectively,] on the principle of  تمر and  تمر [254] (Jrb). The  and  mentioned are converted into 1 because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 719]. Then, two quiescents being combined, the first is not elided [708], notwithstanding that it is a letter of prolongation [663], lest one formation be confounded with another, [vid. the prolonged with the abbreviated]; but the second is converted into a letter susceptible of a vowel, [and] akin to 1 , 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 ى or ى, because one has only just escaped from them (R). It is stipulated, in the case of the [ى or ى (IY)] converted after ى that the ى should be aug. [374, 673], as in كَسَأٰ and رَآى [above]: whereas, if it be rad., the ى or ى is not converted, as ٛؤُ [683 (case 1, a), 697, 698, 720] and ُؤُ [below], ُىَِّٓ and ٌتَبَأَّى [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 ٰخَى عَصَأ and ٰخَى [719]: whereas, when the ى is rad., this assumption is not permissible: (2) that the ى, when rad., is converted from another [letter]; so that, when you proceed to convert the ى or ى, which is a ل, you make two transformations consecutively, which is a catachresis. And Mz exaggerates in precaution by stipulating that the ى, with which the ى or ى is converted into Hamza, should be [not only] aug., [but] third, to guard against ٛؤُى [below] and ُؤُى [720]; for, though "aug." is sufficient as a safeguard, he corroborates it by "third" (IY). As for ُؤُى [321, 720], its ى is converted from a ى, and
its ج is a ى, because it is from the crude-form of جمتعت meaning 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 جروى [683, 684 (condition 10, a, a, ى)] and جروى [683, 713]; but جرية is co-ordinated, in anomalousness, with جرية [above] and جرية [684 (condition 10, b)]. And, as for جرى [above], the fold or nightly resting-place of camels, [sheep, or goats (Jh),] it is from جرم جد I abode. Similarly, if the ج and ى be followed by the inseparable ى of feminization [below], as in ىشقارة ىشقارة and ىشقاره [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 Fath is a weak cause for their conversion [703], and, above all, when an ى 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 ى 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 ىشقاره ىشقاره choice part and ىنهالى [266, 721] ;
(2) the 1 of dualization, when inseparable, as in َنَاثَبْيَاٰن, [228, 230, 683 (case 1, f), 721], since ُذَّنَا for the sing. does not occur; (3) the non-dualistic ٍ and ُن, as in ُغَلَأْن and ُرَماْيِان, on the measure of ُسَكَأْنَان [390], from ُغَلَأْن and ُرَماْيِان: whereas, (a) if the ٍ be separable, which is (a) the ٍ distinguishing the fem. from the masc. in eps. [265], as قَٰسَفَا [682, 683 (case 1, e)] and قَٰسَفَا, because they say قَٰسَفَا [282] and قَٰسَفَا great raider, and (b) the regular ٍ of un. [336], as in قَٰسَفَا a drawing of water and قَٰسَفَا a choice, an election, or, (b) if the 1 of dualization be separable, as in ٌرَدْتَأْنِي and ٌكَٰسَأْنِ [230, 683 (case 1, f)], the ٌ and ِ ى are converted, because quasi-final. And the reason why قَٰسَفَا or قَٰسَفَا [266, 683 (case 1, e), 721], قَٰسَفَا or قَٰسَفَا, and قَٰسَفَا or قَٰسَفَا, with Hamza or ى, are allowable, although in them also the ٍ denotes unity, as in قَٰسَفَا and قَٰسَفَا [above], is only that, in the inf. n. [336], the ٍ of un. is regular, frequent, so that its adventitiousness is obvious; contrary to the concrete n. [3], where those [specimens] whose n. un. is distinguished from their generic n. by the ٍ [254, 265] are rare, whether they be [denotative of] created things, like قَٰسَفَا, or [of] others, like قَٰسَفَا and لَبَنَة [254]: so that, in the three ns. [under discussion], Hamza is allowable from regard to the
separability of the ی, since ی عباد 721, عطام 721, and ی عبان are said for the generic ع. While ی is allowable, because the ی [in the concrete ع], being generally inseparable, since, as we said, it is not regular, becomes like the ی of ی نهائية 8 شقار [229, 266]. And, since the ی of ع in the concrete ع. is quasi-inseparable, ی عبان and ی عبان are allowable, although the generic ع. is ی عبان and ی عبان [721]. But [the inf. عs.] ی شقا and ی شقا are not like [the concrete عs.] ی عبان and ی عبان [above], since ی عبان and ی عبان do not denote the individual, and ی عبان the genus; nay, the ع. ع. would by rule be ی شقا a misery [336]: so that ی شقا is not orig. ی شقا augmented by the ی; and for this reason the ی is permanent, as 8 عبان, not 8 عبان [266]. The reason why the occurrence of an inseparable letter [after the ی and ی ] prevents conversion in the cat. ع. شقا [above] and عبان being ashamed [below], and in the cat. ع. شقا [719, 721], but not in the cat. ع. شقا and عبان [685, 686, 724], respectively, with Kasr of the ی, even if we hold the ی [and ی ] 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 دَنْيَا [724]. The Hamza in such co-ordinates as ٰ and ٰ [248, 273, 385] is orig. converted from the ی added for co-ordination [683 (case 1)], as is proved by their fem. analogues, like ٰ درْحَابَة [282] and [short, fat (IY on §. 683), fleshy, whether tall or short KF, MAR], where, the ی being inseparable, as in حَرَابَة [above], the ی is not converted, contrary to حَرَابَة female chameleon (R).

§. 724. The [final (Jrb)] ی, preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr is [unavoidably (M)] converted (M, SH) into ی (IY, SH), as رَبَّی and دُمِی [below], and ٱلْغَازِی [685 (case 1, a), 719, 721] (SH); [and] as مَفْعُوَلَةَ [below] and مَكْنَوْنَةَ bend in a valley (M), مَكْنَوْنَةَ ٰ I bent, orig. مَكْنَوْنَةَ (BS). For the ی, in addition to being preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is a ی, while the ی is weak as being at the end [719]; and, since they convert the ی in the like of ٍثُبَرَ ُضَمْر [685 (case 3, b, c, α), 713], and ٍثُبَرَ and ٍثُبَرَ [685 (cases 2, 3), 713], notwithstanding that the ی is stronger than the ی, much more should the ی, which is weaker, be converted because of the Kasra before it (IY). The mobile ی, preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, being strengthened by the vowel,
is not converted into ى, except on [one of] two conditions, (1) that it be a ج, because the final is the seat of alteration: (a) it is then converted into ى, whether it be in (a) a n., as دلّى [713]; or (b) a v., act., like ىمن [685 (case 1, a)], or pass., like was called [629]: and whether it (a) become virtually medial, through the occurrence of a subsequent letter inseparable from the word, as in دُرّى (case 1, upon [the measure of] ُعلّان [685 (case 1, d), 686 (case 2, c, a), 723] from ٱعْرَب و ُغَرِّب, and ُغَرِّب upon [the measure of] ُعَلَّةٌ [723] from the same, with inseparability of the ُ, as in ُسَعِرُ [385, 721]; or (b) do not become [so], as in ُعَارِيْة [265 (case 1, a, c), 685 (case 1, b)]: (b) مَقَاتِرٌ pl. of مَقَاتِرِ [685 (case 1, b, c)] is anomalous, being treated as sound for conformity to مَقَاتِرُونَ: (c) they say جَنَّةٌ [overlapping peak of a mountain (MAR)], with ُ, lest the rare ُنْعِلْيَةٍ be confounded with the frequent ُنْعِلِيَةٍ, as ُنَفْرِيةٍ [385], ُنَفْرِيةٍ [an all. seq. of ُنَفْرِيةٍ (KF, MAR)], ُنَفْرِيةٍ [385], and the like: (d) if you contract ُرَضْى [above] and ُغَرِّى was raided, you say ُرَضْى and ُغَرِّى, as you say ُعَلِّم for ُعَلِّم [482, 685 (case 7, b, b, c)], and ُعَلِّم for ُعَلِّم was pressed, squeezed; and the ى is not restored to its ى. f. of ى, notwithstanding the removal
of the Kasra in contraction, because its removal is accidental: (e) they say ّضُرِّبُوا They were pleased and ّضُرِّبُوا They were raided, taking the supplied Kasra into account as respects conversion of the ّ into ی , but not as respects retention of the Đamma on the ی : whereas, if they took it into account in every respect, ّضُرِّبُوا and ّضُرِّبُوا would be said, because Đamma on the ی is deemed heavy after Kasra; and then the ّ 's being affixed to the contracted ّضَرِّبَتَ and ّضَرِّبَتَ would not be plain: (2) that it be an ّ in a ّ made conformable to something else, as in ّتَيَامَ [above], and ّديْار and ّرْيَاض [685 (case 3, a, b)], as before explained [713]. As for the mobile ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Đamm, (1) if it do not occur as a ّ , then, (a) if it be not pronounced with Kasr, as ّعِيَام and ّعِيَام [713], and ّعِيَان pl. of ّعِيَان [246], it is not converted into ّ , because it is strengthened by the vowel, and is also medial; (b) if it be pronounced with Kasr, as in ّبٰع [436], its predicament has been explained [706]: (2) if it occur as a ّ , then, (a) if Fath be inseparable from it, the ی is converted into ّ on account of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Đamm, because the final is the seat of alteration; while, through the inseparability of Fath, a ّ preceded by a letter pronounced with Đamm is not deemed heavy at the end, as it is not so deemed in ّخُتُو [161, 721]: that is [found]
in (a) the v., as رَمَوَ الرَّجُلُ زُيدَ. Most excellent in shooting is the man, Zaid! [468, 686 (case 2, a), 721] from رَمَيُ. (α) if you contract [نَعَلَ by eliding] the Damma of the ع, the ، is not altered, because the contraction is accidental, as طُرِفَ عُرَفَ رَمَوَ الرَّجُلُ [368, 476]: (b) the n., but only when the و is followed by an inseparable aug. necessitating Fath of what is before it, [i.e., of the و, ] like [the ٰ and ـ in] أَرْمَوْاٰنٰ on the measure of أَسْكَبُانٰ [a kind of tree (KF, MAR)] from رُمَيُ, where the ، is not deemed heavy, as it is not so deemed in ُعْنَفُوَانٰ and ِإِنْكُوَانٰ [389, 390, 399, 721], because the ، is, as it were, not a ل: and like [the ی in] رَمَوُّ on the measure of ُنَعْلَةٍ from ُرُمَيُ, when the ی is inseparable [686 (case 2, b)]; whereas, if it be not inseparable, you say َرُمَيَةٍ and َرُمَيُ [686 (case 2, c, a)], by conversion of the ذَمْمَة into كَسْرَا [721]: (α) the reason why كَسْرَا is inseparable from the letter followed immediately by the ی in such as طَوْيِانٌ with كَسْرُ of the و, [orig. طَوْيِانٌ on the measure of ُذَوْيُ with ذَمْمَة, from كَسْرَا [hungered (MAR)], and مَطْرِیَةٌ [orig. مَطْرِیَةٌ on the measure of ُمَسْرِیَةٍ [362], from the same, is only that, the last of such as ُدوْرُ with ذَمْمَة being always converted into ی [685 (case 1, a, a), 728], the ی of طَوْيِانٌ [or مَطْرِیَةٍ ] cannot
possibly be converted into \( \checkmark \); (b) if Fath be not inseparable from it, as in \( \text{الْمَكَّرِي} \) rivalry, competition and \( \text{الْمَكَّرِي} \) disputing, one with another, the Damma is converted into Kasra [700]; and not the \( \checkmark \) into \( \checkmark \), because the heaviest of the unsound letters, i. e. \( \checkmark \), preceded by the heaviest of the vowels, i. e. Damma, is deemed too heavy to be a seat of inflection: (a) as for \( \text{بَهِّرُ الرَّجُل} \), aor. \( \text{بَهِّرَ} \), i. q. \( \text{بَهِّرَ} \), aor. \( \text{بَهِّرَ} \), meaning [The man] became handsome, its [original] \( \checkmark \), notwithstanding its being a seat of inflection [in the aor.], is converted into \( \checkmark \), because of what we have mentioned (R), [i. e.] on account of the Damma [in \( \text{نَفُّذَ} \)], because in vs. the formations are observed, never confused one with another, since the quality of \( v. \) comes into existence only by means of the formation and measure [721]; the a. f. of the \( v. \) being the inf. n. [331], which is a \( n. \), but, on being invaded by the measures, becomes a \( v. \) (R on the Preterite): (b) similarly the Damma is converted into Kasra, when the \( \checkmark \) that is the seat of inflection is doubled, as in \( \checkmark \) on the measure of \( \text{تَمِّلٌ} \) [375, 730. A] from \( \text{رَمِي} \) (R). But \( \text{تَنْثَت} \) [acquiring for oneself, not for traffic (Jh)] and [\( \text{ٍثُورُ أُبُنَّ عَبِّي} \) دِنيَا] [\( \text{دنْيَا} \)], \( \text{He is the son of my paternal uncle, closely related} \) [723] are anomalous (SH), by rule \( \text{دُنْرَا} \) and \( \text{دُنْرَا} \) (Jrb); because you convert the \( \checkmark \) that is a \( \checkmark \) into \( \checkmark \), notwithstanding its separation
from the preceding Kasra by the quiescent. The reason of that, besides its anomalousness, is that the \( \ddot{a} \) is a \( \mathbb{L} \), and the quiescent like the non-existent. On this hypothesis belongs to [the cat. of] the \( \ddot{a} \), because you say \( \text{[I acquired for myself, not for traffic (Jh)]} \): but it should rather be said to belong to \( \text{\[c.\]} \), because its \( \mathbb{L} \) is biform; and hence property acquired for oneself, not for traffic (Jh, MAR)], with Damm of the \( \mathbb{Q} \) (R). And [similarly] \( 246, 257, 685 \) is from, \( \text{[aor. \( \text{\[c.\]} \}, \text{\[0\]} \), and abov] from \( \text{\[d.\]} \) nearness (IY). Tayyi convert the \( \mathbb{I} \) in the cat. of and \( \text{\[d.\]} \) \( \text{\[c.\]} \) and \( \text{\[d.\]} \) into \( \mathbb{I} \) (SH), saying \( \text{\[d.\]} \) \( \text{\[c.\]} \) and \( \text{\[d.\]} \) \( \text{\[c.\]} \) \( \text{\[349, 482\]} \), because, deeming Kasra before the \( \mathbb{I} \) to be heavy, they convert it into Fatha; so that the \( \mathbb{I} \) becomes converted into \( \mathbb{I} \) (Jrb), as before explained [703]. This is a universal rule, according to them, whether the \( \mathbb{I} \) be orig. \( \ddot{a} \), as in \( \text{\[d.\]} \) \( \text{\[c.\]} \) \( \text{\[d.\]} \) \( \text{\[348, 272\]} \); or not, as in \( \text{\[d.\]} \) \( \text{\[c.\]} \) (R). But that is peculiar to vs., to the exclusion of ns., like \( \text{\[al.\]} \) [16, 294, 720] (Jrb).

§. 725. When the \( \mathbb{L} \) of \( \text{\[c.\]} \), with Fath of the \( \ddot{a} \), is unsound, then, (1) if a \( \ddot{a} \), it is preserved in the substantive, as \( \text{\[d.\]} \) \( \text{\[348, 272\]} \); and ep., as \( \text{\[fem. of \text{\[na.\]} \] tipsy (MAZ, Sn)]} \): (a) they make no distinction
between the substantive and ep. in the cat. of the ۶, [below] (A): (b) its ۶ is not converted into ۶, either in the substantive, as ۶ دعوی [above], or ep., as ۶ fem. of ۶ شهوان 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 ۶; whereas, if the ۶ were converted into ۶, both ends of the word would become light (R): (2) if a ۶, it is preserved in the ep., as ۶ صدیبَا حزبیا and ۶ صدیبُان حزبیان; and converted into ۶, in the substantive, as ۶ شهوی, ۶ فنری, and ۶ شهوی, 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 ۶, 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 ۶ into ۶; 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 [686 (case 3, a)], ۶ سعیا طغيیا, and ۶ سعیا, 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 177a
and in the CK, is agreeable with the opinion of S, [Z, IH,] and most of the GG: I mean that, in the substantive نَعْلَى, change of ی into ی is regular, and retention of ی anomalous. But in the Tashil he reverses [the rule], saying that the substitution of ی for the ی [serving as the ل] of نَعْلَى, when a substantive, is anomalous. And, in one of his [other] compositions also, he says "One anomaly in transformation is the substitution of ی for ی in نَعْلَى, when a substantive, like نَشْرُوَى Nashwâ, [a district in Adhrabijân (Sn),] نَفْرُوَى [above], عَنْدَوَا [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 نَفْرُوَى [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 طَغْيَانُ نَشْرُوَى [above], طَغْوَى [i. q طَغْيَانُ (686, case 3, a) (Sn)], قَندُرَا, [so in the MSS, with ق, but not found by me in the KF or elsewhere, what is in the KF being لَغْوَى with the dotted غ, i. q. لَغْوَى, 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 دَعْوَى [above], asserting that their o. f. is ی: whereas, in my opinion, these last, [i. e., نَشْرُوَى and the three after it (Sn),] should rather be regarded as
belonging to [the cat. of (Sn)] the , in order to pre-
clude multiplication of anomalies” (A); though this
argument does not apply to “most of the GG”, because
they do not profess that these four are anomalous (Sn).
And afterwards he says “One thing which makes it
plain that the change of ی [in نَسْوَى and the three after
it (Sn)] into ، is anomalous, is the sounding [of the ی ]
true in یُ [above], سَعِبَا and طَعْبَا; for these three,
which occur [with ی ] according to the o. f., and with
avoidance of anomalousness, are more worthy of being
considered regular”. This is his language: but a criti-
cism 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 یَلُعْلَى ، with Ḍamm of the ﺔ ، is unsound,
then, (1) if a ی ، it is preserved in the substantive, as
اَلْاقْصِيَّا a legal opinion; and ep., as اَلْقُصْيَا fem. of اَلْاقْصِيَّا
the most decisive (A), to be distinguished, say our
Master and YH, from اَلْقُصْيَا , as to which the differ-
ence between the Ḥijāzīs and Tamīmīs will be men-
tioned below, the o. f. [of the ل ] in the latter being ﺔ ،
while in this it is ی (Sn) : (a) they make no distinc-
tion between the substantive and ep. in the نَعْلَى
belonging to the cat. of the ی ، as they make none in the نَعْلَى
belonging to the cat. of the ﺔ [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 Ğamma at its beginning, and the lightness of the І at its end; whereas, if the Ј were converted into І, both ends of the word would become heavy (R); (2) if a І, it is preserved in the substantive, like حَزْرٍى [272], as أَدَأْرَا بِحُزْرٍى آَلِحٍ [685 (case 6, e)]; and converted into І in the ep., as XXXVII. 6, and لِلُّبَئِقَينِ آَلِحٍ [685 (case 6)]: (a) as for the saying of the Hijāzīs [685 (case 6, c)], it is anomalous by rule, [though] chaste by usage, serving to notify the ṣ. ḥ. (A), i. e. (Sn); while Tamīm say أَلْقْصِيَا [above], according to rule: (b) the sweetest also is anomalous, according to all. The opinion adopted by IM is contrary to what is held by [S, Z, IH, and] the [other] Etymologists, who say that the Ј of فَعَلْي, when a І, is converted in the substantive, not in the ep.; and make حَزْرٍى anomalous [685 (case 6, f)] (A). As for the cat. of the І, a sort of heaviness is produced in it by Ğamma’s being at the beginning of the word, and І’s being near the end; while, in addition to alleviation, distinction between the substantive and ep. is intended: so that the І is converted into І 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 І into І; and then, the ep., when it is
reached, is left without conversion for the sake of distinction between them. And أَلْدُنِيَّة [below], أَلْدُنِيَّة, and أَلْدُنِيَّة, though *fems.* of أَلْدُنِيَّة [359], أَلْدُنِيَّة, and أَلْدُنِيَّة, the *feminine* of superiority, are mentioned by *S* under the substantive أَلْدُنِيَّة, since أَلْدُنِيَّة of superiority 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 أَلْدُنِيَّة [above] to be a substantive, and أَلْدُنِيَّة [685 (case 6, f)] and أَلْدُنِيَّة [above], *fems.* of أَلْدُنِيَّة and أَلْدُنِيَّة, to be *eps.*, requires consideration, because أَلْدُنِيَّة also is *fem.* of أَلْدُنِيَّة [above]. But, says *S*, they say أَلْدُنِيَّة, [according to the *o.* *f.* (*S*)]; so that they do not convert its ى into ى, because with the *art.* it is sometimes an *ep.* [356]. According to the opinion of *S*, then, أَلْدُنِيَّة, and every *fem.* of the أَلْدُنِيَّة of superiority whose ى is a ى, should by rule have [its ى converted into] ى, because treated like a substantive: *Sf* says “I have not found *S* mention any *ep.* on [the measure of] ى with ى, whose ى is a ى, except what is used with the *art.*, as أَلْدُنِيَّة [above], أَلْدُنِيَّة, and the like; and these, according to *S*, are like substantives” (R). But [S adds that], when you say أَلْدُنِيَّة belonging to this *cat.* [whose ى is a ى], 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 say حَلْطُ، according to the o. f., though it is a substantive (S).

"And", says Sf, "he means that حَلْطُ, when a scion of the جُ، 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] حَلْطُ 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 حَلْطُ, with Kasr of the جُ, from the defective, its جُ is not converted into يُ, nor its يُ into جُ, whether it be a substantive or an ep., because Kasra is not so heavy as دَامَّ, nor so light as فَتَحَ, but is intermediate between the two; so that moderateness [in weight] is produced in it with the يُ and with the جُ; while the real reason for converting the يُ of حَلْطُ with فَتَحَ, and the جُ of حَلْطُ with دَامَّ, 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 حَلْطُ pronounced with فَتَحَ of its جُ, when belonging to the cat. of the جُ, and the حَلْطُ pronounced with دَامَّ of its جُ, when belonging to the cat. of the يُ, since moderateness is produced in both? But, as for exs. of حَلْطُ, with Kasr of the جُ, belonging to the cat. of the جُ, and likewise of the يُ, 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 ḍ (a) second, followed by (α) a Hamza, (α) original, as in ی preceded, outwent; (β) converted, as in ی. (b) a ی , as in ی. I wished: (b) a ی , as in ی I roasted: (b) third, followed by (α) a ی , as in ی. [281] and ی [below]; (b) a ی , as in ی [a thin skin that rises to the top of milk and broth (MAR)] and ی [266]: (2) is not formed in any of these ways, whether its ی be a Hamza, as in خطیئة fault [below]; or be not, as in بلیئة trial, affliction. The general rule in the [ultimate] pl. 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 ١ , and the Kasra before it into Fatha; and (2) the Hamza into ی . For, since the ی is allowably converted into ١ in such as مداری [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 حمزرآبٰی [230, 686], it is mostly converted into ی, not ی, is quest of moderation, because, ی being approximate to ِ, the insertion of a ی between two یs would be [equivalent to] a combination of three یs: so that a relief from the succession of likes is sought in ی, notwithstanding its heaviness, (1) because the formation is light; and (2) because the enclosure of the ی by two یs in the du. is not permanent, since, the ی of dualization [16, 228, 685] not being inseparable [from the ِ], the ی supervening on account of it is not permanent. But, as for the ultimate ِ, the Hamza in it is not converted into ی, (1) because the formation is heavy; and (2) because the enclosure [of the Hamza] by two یs is permanent, so that the ی would be permanent, if the Hamza were converted into it. In the ِ of present, however, حمزرآبٰی occurs, for the sake of moderation, as in حمزرآبٰی; but this is anomalous, except according to Akh [below], who considers it regular, as in حمزرآبٰی [above]. The general rule mentioned is contravened in two cases, (1) when the sing. contains an ِ [second], followed by a Hamza, as in شآئبٰی from شآَوْتٰی or from شآئبٰی [above]; in which case the Hamza and ِ are left unaltered, as حمزرآبٰی. These are the preceders or the wishers, for observance of the
sing. in the pl., as it is observed in such as حَبَلَ أَي and حَفَلَى [248]: (2) when the sing. contains an ٣ third, followed by a ٣ and ٣, [as in ٣ إِدَارَة (above) and ٣ عُلَقَ] (266); in which case the Hamza is converted, but into ٣, as أَدَّارَى and عَلَقَى, not into ٣, [this contravention] also [being] for observance of the sing. [715]. And, according to this, in the pl. whose sing. contains an ٣ second, followed by a ٣, like شَوَأَيَا pl. of شَوَأَيَة [above], the sing. ought to be observed, as شَوَأَى [715]; but, since it is oryg. شَوَأَيْٕ, and then the ٣ after the ٣ is converted into Hamza, as in أَوْلَىٗ [683 (case 4), 715], because the ٣ of the pl. is enclosed by two unsound letters, the Hamza is not afterwards converted [back] into ٣, 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 ٣, as شَوَأَى [715]. Similarly, [the general rule is observed] in the pl. whose sing. (1) contains an ٣ [third], followed by a ٣, like سَقَابِيَةٕ and دَرَأِىَةٕ [above]; so that, if they were given this pl., دَرَأِىَةٕ and سَقَابِيَةٕ would be said: (a) ٣ is more appropriate here for two reasons, observance of the sing., and conformity to the general rule: (2) does not contain an ٣ followed by a Hamza, ٣, or ٣; so that the Hamza [in the pl.] is converted into ٣.
and the ى [after it] into ٓ, as خطابي and بلابي, pls. of خطيئة [below] and بلية [above]: (a) ٓ or ٓ occurs in the pl. of هدية [above], as we have mentioned. This being established, know that (1) the ٓ [third] in all these pls. is imported for pluralization [256], and is not [found] in the sing.: (2) the Hamza after the ٓ in شوأ pl. of شائي [above], (a) from شارت is the original [Hamza], which is [found] in the sing., [being the ى of the word]; (b) from ٓشت is adventitious in the pl. [683 (case 4), 715], as in the sing. [683 (case 2), 708]: (3) the ٓ [second] in the sing. of both is converted into ٓ in the pl. [247, 686] in the pl. [ٓ]; and so is the ٓ of شاوي [above] in the pl., شوابي: (4) the ٓ of the sing. [ٓ] which is after the ٓ [second], is converted into Hamza [in the pl.], as in ٓأثٓل [above]; and then the Hamza [pronounced with Kasr] into ى pronounced with Fath, as we mentioned: (5) the ٓ [third] in ٓإذار is converted in the pl. into Hamza, as in ٓرسانّل [below]; and its ى into ى because [final and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 1, a), 724]; and then the Hamza [pronounced with Kasr] into ى pronounced with Fath, [and the ى into ٓ, as ٓأثارٓ above]: (6) similarly, ٓ[mutatis mutandis] in ٓ[as ٓabove]:
(7) the ی in دیکه دی [below] is converted into Hamza, according to S, as in دیکه دیف [246, 683 (case 3), 717]: and, two Hamzas being then combined, the second is converted into ی [below]; and the first into ی pronounced with Fath, as in بلکیا [above] and the like; and the ی after it into † [684, 719], because the ی necessarily converted from Hamza is in the predicament of an original ی, [which is converted into † when mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath;] while the second Hamza here is necessarily converted into ی [above], because final [661]: so that its measure is like دیکه دیا [below], the ی, i.e. the last letter, of both being converted into †: (a) Khl [below] says that it is orig. دیکه دیاپری with Hamza after the ی that is [third] in the sing., [so that its measure is دیکه دیاپریف]; but that the ی is put into the position of the Hamza, and the Hamza into the position of the ی, [so that its measure becomes دیکه دیاپریف]; and afterwards the Hamza, which is the ی of the word, is converted into ی pronounced with Fath, so that its measure is [دیکه دیاپریف], which, by conversion of the final ی into †, becomes [دیکه دیاپریف] [below]: (b) IH, therefore says “And hence دیکه دیاپریا, according to the two sayings” [661], meaning that, according to [both] Khl and S [above], it belongs to the cat. of conversion of the single Hamza into a ی pronounced with Fath (R on
Alleviation of the Hamza). When Hamza occurs after the ١ of the pl. upon [the measure of (Tsr)] [١٨, ٢٥٦, ٦٨٥], and that Hamza is adventitious in the pl. [below], and the ٠ of the pl. is a Hamza, ی or ١, 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 ٠ of the sing. is a Hamza, an original ی, or a ١ converted into ی; and (b) into ١ in one case, vid. when the ٠ of the sing. is a ١ apparent (Aud) in the expression, preserved from conversion into ی: so that these are four cases, which need four exs. [given below] (Tsr). When the Hamza is not adventitious in the pl., [but is found in the sing. as an ع (IY),] like the Hamza of ١٧٠٨ [٢٤٨, ٧٠٨] and ١٧٠٨ سوأ, pIs. of ١٧٠٨ جائِّة and ١٧٠٨ سَّكِّيَّة, [which are] فَاعِلَة from ١٧٠٨ جَاء came, [orig. ١٧٠٨ جبِّا ] and ١٧٠٨ ١٦ُلَّت. illtreated, vexed, [orig. ١٧٠٨ سوأ,] it is not converted (M), but remains in its o. f., [whether the Hamza found in the position of the ع in the sing. be a subst. for a ١ or ی, as in the two exs. just given by Z, or be original;] so that, in the pl. of ١٧٠٨, جَائِّة [fem.] act. part. from ١٧٠٨ عَلَّبَهُ hit it, and of ١٧٠٨ سَكِّيَّة [above] from ١٧٠٨ شَاء preceded, outwent, him, you say ١٧٠٨ ١٧٠٨ and ١٧٠٨ ١٧٠٨ [٢٤٨, ٧٠٨], like ١٧٠٨ جَوَّاء girls and ١٧٠٨ غَواش coverings [١٨], to distinguish the original Hamza,
existing in the sing., from the adventitious (IY). In order that such [a formation] as ُشَوِّرَتْ pl. of ُشَوَّرَتْ or ُشَوَّرَتْ [above] may be excluded, IH prescribes, as a condition for conversion of the Hamza of the pl. into ي, and of its ي into ل, that the sing. should not be like that, i.e., should not have after its ل a Hamza followed by ي, [as ُشَوِّرَتْ, like ُشَوَّرَتْ, has]; since, if it were like that, the Hamza and ي would be left in the pl. without conversion, in order that the pl. might match its sing.: do you not observe them say ُحَبَلَلَي ُكَنَّم ُكَنَّم ُكَنَّم ُكَنَّم ُكَنَّم ُكَنَّم ُكَنَّم as pl. of ُأَدَّرَي [248], ُهُبْلَي as pl. of ُدَأَرِث [above], and ُشُوُّرَتْ as pl. of ُشُوُّرَتْ [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 ُشَوِّرَتْ from ُشَوِّرَتْ [above], S is bound to say ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ, because the Hamza is adventitious [683 (case 4), 715], according to him, [in the pl. ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ], 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 ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ ُشَوِّرَتْ from ُشَوِّرَتْ is a Hamza in the sing. also; so that, by this interpretation, it is not "adventitious in the pl."
(R on Transformation). The stipulation of adventitiousness excludes [also] such as $\text{الْبَرَاءَةُ}$ pl. of $\text{الْبَرَائِيَّة}$ [658], where the Hamza, being found in the sing., because $\text{رُوُبَةُ}$ مَّقْعَلَةٌ is $\text{مَرَاةُ}$ [366] from $\text{زَرُوُبَةُ}$ [658], is not altered in the pl. (Aud); although $\text{الْبَرَائِيَّة}$ with change, anomalously, has been heard (Tsr). And the stipulation of unsoundness of the $\text{j}$ excludes such as $\text{صُكَحْتَيْفُ}$ [above], $\text{رَسَأَتْ}$ [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 Tashāl 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 $\text{j}$ is a Hamza, is $\text{خَطَّلِيَاةُ}$ [661, 708] (Aud), pl. of $\text{خَطَّلِيَة}$ [above], committing a fault (Tsr): [for] it is orig. $\text{خَطَّلِيَاةُ}$ with a $\text{ي}$ pronounced with Kasr, which is the $\text{ي}$ of $\text{خَطَّلِيَاةُ}$; and followed by a Hamza, which is its $\text{j}$: then (1) the $\text{ي}$ [pronounced
with Kasr (Tsr) is changed into Hamza, as in □□□□□; so that the word becomes □□□□□ with two Hamzas, [the first substituted for the ی, and the second the ج of the word (Tsr)]: then (2) the second Hamza is changed into ی, because final Hamza after Hamza is changed into ی, even if it be not after a [Hamza (Tsr)] pronounced with Kasr [661], and a fortiori after a [Hamza (Tsr)] pronounced with Kasr; [so that the word becomes □□□□□]: then (3) the Kasra of the first [Hamza (Tsr)] is converted into Fatha for alleviation, since they sometimes do that where the ج is sound, as in □□□□□ [above] and □□□□□ for □□□□□ [248, 256], as □□□□□ [504] and □□□□□ [which also is (Tsr) by Imra al-Kals (MN, Tsr), The plaits whereof are piled up on high, the hair-pins being lost in hair coiled and loosened (MN)]; and a fortiori here (Aud), where the ج is unsound, because [ی preceded by] Kasra is heavy (Tsr); [so that the word becomes □□□□□]: then (4) the ی is converted into ! [684, 719], because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; so that the word becomes □□□□□, with two !s, having a Hamza between them; and then,
(5) since Hamza resembles ج [because it is from the same outlet (Tsr)], three جs seem to be combined; and, [that being disliked (Tsr)], the Hamza is therefore changed into ج [not into ج, because ج is lighter than it (Tsr)]: so that the word becomes خطابا 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 ج 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 ج, so that the word becomes خطابي [661]; and then what has been mentioned [in operations 3—5] above, as to converting the Kasra into Fatha, then the ج into ج, and then the Hamza into ج, is done here. But it is objected that they sometimes pronounce the جl. according to the o.f., since اللهم آتفر الرج [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 ج is an original ج, is خطابي [pl. of قصبة decision (Tsr)]: [for] it is orig. خطابي with two جs, the first the ج of نعيلة, and the second the ج of نعيلة: then (1) the first [ ج (Tsr)] is changed into Hamza, as in شكافث [above] (Aud); so that the word
becomes ُضَأْيَيْ (Tsr): then (2) the Kasra of the Hamza is converted into Fathā (Aud); so that it becomes ُضَأْئَيْ (Tsr): then (3) the ی is converted into ِ (Aud); so that it becomes ُضَأْئَيْ (Tsr): and then (4) the Hamza [intermediate between the two ِs (Tsr)] is converted into ی, [for a return to its o. f. (Tsr)]; so that the word becomes ُضَأْيَايَيْ after four operations. The ex. of the [third] case, where the ی is a ۯ converted into ی in the sing., is مطَبة [saddle-camel (Tsr)]: for it is orig. مطَيرة, [being] مَطَأ meaning back (Aud), or from مَطَر I made them extend the journey, i. e., مَدَدْ (Tsr); but the ۯ is changed into ی, and the [preceeding] ی then incorporated into it, on the principle of the change and incorporation in مَيْرَت and مَيْرِت, for which مَيْيَت and مَيْيَت ت [685 (case 7, a, a), 716, 747] are said: and its pl. is مطَيِّب [661, 708], orig. مطَيِّب [with a ی pronounced with Kasr before the ۯ (Tsr)]; where (1) the ۯ is converted into ی, because final after Kasra, as in الدّاعِي للَّغَارِي and مطَيِّب (Tsr); then (2) the first ی is converted into Hamza, as in صَكَائِف [above] (Aud); so that it becomes مَطَيِّب (Tsr): then (3) the Kasra is changed into Fathā (Aud);
so that it becomes یماطلا (Tsr): then (4) the ی [is changed (Tsr)] into ی; [so that it becomes یماطلا]: and then (5) the Hamza [intermediate between the two ی’s] is changed (Tsr)] into ی; so that it becomes یماطبابا after five operations. The ex. of the [fourth] case, where the ی is a، [apparent (Tsr),] preserved in the sing., is یهراق (Tsr), pl. یهراقی: for (1) we convert the ی of the pl. into Hamza, as in یساله pl. of یسالة [246, 683 (case 3, a-d), 717] (Aud); so that it becomes یهراق (Tsr): then (2) we change the ی into ی، because final after Kasra [685 (case 1, a), 724] (Aud); so that it becomes یهراق (Tsr): then (3) we convert the Kasra into Fatha (Aud); so that it becomes یهراق (Tsr): then (4) the ی is converted into ی (Aud), because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 719]; so that it becomes یهراق with a Hamza between two ی’s (Tsr): and then (5) we convert the Hamza into ی، [in order that the pl. may be conformable to the sing. (Tsr);] so that it becomes یهراقی، [which result] also [is reached] after five operations (Aud). As for یعفادیا... [pl. of یعفاد in] Such a one comes to us in the mornings and evenings, یی in the Commentary on the Takmilat [الیداح by F (Hkh)] and ISd in the Exposition of the verses of the Jumal [by Zji
(Hkh)] say that occurs in it only in order that it may be akin to عشَّاَيَا [pl. of عَشَّاَيَا (KF)]. But the right [view] is that what is done [here] for conformity is only to give عَدَّاءَا, to which it is not entitled, [its measure being عُنْعُننَّ, which does not take the pl. عَدَّاءَا,] contrary to عَشَّاَيَا, which is like نقَايَا [above] and نُقَايَا [testament, precept, pl. نقَايَا (MAZ)]; whereas, after receiving this pl., it is entitled to عَدَّاءَا, which is substituted for the Hamza of عَدَّاءَا [246], not for the ل of عَدَّاءَا, which is , because its pl. is عَدَّاءَا, like سَّلُو [719]. For, since they give عَدَّاءَا a pl. on [the measure of] نقَايَا for affinity [to عَشَّاَيَا.], while every pl. on [the measure of] نقَايَا, whose ل is a Hamza or عَدَّاءَا, or a , not preserved in the sing., is entitled to have عَدَّاءَا substituted for its Hamza, like حَضَابَا [above], نقَايَا, and نقَايَا, they do that in عَدَّاءَا, because the ل of عَدَّاءَا is not preserved. If you say "Assume عَدَّاءَا to be pl. of عَدَّاءَا [286]: then their language is correct, because, the ل being preserved in the sing., the regular form would be عَدَّاءَا, like عَدَّاءَا pl. of عَدَّاءَا [above]", I say "This is forbidden by two considerations, (1) that, since they say only that it is pl. of عَدَّاءَا, 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 غداة, he cites the saying

اللَّيْتُ حَظْيَةٌ مِنْ زِيَارَةٍ مُّبَيْنَةٍ غَدِيَّةٍ قَيْطُ أو عُشِيْبَةٍ أَشْتَيْة

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

فَمَا بَرِحْتُ أَقْدَامِيُّ فِي مَقَامِيّ مُقَالًا كَتَبًا حَتَّى أَرَأُوا أَلْمَسَايًا
[by 'Ubaida Ibn AlHārith Ibn 'Abd AlMuṭṭalib alKurashi alMuṭṭalibī, 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 'Alī and Ḥamza, until they were made to visit the fates, i.e., death (MN)]], by rule عَلَّمَيَايَا, but pronounced according to the o. f. [by poetic license (MN)]: (2) sounding it, and the Hamza after it, which is a ل, true, as علَّمَيَايَا [above], with two Hamzas, by rule خطأيايلى; and this is more anomalous
than the preceding: (3) changing the letter after the \( l \) into a letter not required by rule, as \( عَدَائِيّ pl. \) of \( عَدَائِيّ \) [above], by rule \( عَدَائِيّ (Tsr) \). Akh [above] holds 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 \( pl. \) [mentioned above as \( exs. \) of the four cases] are on the measure of \( فَعَالٍ [272] (A) \), where the letter after the \( l \) of the \( pl. \) is the \( ج \) of the word, and the [final] \( l \) is for feminization (Sn): the \( ج \) being sounded true in \( حَرَأٰئِيّ \), as in the sing.; and transformed [into \( ي \)] in \( مَطَابِيّ \), as in the sing.; while [\( قَصَّاٰيّ or \)] \( عَدَائِيّ (A) \), i.e., matches the sing., its \( ج \) being sounded true, like the \( ج \) of the sing. (Sn); and, as for \( حَطَابَيّ \), it comes from \( حِطَبَٰئِيّ [658] \), with change and incorporation, on the measure of \( عَدَائِيّ (A) \), \( حَطَابَيّ also, according to this, being on the measure of the o. f., like \( حَرَأٰئِيّ [above], مَطَابِيّ \), and [\( قَصَّاٰيّ or \)] \( عَدَائِيّ (Sn) \). But the BB [above] hold that they are [on the measure of (KIAmb)] \( فَعَالٍ (Sn), \) [which is the opinion adopted by IM (Sn),] in order to make the unsound [in the \( ج \) ], [like \( عَدَائِيّ pl. \) of \( عَدَائِيّ (Sn), \)] conform to the sound (A), like
\textit{pl. of} صَكَکِّاَفْ (Sn). And the correctness of their opinion is proved by the saying

حَتَّى أُرِيَّا لِلْمَانِثِبا [above]. As for the report [transmitted] from Khl, that the measure of خطاءي is [above], it is not like the saying of the KK, because the [final] ي, 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 [ي] which becomes posterior [to the ج] in the pl. after being prior [to it] in the sing., vid. the letter of prolongation converted into حمزة in خَعَامِر [246, 683 (case 3), 717] (Sn).

§. 727. Every (M) [final] ؛ occurring fourth or upwards is converted into ي [685 (case 4)], when the letter before it is not pronounced with دام [below] (M, SH), whether that letter be pronounced with فات [below] or كسر [685 (case 1), 724] (Jrb), as (1) أَغْرَيْتُ [685] (M, SH), رَجَيْتُ [685 (case 4, b)], I hoped, تَرَجَيْتُ I hoped (M) and تَعَرَّيْتُ I was equipped for raiding (SH), إِسْتَرَشَيْتُ [685 (case 4, b)] (IY), I demanded a bribe (M) and إِسْتَغْرَيْتُ [685] (SH); and their aors. [in most cases] (M): (a) every v. whose pret.
is of four or more letters, except تفاعل and تفاعل, has the penultimate of its aor. pronounced with Kasr [404]; so that its ج, when a, is converted into [685 (case 1, a), 724], because final and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as يَبْعَرْيَيْي and يَعْرَبْيَي: and they make the pret. accord with the aor., saying أُغْرِبْت and أُسْتَغْرِبْت: (b) similarly they convert the ج into in [the pret. of] تفاعل and تفاعل, because نَفْعَل and نَفْعَل are quasi-pass. of نَفْعَل and نَفْعَل [486, 487]; so that, since the ج is converted into ى in the o. f., it remains so after prefixion of the of quasi-passivity (Jrb): (2) يَرْضِيَان and يَغْرِيَان [719] (M, SH) and يَشْأَيْان [685 (case 4, c)], in the aors. of وَيَغْرِي and وَيَشْأَي [229, 626, 629] (M), du. of مَلِعَي [327] (IY); and [du. of مُصْطَفَيْان [327] (IY); chosen, elect]; مَلِعَي [du. of مُعَلَى] (M), pass. part. of عَلَى raised, aor. مُعَلَى (IY); and [similarly (IY)] [du. of مُسْتَدْعِيَان (327)] (M): contrary to يَدْعُو and يَغْرِي [404, 719-721] (SH), where the ج, though fourth, is not converted into ى, because the letter before it is pronounced with Damm (Jrb). The final ج, fourth or upwards, preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [above], is converted into ى on two conditions, (1) that
its conversion into I be not allowable because of (a) quiescence of the , and (b) ambiguity [684 (condition 6, 719), as in [above], and [du. of higher]: (a) that is because, their object being alleviation, so long as its conversion into continues to be possible for them, is not converted into ى, since ى is lighter: (2) that it be not followed by an inseparable letter, making it virtually medial, as in 228, 229, 721]. The ى mentioned is converted into ى, (1) because it occurs in a place to which lightness is suitable, since it is fourth [or upwards] and final; while extreme alleviation—I mean its conversion into —is impracticable, as we have mentioned [in the first condition]; so that it is converted into a letter lighter than , vid. ى: (2) as is said [by IHsh in the Commentary on the IM (MAR)], because it is converted into ى in some variations [685 (case 4, a), as and ى [above], the aor. of which is ى and ى: (a) as for and ى [above], although the is not converted into ى in their aors., as ى and ى, still they are deriv. of I equipped for raiding and ى [above], the of which is converted into ى [685 (case 4, b)] (R): (b) Akh says that, since they say ى in the aor. [of ى], pronouncing [the ى]
with Fath [482, 685 (case 4, c)], it resembles the aor. whose pret. is نَفَعَلْ with Kasr, because the normal pret. of نَفَعَلْ is نَفَعَلْ [482]; and therefore it is treated like [the aor. of] رَضَیِّ [above] and was wretched, so that they say يَرْضَیْبَانِ [above], as they say يَرْضَیْبَانِ and يَرْضَیْبَانِ (IY): (c) this reason [ascribed to IHsh] is weak, as you see, since (a) it does not apply to [above]; (b) if conversion of the ی 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 یَرْضَیْبَانِ [for یَرْضَیْبَانِ] ought to be said because of their saying یَرْضَیْبَانِ [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 Դamm" [above], Z [followed by IH] guards against such vs. as یَغْرَضَو and یَدَعَو [above], and ns. as یَتَرْفَعَة [283, 385] and یَتَرْفَعَة [248] (IY). [Z and] IH ought to say "when the letter before it is not pronounced with Դamm, and its conversion into ی is not allowable", in order to exclude such as ْٰعَرُظَى. He equipped for raiding. Nor is the saying "when the letter before it is not pronounced with Դamm" [to be taken] without restriction; but the condition is that the letter before it should not be
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pronounced with دامم in the و., as يَدْعَر [above]: whereas in the ن. the ِ is converted into ى, [notwithstanding that the letter before it is pronounced with دامم,] as أَدَلٌ تَغَازِ [721]; [while in ُ تَغَازِ and ُ] conversion is prevented not, as ى ي ه makes out, by the دامم before the ِ, but by the ى 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 دامم", [ز and] ى ه should rather say "when the letter before it is pronounced with فتح", [كسر having been provided for in § 724] (ر).

§ 728. The cat. of َيَوْرَى and ِهْوَى is [treated as] sound [in the ُ which, though mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with فتح, is not converted into ل (ب)] because of the two transformations (ش). For in َيَوْرَى [729, 730. أ], the ُ and ُ of which are ى, the [second] ِ is unavoidably converted into ى [685 (case 1, ا)]; so that, if the first were converted into ل, two transformations would be combined in a tril., which is not allowable: while in ِهْوَى fell down [302, 713] you transform the ل by converting it into ل [684, 719]; so that you have no means of transforming the ُ, from fear of two transformations (ر). And the cat. of ُطْوِي [302, 703, 713, 724] and ُحَبِي [697, 698, 703] (ش),
notwithstanding that two transformations would not be combined in it, if they converted the َع into ِ, is also [treated as] sound (Jrb), because it is subordinate to [the cat. of (MASH)] َعَرَى [above] (SH): for َفَعَلُ with Fath of the ِ [482] is the principal [form of unaugmented tril. pret.], because of its lightness and frequency; and, since the َع is sounded true in the principal, it is sounded true in the subordinate (Jrb). Or [their omission to transform the َع in three of the vs. mentioned, vid. those which are on the measure of َفَعَلُ with Kasr of the َع , is (R)] because [every hollow v. of the conjug. of َفَعَلُ, whose َع is converted into ِ in the pret., has its َع converted in the aor., as َخَافُ, َخَافُ, and َخَافُ; َيَحَابُ: so that, if they said َخَاءُ, َخَاءُ, and َخَاءُ in the pret., then (R)] would have to be said (SH) in the aor.; whereas, in the aor., Damm of the ِ, when a َع is eschewed [720], even with quiescence of the letter before it, contrary to the n., as َعَرَى َعَرَى َعَرَى َعَرَى َعَرَى َعَرَى [720] and َعَرَى [723], because the v. is heavy. And the like may be said of َعَرَى also, because every hollow [v.] of the conjug. of َفَعَلُ, whose َع is made quiescent by conversion into ِ [in the pret.], must have the َع of its aor. made quiescent, the vowel thereof being transferred to the preceding letter, as َقَالُ, َقَالُ, and َبَعُ بَعُ بَعُ [697, 703]; and it would [therefore]
be necessary to say لیبی for the aor. لیبی; 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 لیبی [697, 698]. Or their omission to transform the of ع طوی and لیبی [729] may, as before mentioned [703], be accounted for by the fact that transformation of their ل, 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 لیبیة [684 (condition 10, b, c), 730. A], لیبِیة [300], and لیبِیة نویة date-stone: while لیبیة غایة and لیبیه غاپیه [684 (condition 10, b), 723], لیبیة زایة and لیبیه زایة [723], and لیبیة وآیه and لیبیه وآیه [683 (case 1, c, b), 684 (condition 10 b, a, γ, b-δ), 723] are anomalous, by rule [e. g.] لیبیة غواه or لیبیة غواه, more properly the former, because the cat. of طویت is more numerous than that of لیبیه [698]. We call that [conversion of the first of the two unsound letters into ل] anomalous, because conversion of the last, as in لیبیه [above] and لیبیه نوی [697], is more appropriate. Fr and many of the Ancients say of لیبیہ that it is quiescent in the ع, the o. f. being لیبیہ and لیبیہ; but that the quiescent ع is converted into ل, because of the Fath of the
letter before it, as in ُيَّ أَجِلُ ُطَّأَتِيُّ [684, 703] and ُعَابُ [pl. of ُعَابَة α thicket (MAR)], which [conversion] is more appropriate here, because of the combination of two ى s: while Ks says that it is orig. ُرَأَايَةٌ, on the measure of ُنَعَلَةٌ; but that they dislike the combination of two ى s, the first of which is pronounced with Kasr; so that the first is elided. But, according to all [three] accounts, ُرَأَايَةٌ is not free from anomalousness in conversion or elision. And it is possible to account for ُخَايَةٌ [above], ُرَأَايَةٌ [684 (condition 10, b, α, α), 723], and ُرَأَايَةٌ in the [last] two ways (R). Incorporation is frequent in the cat. of َحَدِيَّةٌ [731], because of the [combination of (Jrb)] two likes (SH), as َحَدِيَّةٌ [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] ى [above] would have to be vocalized with ُتَمَّمَ (Jrb), [as] َحَدِيَّةٌ [above], aor. ُتَمَّمَ [below] (KF). S says “Incorporation is more frequent; but the other [method] is [good] Arabic, frequent” (R). Most of them incorporate [the ُعَ into the ِج when the ِج is mobile (IY)], saying َحَدِيَّةٌ and َعَمَيْنَيْ with Fath or Kasr of the ُن [below], as ُلَىٰ or ُلَيٰ is said for the pl. of َأَلْوَيٰ [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 he lived, du. حيّاً, حيّاً حيّاً, pl. حيّات حيّات, and she lived, du. حيّاتاً حيّاتاً حيّاتاً حيّاتاً (R). The Kur has وَحْيَاهِ مَنْ حَيَّ عَنْ بِبَيْنَتِ حَيَّيَاً.* VIII. 44. And he that should live might live after a manifest sign; and (M) the poet (R) 'Abīd (M), [or] Ibn Mufarrigh (Jh on حيّاً, حيّاً), says

عَيِّنُوا بِأَمْرِهِمْ كَمَاٌ عِيّنَتْ بِبَيْضَتِهَا النُّعَامَةَ

جَعَلَتْ لَهَا عِروْدَيْنِ مِنْهُ * نَصْمٍ وَأَحَرٍّ مِنْ ثَمَانِيَةَ

(M, R), 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.] مُحَيْيَاتِ quickening and [the du.] مُحَيّينَا quickened, where the vowel is [imported] on account of the ِ in the ep. [below] and of the ِ in the du. [228], both of which letters are adventitious, [and] separable from the word: and similarly with the inflectional vowels [16, 404], as لَا يُذْهِبَ الْمُرْتَى LXXV. 40. [551] and
I saw a \(\text{معيّة} [248]\). But, if the vowel be naturally inseparable, as in \(\text{حَيّة} (\text{Jh, KF})\), or be [imported] on account of an adventitious, [but] inseparable, letter, as in \(\text{أَحْيَة} [\text{S, M}]\), pl. of \(\text{حَيّة} [228]\) vulva, where the \(\text{i}\) is inseparable [265 (case 6, a, a)], contrary to the \(\text{i}\) of the ep. [265 (case 1, a), 266], then incorporation or display is allowable, for which reason \(\text{حَيّة} [228]\) or \(\text{أَحْيَة} [228]\) is allowable in the pl. of \(\text{حَيّة} [228]\) boggler, because the \(\text{i} [228] \text{فيّة} [228]\) is inseparable. And, in this [second] sort also, incorporation is more proper, as it is in [the first, like] \(\text{حَيّة} [228] \text{أَحْيَة} [228]\) [above] and \(\text{حَيّة} [228] \text{أَحْيَة} [228]\) [below]. The reason why, for allowability of incorporation, it is stipulated in this cat., contrary to the cat. of \(\text{يرْتَدَّ} \text{مَيْعَيّة} [731]\), 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 \(\text{يرْتَدَّ} [402, 406] \text{مَيْعَيّة} [663]\): whereas, in the unsound, as \(\text{يرْتَدَّ} \text{مَيْعَيّة} [248]\) and \(\text{يرْتَدَّ} \text{مَيْعَيّة} [248]\) [above], the second is [often] made quiescent without the invasion of anything, as \(\text{يرْتَدَّ} [248]\); so that they do not approve of incorporating a letter into what is quasi-quiescent [731]. And, when the [first] \(\text{i}\) is displayed, whether necessarily, as in \(\text{حَيّة} [228]\) [above], or allowably,
as in 

\[\text{حَيَّى} \text{[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 

\[\text{i} \text{]} \text{is deemed heavy: (2) if it be pronounced with Fath, as in 

\[\text{حَيَا} \text{[above]} \text{du. of [684 (condition 10, a, a, b)]}, 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 

\[\text{l} \text{of dualization is not inseparable. He that displays the [first] 

\[\text{i} \text{in 

\[\text{حَيَّى} \text{says with a single 

\[\text{i}, like 

\text{حُشْوَا 

\[\text{حَيَّى} \text{they dreaded, as}

\[\text{وَكُنَّا حُسَبَنَا هُمْ فَوَاَسَ كَهْسِ

\[\text{حَيِّى} 

\text{بَعْدَمَا ماتُوا مِنَ الْدَّهْرِ أَعْصَرَأ

\[\text{إِلَّا} \text{[above]. But, it is said, this}

(R) And we had accounted them to be horsemen of Kahmas, [a man of Tamim celebrated for horsemanship and valour (IY),] father of a clan of Rabî’a Ibn Hanzala, who, after they had died, lived, in reputation for valour, through ages of time (Jsh). The 

\[\text{ف} \text{is [said to be] sometimes pronounced with Kasr [above] (SH) in the act. 

\[\text{حَيِّى} \text{(R), when incorporation takes place. Some retain the Fatha of the 

\[\text{ف}, for lightness; while others pronounce [the 

\[\text{ف} \text{] with Kasr, for affinity [to the 

\[\text{i} \text{], as they say 

\[\text{لَي} \text{or 

\[\text{لُي}, with Kasr or Damm of the 

\[\text{J}, for the pl. of 

\[\text{ألْرِى} \text{[above]. But, it is said, this}
requires consideration, because the Damma before the incorporated ی in یُ is heavy, so that it is proper to flee therefrom to Kasra; whereas the Fatha before the incorporated ی in یِ 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] ی to the letter before it pronounce the ح with Kasr; while those who elide the vowel without transfer retain the Fatha (Jrb). Apparently, however, this [assertion that the ف is sometimes pronounced with Kasr in the act. voice] is a blunder copied by IH from the M [above]; whereas S cites only یُ in the pass., like قَرْنِ یُ لَبِّي [below], with Damm and Kasr, pl. of قَرْنٌ أَلْرَعٌ [twisted horn (MAR)], in the n. (R). Similarly (M) incorporation is allowable in (SH) [the pret. of] every pass. v. [of this cat.], as حَوَيُ أَحْيَى and أَسْتَحْيَى, for (M) the pass. prets. (Jrb) حَوَيُ (IY) أَحْيَى and أَسْتَحْيَى (M, SH) and حَوَيُ (M), because of the combination of two likes (Jrb); contrary to [the act. prets. (Jrb)] أَحْيَا and أَسْتَحْيَا [and حَمَايَا] (SH), because, when the [second] ی is converted into ی, the motive for incorporation does not remain. But it is not so frequent [in أَحْيَى and the
following] as in حَيْبَى [above], because here the letter before the two likes is quiescent; while it does not follow that أُحْيَى should be treated like حَيْبَى, as was sent on pilgrimage is put on a par with حَيْبَى went on pilgrimage, because incorporation in that is necessary, contrary to this (Jrb). حَيْبَى [above] is constructed with a prep. and gen., which take the place of the [pro-] ag., since حَيْبَى is intrans. [436, 438]. You are allowed the option of pronouncing the ح with دَامّ or كَارّ; but كَارّ is more frequent, because lighter. دَامّ is according to the o. f. [436]: and كَارّ for a kind of alleviation, because the double letter is, in some positions, treated like a single letter, as in فَأْبَأَتْ and فَأْبَأَتْ [665], where the double ب is treated, according to them, like a single mobile letter, otherwise it would not be combinable with the quiescent ل; that [treatment of the double letter] being [allowable] because the tongue recoils from [both components of] it with one impulse [663, 686 (case 1, α, β), 731]: and therefore, as the occurrence of a [single] الي preceded by دَامّa, at the end [of a word], is disallowed, so دَامّ is rare here, though not disallowed; and like it is تَرْوَى [above], where دَامّ and كَارّ are allowable, but كَارّ is more frequent; the rarity of دَامّ [in تَرْوَى] corresponding to the disallowance of [it in] أَذْرَى and أَذْرَى gazelles [243, 721] (IY).
If any one say "How is conversion of ḫamma into Kasra necessary in [the case of formations] other than نَعْلُ, as مُسْلِمِبَى [685 (case 7), 716], جَعْلُى and [685 (case 9, b, a), 722], and عَزْوَى [722, 730. A], while both modes [of vocalization] are allowable in نَعْلُ?", the answer is that، نَعْلُ being liable to be mistaken for نَعْلُ, ḫamma 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 ḫamma of نَعْلُ allowable before ی is the lightness of the formation. Sf says that لِي with Kasr may be said as pl. of أَلْوَى، like فِي pl. of أَلْوَى [686, 718], the incorporated quiescent ی being treated like the unincorporated; and that حَيّ for [above] is like بَيْلَ and بَيْعَ [436, 706]. Those who incorporate say ḫَبَيْرا ṣ was quickened, du. أَحْبَا، أَحْبَا، pl. أَحْبَا; and ṣ was left alive, du. أَسْتَحْبِيْرا، أَسْتَحْبِيْرا، pl. أَسْتَحْبِيْرا; because the vowel [of the second unsound letter] is inseparable: while those who do not incorporate say أَحْبَا، أَحْبَا، pl. أَحْبَا، أَحْبَا، like أَرمَيْا was thrown, du. أَرمَيْا، أَرمَيْا، pl. أَرمَيْا. But ṣ has three dial. vars. :— (1) this, which is its o. f.; (2) incorporation; (3) elision of the first ی, as in [the act.] ṣ was ashamed
[below], according to Tamīm. [The act.] **إِسْتَكْشَيْث** has two dial. vars.:—(1) that of the people of the Hijāz is **يُسْتَكْشِي**، act. **إِسْتَكْشَيْث**، pass. **إِسْتَكْشَيْث**، exactly on the measure of **إِسْتَرَعْي** asked to keep guard, aor. **يُسْتَرَعِي** : (2) that of Tamīm is **إِسْتَكْشَيْث** [above], aor. **يُسْتَكْشِي**， with vocalization of the **ح** and elision of one of the two **ي**s: (a) the opinion of Khīl is that it is formed from **هَابِ حَلاَي** when transformed like **بَعَ 684، 703**，as though [above] were said; and therefore, as you say **إِسْتَبَعَتْ I asked to sell from** بَعَ， so you say from **إِسْتَكْشَيْتُ 820** : (a) the reason why it is formed from the eschewed **حَلاَي** is that the **ع** of **حَلاَي** ought to be transformed, since transformation of its **ل** is impossible: (b) [the pret.] **إِسْتَكْشَيْتُ **، according to this, is **إِسْتَكْشَيْتُ **[below], like **إِسْتَبَعَتْ**： but the vowel of the **ي** is elided, since no **ل** of the pret. is found, in their speech, to be a mobile **ي** preceded by a quiescent; so that, two quiescents then concurring, the first of them is elided; and afterwards the quiescent **ي** is converted into **ل**，because preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as in **هَلَتْي وَيَأْجُلُ** [above]: (c) similarly you say of the aor. **إِسْتَكْشَيْتُ **[below] that it ought to be **يُسْتَكْشِي** like **يُسْتَرَعِي**： but that the vowel of the [final] **ي** is elided,
since there is no precedent for it among \[720\]; and afterwards the first \(\text{i}\) is elided, because of the two quiescents: (d) its imp. is ٍستَح : (e) its inf. n., according to this, ought to be ٍاستَباعَة, like ٍاستَباعَةٍ [338]; but is not used: (f) the act. part. is ٍمستَكَٰٓ, orig. ٍمستَكَٰٓ, [like ٍمستَكَٰٓ;] but transformed in the same way as the aor.: (g) the pass. part. is ٍمستَكَٰٓ, orig. ٍمستَكَٰٓ, the vowel of the ٍbeing elided, as in ٍيُستَكَٰٓ [720]; and the word then transformed in the same way as ٍإِسْتَكَٰٓ [above]: (h) there is a weakness, that will not escape notice, in the opinion of Khl, because of [his] venturing upon the disliked [form ٍحَايَ ]; (b) others, whose opinion is adopted by Mz, say that, in all of these variations, the first ٍis elided, as [the first ٍ or ل is elided] in ٍأَحْسَنَت. I perceived, ْطَلَّت I passed the day, and ْمَسْتَ 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. ٍإِسْتَكَٰٓ; and they would say ٍإِسْتَباعَة, like ٍإِسْتَباعَةٍ" (R). The verse [329. A.] contains evidence that ٍيُسْتَكَٰٓ [above], aor. ٍيُسْتَكَٰٓ, like ٍإِسْتَباعَةٍ.
took captive, aor. يَسْتَكِيَ, is said; while Ya'kūb and Ibn Muḥaisin read إنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَسْتَكِيَ أَنْ يَضُرَّ مِثَالًا II. 24. Verily God is not ashamed to propound a parable, with a single ى, which is reported to have been read by Ibn Kathīr also, and is the dial. var. of Tanwin. The o. f. is [ءَسْتَكِيَ, aor. ءَسْتَكِيَ] with two ى’s: but the vowel of the ى is transferred to the ف; and, two quiescents then concurring, the ل is said to be elided, the measure [of in the verse] being ثْسُفُ َتْسُفْبْي َتْسُفْبْي; or the ى, the measure being يستفبل (BS). And, as for revive, aor. يَحْكَمُي , when you put it into the pass., you say حُرَيْبَيْ, according to the o. f.; or, if you please, you incorporate, saying حُرَيْبَيْ, because the vowel of its final is inseparable. But he that says حِيْي َيَّ أَحْيَيْ and does not say يَنْكَيْ [for their aor.], because Damm does not enter [the final of] these vs. at all, since the ل in them takes the place of Damma, and is not combined with it [720] (IY). In the aor. of [the pass.] أَحْيَيْ you say يَعْكِبَيْ and 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)] يَعْكِبَيْ and يَعْكِبَيْ, [although two likes are combined in them (Jrb),] it is [in order that Damm may
not fall upon the ی (Jrb), lest that [final] whose Damm is eschewed [720], [vid. ی (MASH),] be pronounced with Damm (SH). And so, if you used the subj., saying لَنْ يَنْفِقَ 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 (IY). Incorporation is allowable only in [the cat. of] حَيْيَ (R), contrary to the cat. of ٰيَّ (SH), although ٰيَّ has a double ٰ, as حَيْيَ has a double ی [697]; so that ٰيَّ is not said, as they say حَيْيَ (R), (1) because transformation comes before incorporation [below] (SH), since conversion of the [final] و into ی is a transformation at the end, while incorporation of the ع into the ل is a transformation in the middle; and the former is more appropriate, as we have mentioned more than once; for which reason one begins with incorporation in اَيَّة before [and to the exclusion of] conversion of the quiescent Hamza into ٰ[661, 684 (condition 10, b, b, γ)] (R); and, when the final و is converted into ی, the motive for incorporation does not remain (Jrb): (2) because ٰيَّ with conversion of the [second] و into ی is lighter than ٰيَّ with incorporation of one و into the other; and the method [that is] conducive to increase of lightness should be pursued rather than what is not so (R). We say that
transformation comes before incorporation [684, 721, 729, 730] because the cause of transformation makes transformation necessary; whereas the cause of incorporation does not make incorporation necessary, but allowable; which is proved by the fact that sounding [the ] true in the cat. of 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 يَقْرَى and يَحْبِى [719, 730. A] (SH); not يَبْكَى [above], although they incorporate in the pret. [حَبَى], nor يَقْرَى (R): (1) because transformation comes before incorporation (R, Jrb); and, when the [final] ي in يَحْبِى and يَقْرَى is converted into ل, 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 قَعَى [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 ج, is peculiar to فَعَل with Kasr of
the ع (Jrb). They do not form from the cat. of تَوَى any [فعل] "struck" [482], nor any [فعل] "was noble" [482], from dislike to [the combination of two م in (R)] تَتَرَتَت and تَتَرَتَت [730. A] (SH), when the nom. pron. is attached to the pret. [تَوَرُ or تَرَوَ] (R), because they dislike the combination of two م م more than the combination of two م م (Jrb). As for [فعل] with دامم, if it were formed therefrom, two م م would be produced without attachment of the pron., because the [first] ع which is an ع, would not be converted [into ل], since the cause of [such] conversion would not exist in the ل, as we mentioned in the case of طَرَي and حُيى [703, 728]; nor would the second [م م] be converted into م م on account of the دامم before it, as in ع في [243, 721], since that [conversion] is [found only] in the n., [not in the v.,] as you see in such as سَرَ [721] (R). They therefore deviate toنَعْلُت, in order that the [second] م may be converted into م, and the heaviness be removed by the difference of the two letters, on the principle of their action in حَبْرَان [698, 730. A], orig. حَبْيَان; and, since [in حَبْرَان] they convert the lighter [letter] into the heavier, in order that the form may be lightened by removal of reduplication, a fortiori [in تَوَى] they convert...
the heavier into the lighter for removal of reduplication. For that reason they say زَوِيَتُ I was strong [730. A], orig. زَوِيَتُ, the ل, which is ض, being converted into أ, because [quiescent and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)]; and the أ being [treated as] sound [728], because the ل is transformed. This [avoidance of double ] is when the أ is orig. mobile (IY). But [such as (IY, SH)] زُرَا [685 (case 1, a, a), 697, 698] (M, SH) and ضُرَا (SH) a mark [of stone (MASH)] on the way (Jrb, MASH), جَٰلِبٍ [698] (M, SH) and قَٰرُ [698, 730. A, 734], a name of a place (IY), and جَٰلِبٍ [685 (case 3, b, d, ب) (SH), and حُرُ [684 (condition 10, a, α, α), 730. A] (M, Jrb), where the أ is orig. quiescent (IY), are tolerated, [i.e., pardoned and permitted (Jrb),] because of the incorporation (M, SH), by which the word is lightened. In the v., however, even if incorporation came before transformation [728], that [double ] would not be allowable, as it is in the n., from the heaviness of two ض in the v., which is itself heavy (R).

§. 730. They say, (1) [in إَمْعَالَ (493. A) (M), like إِحْمَارُ (482) (IY),] (a) became blackish red (M, SH), إحْمَارَ (R) from حُرَة [672] (M, R), orig. إحْمَارَ (IY, R), converting the second ض [at the end (IY)] into 
(M), because mobile and preceded by Fatha [684, 719] (IY); (b) aor. (R) يَكْرَوْرِي (M, SH): (2) similarly, in [493. A], like إِحْمَرْ (R), (a) (SH) refrained (from foul conduct), from رَا عَا, aor. يَدَرْ (MASH), orig. like إِحْمَرَ (SH). They do not incorporate (M, SH), but transform (R), (1) because transformation comes before incorporation [728] (R, Jrb); and, when the [final] و is converted in إِحْوَأَي and إِحْوَأَي into ى, and in يَكْرَوْرِي into ى, 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 إِحْوَأَي, aor. يَكْرَوْرِي, would reduce them to that vocalization of ى, with Damm, which they eschew in such as يَفْغَرُو و [719—721] (M); but [IY asserts that] Z's saying "because incorporation . . . . . . . . يَسَرُّ ى" is not correct, since vowels of inflection are not heavy upon double ى, as ىعَدَّا عَدَّ. This is an enemy [643, 720] and [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 إِحْوَأَي (M, R, Jrb)] you say (1) إِحْوَأَي (M, SH), according to some (IY),
like [332, 391] (R), without [conversion and (R)] incorporation [685 (case 7)] (IY, R, Jrb), because the ی is adventitious in the inf. n., on account of the Kasra, being orig. the ل in [685 (case 1, a)]; and, by reason of its adventitiousness, is not taken into account, as the ی and ل in سُوْيَر [685 (case 7, b, b, b), 716] is not taken into account, because it is a subst. for the ل [in سَوْيَر and قَبَل]: (a) properly, however, the ل in the v. is a subst. for the ی 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) اَحْمِرَةُ (M, SH), with incorporation (Jrb), the [only (R)] form mentioned by S (IY, R), orig. اَحْمِرَةُ [above] and اَشْهِبَابُ [391, 667]: (a) they convert the middle ل into ی, because ی occurs quiescent before it, as in مَيْت سَبْد [685 (case 7, a, a), 703, 716]; this ی being substituted for the ل [of اَحْمِرَةُ], because of the Kasra before it [685 (case 1, a)]: (b) the last ل is converted into Hamza, because it occurs as a final after an aug. ل, according to the rule in such as ۗکَسَاءَ [683 (case 1), 723] (IY). But those who say ل for اَشْهِبَابُ (R, Jrb), by eliding the ی (IY, Jrb) for alleviation, because the n. is long (IY),] say اَحْمِرَةُ (M, SH) for اَحْمِرَةَ [above] (R, Jrb), by
eliding the ی, because یاٰس is heavier than وَیُهُب (Jrb); so that two ی s are combined, as two ت s are combined in یُهُبُل [756], although یُهُبُل is not of the same conj. as یُهُبُل [492] (R): and they do not incorporate (IY, Jrb), (1) because the two ی s are medial, as they do not incorporate in یُهُبُل, because the two ت s, though alike, are strong as being in the middle; and are not considered like the ق s in قُدَّ شَدَ و and قُدَّ [731], which are at the end (IY): (2) because the letter before the two likes is quiescent, as in یُهُبُل (Jrb). Those, however, who incorporate in یُهُبُل, [not regarding the quiescence of the letter before the two likes in such a formation as this (Jrb), and say قُتَال (M, R, Jrb), ought by analogy to (Jrb)] say یَا (M, SH), incorporating one ی into the other; and transferring the vowel of the first ی to the ی before it, so that they dispense with the conj. Hamza (IY). For two ی 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 خَوَى, aor. يَخُرُى, with Fath of the ی in both, and خَوَى, aor. يَخُرُى, with Kasr of the two ی s, [inf. n. یَا], like قَتَال, aor. يَقَتَّل, inf. n. قَتَال [756]. When from خَوَى and خَوَى you form a [pret.] like ⌈حُمِّر ⌉ and ⌈حُمِّر ⌉ [above], you
say [730. A] and إِحْيَيَا, إِحْيَيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِحْيَأَيَا, إِحْيَأَيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, transformation coming before incorporation; du., إِحْيَيَا, إِحْيَيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, incorporation not being allowable, because the vowel on the last [ي] is adventitious, on account of the ٰ of the du.; pl., إِحْيَيَا, إِحْيَيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, [and إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا (S)]: but, when the vowel is inseparable, vid. in the pass., as أَحْيَيَا and أَرْمِيَا, and أَحْيَيَا, and أَرْمِيَا, du. [and إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا], pl. أَحْيَيَا, أَرْمِيَا, أَحْيَيَا, Aَرْمِيَا, أَحْيَيَا, Aَرْمِيَا, أَحْيَيَا, i.e., the ى pronounced with Damm being then pronounced with Kasr, as in مُسْلِمٍ [685 (case 7), 716], du. أَحْيَيَا, أَرْمِيَا, pl. أَحْيَيَا, أَرْمِيَا, and أَحْيَيَا, أَرْمِيَا; and the أَحْيَيَا, أَرْمِيَا, أَحْيَيَا, أَرْمِيَا: but the أَحْيَيَا, أَرْمِيَا, أَحْيَيَا, أَرْمِيَا, in أَحْيَيَا [above], like that of سُوْيْر [above], may not be incorporated. And you say, (1) in the aor. [act.], i.e., إِحْيَيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, and إِرْمِيَا, incorporation not being allowable, because the vowel [of the last unsound letter] is adventitious; but Kasr being made faint rather than clear, as we said [728]: (3) in the inf. n (a) of إِحْيَيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا,إِرْمِيَا: (b) of إِحْيَيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا, with incorporation: (a) those who do not incorporate in إِرْمِيَا, إِرْمِيَا,
[above], because of the ٰی 's being a subst. for the ٰی، ought not to incorporate here also; but [without incorporation] it would be deemed heavy. Those, however, who incorporate in ٰی، یقتٰتل، inf. n. ٰیقتٰتال [above], say ِحیا [730. A], ییکَی، inf. n. ِحیا (R).

§ 730. A. This being the end of the chapter on Transformation, let us make such additions to it as are suitable. When two ٰیs are combined, (1) if the last be not a ٰل، then, (a) if the first be quiescent, it is incorporated, as ٰبِیٰعَ and ٰبِیٰع [714 715]: (b) if the second be quiescent, or both be mobile, each of them is in the predicament of a single ٰی، as ٰبیٰت [274, 686, 721]; and similarly ٰیٰن and ٰیٰن، when you form words like ٰبٰع [684, 703] and ٰعیِلٰم [686, 714] from ٰیٰن [698]: (2) if the last be a ٰل، then, (a) if the first be quiescent, it is incorporated into the second, as ٰحی [697, 698]: (b) if the last be quiescent, both are preserved, as ٰحیبَت [698]: (c) if both be mobile, then, if conversion of the second into ٰل be allowable, it is converted, as ٰحیا [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 \(ج\), as \(جج\) [698], where incorporation [of the first \(ج\) into the second] is not allowable, because from the reduplicated, as \(جج\), is not subject to incorporation [731]; nor may the second be converted into \(ج\), for lack of commensurability with the \(غ\) [712]; but it is converted into \(ج\), because the combination of two mobile \(ج\)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 \(ج\); the second, not the first, being converted [into \(ج\)], because by it the sensation of heaviness in the combination is produced; while the \(ج\), notwithstanding that the final ought to be a light letter, is convertible into \(ج\), because the inseparability of the \(ج\) and \(ن\) make it medial, as they say of [the \(ج\) in \(ننفون\) and \(حبيبان\) [721]: but S says that the regular form is \(حبيبان\), so that he does not convert the second [\(ج\) into \(ج\)]; while \(حبيبون\), according to him, is anomalous: and so, in \(حبيبون\) from \(تى\), he says \(حبيبان\) [below], as will be seen (R); for the first \(ج\) is like the \(غ\) of \(عور\) [707]; while the last \(ج\) is strong, like the \(ج\) in \(جرزان\) [719], and becomes equivalent to the sound; and they do not deem them heavy, when pronounced with \(فاث\), as they say \(كروي\) [302] and \(أحروي\) [300] (S): and so you say \(حبيبان\), on the measure of \(سبعان\) [236, 686 (case 2, c)], from \(حبي\); and do not
incorporate, as you do in 
[731], because transformation comes before incorporation; but S makes the regular form 
with incorporation, because he does not convert [the second ى into ٌ ] in such [formations]: (8) if incorporation be allowable, you may incorporate or not, as حَيَّانٌ or حَيَّيَّ [728, 747]; and [similarly, in حَيَّانٌ from نَعْلَانٌ with Kasr or حَيَّانٌ: 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 لَنْ يُحْيِي [728, 731], both [ى s] must be sounded true, [and] displayed; while the Kasra of the first is better made faint. When three ى s are combined, (1) if the last be a جٌ, 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 حَيَّٰ, as حَيَّٰ in [281], aor. حَيَّي, act. part. حَيَّٰ, pass. part. حَيَّٰ, like عَرَى denuded, aor. يُعَرِى act. part. يُعَرِى, pass. part. يُعَرِى: (α) the reason why the third [ى ] preceded by Kasra, notwithstanding that this [combination of ى s and Kasra] is deemed heavy, is not elided, as forgotten, in the v., as يُنْكِى [below], is only that the vowel of the ِع in the v. may be spared, since
through it the measures of the v. vary; while the measures of the v. must be observed, as before explained in accounting for the impossibility of converting the, of such as يُذْعَر into ی [721]: (т) then the part., as المُكْبَرِي, is treated like the v. in respect of omission to elide the third ی as forgotten: (b) when that is not in a v. or part., then, (α) if conversion of the third [into ۱] be allowable, vid. when the double [ی] is pronounced with فاث, and the last is final, it is converted, as نِيا, on the measure of $\$ز$ goose [here supposed to be for $\$ز$ I betook myself, repaired, orig. $\$ن$ [on the measure of $\$ن$ انعَلُة ], then $\$ن$ [661], [then $\$ن$ (685, case 7),] then $\$ن$ [684]; (т) if that [conversion of the third] be not allowable, either because, though the double [ی] is pronounced with فاث, the last is intermediate, as being followed by a letter constitutionally inseparable in every position, like the non-dualistic ۱ and ن, or because, [though the last is final,] the double [ی] is pronounced with دامم or كسر, then, in the first case, the third [ی] is converted into ۰, as حَيْوَان, on [the measure of] حَيْوَان [above] from حَيْبَي, because it is heavier than حَيْوَان [above] with a single ی; but, according to س, حَيْبَي, as [implied] above: and, in the second case, the دامم [of the double ی, if it be pronounced with دامم,] 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] ي s, together with Kasra of the double ي, are deemed heavy at the end; as حَيْبِيّ [281], orig. [معَيّيّة], then حَيْبِيّ; and as حَيْبِيّ, on the measure of كَنِّهَبُ [394], from حَيْبِيّ, orig. حَيْبِيّ, then حَيْبِيّ, and then حَيْبِيّ: 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 أَشِيْبٌاَن, on the measure of [fermented dough (MAR)], from شُوْي [inf. n. of شَوى he roasted meat (Jh, KF)], where you say أَشِيْبٌاَن, then أَشِيْبٌاَن, and then أَشِيْبٌاَن: but IAl 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 أَحْيَ [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 تَرَبِّيّ [302] in the rel. n.; and رَمَيّ, on the measure of بَرْطِيلَ [long stone (MAR)], from رَمَيّ: (b) if the letter before the first be mobile, then, (α) if the first (ي) be the second [letter] of the word, [all] the ي s are preserved, as حَيْبِيّ,
like ۲ حَمِيَّ (375); and ۳ حَمِيَّ [below], like ۲ دَمَّ [375, 724],
orig. ۳ حَمِيَّ with Damm of the ع; and ۳ حَمِيَّ shamefaced,
bashful, modest, [like ۳ غُنِيَّ independent, wealthy (KF),]
from ۳ حَمِيَّ shame; because the word is light; (أ) if the
first ى be the third [letter] of the word, it is made a ،
whether the letter before it be pronounced with
Fatha, as when you form a [word] like ۳ حَمِيَّصَة [274,
303], [n. un. of حَمِيّصَة (KF),] from ۳ رَمِيِّ، in which case
you say ۳ رَمِيَّة، [orig. ۳ رَمِيَّة (S),] like ۳ رَمِيَّة، [orig.
۳ رَمِيَّة،] in [the fem. of] the rel. n. (R) from ۳ حَمِيَّ [294,
300, 686] (S); and do not convert the first ى into ١، either
in the rel. n., because the vowel [of this ى] is acci-
dental [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
حَلَكُون intensely black [below] from ۳ رَمِيَّ. you say ۳ رَمِيَّ،
orig. ۳ رَمِيَّ، then ۱ رَمِيَّ [685 (case 7)], then ۳ رَمِيَّ، [like
۳ رَمِيَّ (724) and ۳ حَمِيَّ (above),] and then ۲ رَمِيَّ: or with
Kasr, as ۳ عُمَرِي [294, 301, 686], where you convert the
Kasra into Fatha, in order that the َ may be preserved :
and, in these exs., one of the ى s is converted into ،
because the [three] ى s are deemed heavy; but, although
alteration is more appropriate in the final, the last is not
converted, as in ُحَيْرَان [above], because it is strong through the doubling; and, for this reason, the third is not elided, as in مَعِيَة [above]; while, in the ى of relation, elision and conversion would be more extraordinary, because it is a sign [282, 294]: (γ) if the first [ى] be the fourth [letter] of the word, then, if it be before the ى of relation, it is elided, according to the soundest [opinion], as ۡبَقَّى ۡقَارِصُوٰى [282, 301], because of the combination of ىs, together with the heaviness of the word, and the first's being the final of the word, since the ى of relation is adventitious; but ۡبَقَّى ۡقَارِصُوٰى is allowable, as before stated [301]: whereas, if it be not before the ى of relation, it is not elided, because it is not the final of the word; but is converted into َى, as when it is the third [letter] of the word [case (β) above]: you say ۡرَمَى ۡتَمَيْىى, on the measure of ۡخُيَتَعَرَز [398] from ۡرَمَى, orig. ۡرَمَى ۡتَمَيْىى, the of which is converted into ى, and incorporated into the last ى; and the Damma then converted into Kasra, and the ى [before the double ى] into َى, and similarly ۡبَنَوَى ۡتَمَيْىى, [orig. ۡبَنَوَى ۡتَمَيْىى] like ۡخُنْفَقَيْىىك [677], from ۡبَكَى wept: (c) if none of them be incorporated, then, (a) if the third be entitled to conversion into َى, it is converted, as when a [v.] like حَيَى اُحُمْرٍ is formed from حَيِّى اُحُمْرٍ, in which case you convert the third into َى, as ًۡحَيِّى اُحُمْرٍ.
and then, if you incorporate, as in حَيَا [756], you say حَيَا [730]; but, if not, you convert the second into ٌوَ, as in حَيِّوَان [above]: (b) if the third be not entitled [to conversion into ٌ], as when you form a [n. حُبَيّ], [contracted from حَدَدَّ اَلَّا حُبَيّ] like حُدَدَّ [very thick milk (MAR)] or جَدَّد [296, 392], from حَيَِّ, you may elide it as forgotten, because the heaviness is more than in مُعَمَّتْه [above]; so that you say حَيَا or حَيَا, 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 ٌوَ, as in حَيِّوَان [above]; so that the third is preserved, because the combination of ىs ceases; and the word then becomes حِبَيّا or حْيَوٌ, حْيَوٌ, حْيَوٌ [acc. حُبَيّا or حَبِّيّا, حَبِّيّا]: and similarly, when you form a [n. قَضِيّ], [like جَغْمَرِش [401], you say قَضِيّا, by eliding the last [ى] as forgotten, and converting the second into ٌ; or قَضِيّ, by converting the second into ٌ, [and preserving the third]: (α) the third is not converted into ٌ, [like the second in حَيِّوَان, ] because [ٌ is heavy, while] the end of the word is worthier of alleviation [than the middle]; and also [because], if you converted it into ٌ, the combination of the first two ىs would remain unaltered:
(3) as for the first [ي] it is not converted, because the heaviness arises from the second and third: while in ١٨٩٨ [above], like ١٨٩٨٠, the first is not converted, because its analogue is not converted into ١ in the v., as ١٨٩٨٠[728]; so that, a fortiori, it is not converted in a n. not commensurable with the v. [703, 712]: (ɔ) if the last ١ be not ٨٠, [all] the ١ s remain unaltered, without conversion or elision, as ١٨٩٨٠ dim. of ١٨٩٨٠٠٠٠ (R), which is foreign, arabicized, the archer, or horseman, of the Persians (Jk). And, when four ١ s are combined, (1) if the two last do not denote relation, then, in forming [a word], (a) from ١٨٩٨٠ ١٨٩٨٠ ١٨٩٨ [401], you say ١٨٩٨٠, incorporating the first into the second, so that they become like a single ١: and [then] (α) you convert the third into ١, as we said of [the second in] the [n.] formed on the measure of ١٨٩٨٠ [above]; so that the fourth is preserved, as ١٨٩٨٠, [acc. ١٨٩٨٠ ١٨٩٨٠ ١٨٩٨], or (β) you may elide the last as forgotten, because it is heavier than in ١٨٩٨٠ [above]; so that the third is converted into ١, because mobile as a final, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as ١٨٩٨٠: as we said before [about ١٨٩٨٠ ١٨٩٨٠ ١٨٩٨٠ ١٨٩٨٠]: (b) like ١٨٩٨٠ [368, 401, 674], you say ١٨٩٨٠: (c) like ١٨٩٨٠ [401], you say ١٨٩٨٠ ١٨٩٨٠, the second double [ي] not being
converted into خَلَّان, as [the second single ي is] in خَلَّان [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 مَعَبِيَة [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 طَيِّي [302] and أميّي [299] are allowable, according to one saying, notwithstanding that the two first [ي s] are the termination of the word [أمّيّي and طِيّي], the ي of relation being adventitious, this is more excellent: (δ) like تَدْعُبَل [401], you say حَبْيّي, incorporating the second into the third; and [then] elide the fourth, as [you elide the third] in مَعَبِيَة [above], which [elision] is more appropriate here; and do not convert the double [ي] into خَلَّان, because by the doubling it becomes strong, like a sound letter; so that حَبْيّي remains: (b) from قَرَى judged, decreed, on the measure of تَدْعُبَلَة [401], you say قَرَى: (α) Mz allows only قَرَى, [with elision of the first ي, and conversion of the second into خَلَّان, ] as in the rel. n. قَرَى (299): but others, together with قَرَى, allow قَرَى with two double [ي s] more often than أميّي [above]: (b) what I hold is that only قَرَى 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 [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 أَمْرٍى [299]: (c) from شَرَى [above], on the measure of عصفر [396], you say شَوْيٌ; and then convert the two ش into ی, and incorporate them into the two یs [685 (case 7)]; so that it becomes ْشِيِّى, the دامّما of the first double [ی] being converted into Kasra; and Kasr of the ْن also being then allowable, as in عطى [685 (case 9, b, a), 722]: (a) S says شَوْى, by analogy to حُرْيَ و ْطْرُ ْتَ ْلَى and حُرْيَ and ْطْرُ ْتَ ْلَى rel. ns. of طَى and ْتَ ْلَى or ْشِيِّى, as ْبَيْقَر ْبِبْقَر [302] is said: (d) from ْطْرُ ْتَ ْلَى [728], on the measure of ْبَيْقَر ْبِبْقَر ْبَيْقَر ْبِبْقَر ْبَيْقَر ْبِبْقَر, you say ْطْرُ ْتَ ْلَى: and then convert (a) 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 دامّما of the [second] ی into Kasra; so that you say ْطْرُ ْتَ ْلَى, and ْطْرُ ْتَ ْلَى also, like the rel. ns. [ ْعَلِى and ْحَبُوَى] of حُبَى [302]: (2) if the two last [یs] do denote relation, as in the rel. ns. of ْعَلِى and ْحَبُوَى [302], ْعَلِى [302, 684 (condition 6, b, and g, b)] and ْحَبُوَى [299], ْحَبُوَى [299] and ْعَلِى [301], the predicament of the four یs has been already
explained in the chapter on the Relative Noun: (a) it has also been mentioned [in the chapter on the Diminutive] that the ی of the dim., if the rel. formation invade the dim., is elided, as امَّي [above]; but, if the dim. formation invade the rel. n., is not elided, as ٍؤَرِيَّة , with two double ی s, dim. of ٍؤَرِيَّة [281]. All of this is the predicament of the ی s. And, as for the predicament of the ، s, we say that, when two ، s are combined, (1) if their second be quiescent, then, (a) if it be final, the first cannot be pronounced with Fath or دامم, except when the second is adscititious, as in لَمْ يَزَوَّرُوا. They quenched not their thirst and مَرَوْبُ نِمْزِيَّة quenchers of Zaid’s thirst, because, at the end of the word, which is the seat of lightness, they deem two ، s without incorporation to be heavy, for which reason they do not form a.[v.] like كَوْرَت or كَوْرَت [729]; so that, if the two ، s were in one word, the first would unavoidably be pronounced with كسر, in order that the second might be converted into ی, as كُوَرَت [729]: (b) if the last be medial, their combination is allowable, as تُرُول [714]: (2) if both be mobile, then, (a) if that be at the beginning of the word, the first is converted into حمزة, as أَرْأَيْل [683, 699]; (b) if it be in the middle, then, (a) if incorporation be allowable, you incorporate, as when you form فُعَلَّنِي، with دامم of the ع، from تُرَة، in
which case you say 

, according to [S and] Mb: (a) the proper [course], however, is not to incorporate; but to convert the second into in and the Damma before it into Kasra, as already mentioned in this chapter [721], because transformation comes before incorporation: and this is the saying of Jr: (b) if incorporation be not allowable, as when you form 

; with Fath of the , from ; S says that you say 

[above], as he says 

: (a) the proper [course], however, is to say [below]; because two s are deemed heavy; so that, when alleviation by incorporation is not allowable, you alleviate by converting one of them into in : and, since the [second] in is converted into in [above] from dislike of two in s, a fortiori the second in is converted into in , because is heavier [than in]: (c) if you form , with Kasr of the , [you say , because (S)] you convert the second in into in on account of the Kasra, since transformation comes before incorporation: (c) if that be at the end, then, (a) if the first be permanently pronounced with Fath, the second is converted into !, as [Note on Part I, p. 908, ll. 15-17 [719, 728], and ] stronger: (a) as for [the retention of the second in] rel. n. of [302], it is because
the Fatha of the first is accidental [684 (condition 5)]; while in قَوِى قَوِй
third is converted into (a) ٍ, if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as تُقْوَى strengthened himself and the strengthened: (b) ی, if the letter before it be pronounced with Kasr, as يُقْوَى strengthens and the strengthener; or Damm, as تُقْوَى, on the measure of بَرْتُن [392], from قَوْة: (b) if the second be incorporated into the third, the double [و ] is converted into double ی, whether the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as تُبْطَر [375] or فِلَبْر [245, 392]; or Kasr, as تُقْوَى, on the measure of بَنْل [375]; or Damm, as تُقْوَى, on the measure of بُنْل [375, 724], that Damm being converted into Kasr, and Kasr of the ی being then allowable, by imitation, as in عِتَی [722], from the heaviness of the ی preceded by a mobile, contrary to such as حِیى [above], since ی is lighter [than و ]: (a) [in the preceding exs. under case (b) the first of the three ی is the second letter of the word:] and similarly [the double ی is converted into double ی ], when the first of the [three] ی is the third [letter] of the word, and the letter before it is mobile, as غَزْوَى, on the measure of حَلْكُر [above]: whereas, if it be quiescent, then, if the first [و ] be pronounced with Fath, the whole are preserved, as غَزْوَى [below], on the measure of قُرْشَب [397] or قُرْطَب [401]; but, if with Damm or
Kasr, the double [ة] is converted into [double] ى, and the Damma into Kasra, as مَقُورٌ [685 (case 8), 722] and مُقُورٌ [722, 728]: (c) if none of them be incorporated, you convert the last into (α)!, if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as [ on the measure of اَبُورُ and then, (α) if you incorporate, you say ىُقُور [730, 756]: (β) if not, you convert the second [ة] into ى, on the analogy of قُوَان [above], which [conversion] is more appropriate here [at the end of the word]; so that you say اَتُوبَا, aor. ىُقُورٍ, saying [for قُوَان], like جَدِّلٌ or هَدْبِنَ [above], from قوَّة, because of the Kasra on the letter before it: (α) the first [ة in ىُقُور] is not incorporated into the second, notwithstanding that the vowel of the second is inseparable [728], in order that the form of co-ordination [with ] may be preserved, and also because resemblance to the v. is lacking [731]: (β) it is better, however, not to form such augmented ns. unconnected with the v. [330] as lead to heaviness like this: (2) if [the last of] the three [ة] be [not a ج, because of their being] combined in the middle [of the word], they remain unaltered, as قَوْنَ, on the measure of سُبُوح [384]; and قَوْنَ [below], like لَعْدُودٌ [482, 483]: (a) Akh converts
the last [ي] in [683, 699], and therefore the second also
[685 (case 7)], into ي; but S does not mind that [combina-
tion of ي, س], because they are in the middle: (b) Akh ought to say تَرَوَلُتْ تَرَوَلُتْ for تَرَوَلَتْ; but excuses himself by
the plea that the ع, of prolongation is light: (c) Akh does
not convert [the third ي in] أَتْرُوْلُتْ, because the middle
[و] is like ٰ, for which it is a subst.: do you not see
that, for a similar reason, the initial of وُرِي pass. of
زَارَى [683, 699] is not necessarily converted into Hamza?
And, when four س are combined, then, (1) if the third
be incorporated into the fourth, the third and fourth
must be converted into س, as تَرَوَلُتْ, on the measure of
[401], from تَرُوْلُتْ, because تَرُوْلُتْ is heavier than such
as غُرَوْلُتْ [above]: (2) if the third be not incorporated
into the fourth, the last is converted into ٰ, if the letter
before it be pronounced with Fath; and into ي, if it
be pronounced with Kasr: while the third (a) remains
unaltered, according to S, as تَرَوَلُتْ [below], on the
measure of جَكْمَرْش, because it is then [in the middle,]
like [the third ي in] أَتْرُوْلُتْ [above]; (b) تَرَوَلُتْ, on the
measure of تَرَوُلُتْ; (c) أَتْرُوْلُتْ, on the measure of
: (b) is converted into ي by Akh, who says (a)
إِتْرُوْلُتْ, like جَكْمَرْش تَرَوَلُتْ; (b) like تَرَوُلُتْ; (c) تَرَوُلُتْ, like
for, deeming the [combination of] $s$ heavy, he converts the one near the end into $i$: ($\alpha$) the third in [above], like $\text{جَحَكْمِش}$, [orig. $\text{جَوُيْم}$, then $\text{جُورٌي}$, and then $\text{جُوروُي}$] is not converted into $l$, as the $\text{و}$ of $[728]$ is not converted. And God best knows the right! (R).
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